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TO MY WIFE
I have felt a little presumptuous writing this thesis. Though I am not an Anglican I have been writing on the thought of the classical Anglican divines; and I have found myself unable to present simply and dispassionately an outline of their thought. Throughout I have been interpreting, and even assessing, them theologically - though I hasten to add that I have tried to make the assessment chiefly on the basis of the theological tradition of the Anglican Reformation itself.

Yet my feeling of presumptuousness has always been modified by another feeling: that of kinship with most of the men I have been reading. At first, it is true, I read them as an outsider, but soon I was drawn into their work and concerns; since then I have felt as though I were seeing everything from the inside. And as a result of this study I believe I understand and respect and admire the Church of England, in a way that I could never otherwise have done without actually becoming a member of that communion.

It was at Professor Torrance's suggestion that I began this investigation and I am immensely grateful to him for putting me on to it. Without his help, however, I could never have carried it through. He resolutely refused to tell me my job, yet by simple devastating questions he was always able to lead me to the place where I could tackle a new theme fruitfully. For his personal assistance, and perhaps even more, for the enormous help I have received by sitting under him in class, I express my most sincere thanks.

Principal Burleigh has been my other adviser, and though I have not been in close touch with him on it, he very kindly saved
me from disaster in the earlier stages of the work. In connection with a very questionable historical survey I was proposing to include in the dissertation. I am most grateful to him for this.

To my intimate friend, Dr. J. D. Fry, who has also written a thesis on this period, I am much indebted. Though he and I were working in the same area, he normally saw what was significant long before I did. It was he who made me look more carefully at Andrewes and Beveridge when I, after an initial reading of a few sermons, was inclined to treat them lightly. His insight into the important issues was an invaluable aid to me in my own effort to understand and interpret.

Two other friends, Dr. F. W. McNally and Mr. William Klempa, have with amazing good humor spent considerable time trying to turn my writing into acceptable English. The former was especially long-suffering, for he read the first four chapters and made many suggestions, almost all of which were followed to advantage. To both of them I extend my humble thanks.

I must also mention one who has had no direct connection with the writing of this thesis, without whom nevertheless I would never have been able to carry out such a study: my former teacher and valued friend, Professor Gordon Harland. It was he who first taught me to think theologically and who tried (vainly perhaps) to make me think consistently. And it was he who first led me to the theologians of past and present and helped me to understand what they were saying. His influence upon me was decisive, and I shall never be able to give to him the gratitude that I would like to express or that he really deserves.
My wife too, in spite of the fact that she has the formidable task of looking after me and our two children, has helped a great deal in correcting my grammar and polishing my style (?). Even more important than this, however, has been her belief that the study was worth doing and her confidence that I could do it. Without such support I might never have begun, and I most certainly would never have finished, this undertaking. I gratefully dedicate the thesis to her.

The library staff at New College were invariably helpful. When asked for assistance they maintained a cheerfulness that I found rather amazing, especially considering that the books I seemed unable to find were normally on the shelf where they were supposed to be! My sincere thanks go to Dr. Lamb, Miss Leslie, and Miss Barrie for their kindness.

It has been my good fortune to have Mrs. R. R. Watt of Edinburgh as my typist. She has not only been able to type the thesis competently, but also to correct a number of errors in spelling, punctuation, and footnoting as she went along. I am grateful to her for her fine work.

Finally, I draw the reader's attention to two minor points: first, American spelling has been followed throughout, except of course in direct quotations; secondly, the abbreviations P.S., and L.A.C.T., refer respectively to volumes from the "Parker Society" and the "Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology".

A. M. WATTS

Edinburgh,
April 27, 1960
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INTRODUCTION

Properly speaking, the Caroline Divines are those Anglican divines who lived in the reigns of the two Stuart kings named Charles; those, that is, who lived and worked between 1625 and 1685. I early discovered, however, that for my purposes 1625 was an impossible boundary line, if only because strict adherence to it would have eliminated from the study the most significant theologian of 17th century England, Lancelot Andrewes. To neglect

1. The word "Anglican" is one that needs definition. It is commonly assumed that, in the 16th and 17th centuries, if a man was an Anglican he could not be a Puritan, and vice versa. But this idea cannot be sustained. In the early days of Elizabeth's reign the Puritans were simply Anglicans who advocated further reformation of the established Church. In the 1580's and 90's some "Puritans" began to separate themselves from the Church and set up independent congregations, but they were a small minority of the Puritans and were displeased as heartily by the Presbyterians (i.e. non-separatist Puritans) as they were by the "Anglicans". Thomas Cartwright may be a different kind of Anglican than John Whitgift but he is an Anglican all the same. And until 1662 the Presbyterians were in a definite sense Anglicans, for they continued to be members of the established Church, even though many of the ministers set up "classes" in an attempt to order and discipline the Church apart from the authority of the bishop. Mr. George Every, speaking of the Presbyterians after 1662, says that they, "unlike the Independent the Quakers, and the Baptists, were not a community of separatists, but a group of displaced ministers and their adherents, who accepted the principle of a national Church, the Royal Supremacy, a fixed liturgy, and a 'moderated' Episcopacy". (The High Church Party 1688-1710, 1936, pp. 20f). When I say, therefore, that the Carolines were the "Anglican" divines in the time of the two Charles, the statement needs to be qualified. I mean by the word "Carolines" the non-Puritan Anglicans in that period, those Anglicans who more or less supported the Establishment as it was, those who belonged more or less to the Church Party as such. This means that men like Archbishop Ussher and Bishop Davenant are included whereas a man like Richard Baxter is excluded. It would be hard to find serious fundamental differences between Baxter and the other two; yet I consider Ussher and Davenant to be Carolines because they accept and support the Establishment, whereas Baxter I consider to belong in another classification because of his non-conformity.

2. Andrewes died in September, 1626, a little over a year after Charles I came to the throne.
Andrewes appeared to me to be out of the question. But if Andrewes was to be included, why not Richard Field, who wrote the only full-scale work on the Church produced by an Englishman between the Reformation and the 19th century? The natural course, therefore, seemed to be to reckon the important Jacobean with the "legitimate" Caroline. Even this, however, did not solve all my problems, for it soon became apparent to me that between the men in the early part of the century and those in the later there was a definite, and important, difference of theological perspective. Surely my thesis should point out and interpret this difference. I decided I could do this more intelligibly by dividing the early men from the later, and that is how I have set out each chapter. The criterion by which the men are separated is a fairly natural one, and I believe it has worked effectively. All those 17th century Anglicans who lived and died before the Restoration are included under the title "Early Carolines"; those who died after the Restoration, even if only shortly after, (e.g. John Bramhall), are called "Later Carolines". But a glance at the chapters to follow will reveal that they are divided not into two, but into three sections. Each chapter begins with a brief section on the 16th century. A more normal approach, if knowledge of the situation in the preceding century were deemed necessary, would be to provide a short chapter on the 16th century, or perhaps to discuss it here in the Introduction.

1. Field's book, Of The Church, was first published in 1605. See Woodhouse, Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547-1603, 1954, p.1.
But under the circumstances this would not be adequate. I believe the change of theological outlook that takes place in 17th century Anglican thought from the accession of James I to the Bloodless Revolution is something that must be discerned and understood. I have considered it a large part of my task in this thesis to describe it — from, of course, the perspective of the doctrine of the Church. But this movement of thought cannot be understood apart from the Reformation. Without first referring to Reformation doctrine I felt that I could not discuss properly the writings of the 17th century divines. At the beginning of each chapter I have tried to outline the position of the 16th century men in order to approach the Early Carolines in their proper setting. If it seems to the reader that in two of the chapters (Chapters IV and V) I have done more than deal briefly with the 16th century I can only say that the themes demanded it.

It would be foolish for me to deny that I have an axe to grind. The reader will probably find it only too obvious that I am sympathetic with the Anglican reformation tradition and that in most of their debates with the Romans I am in agreement with the Reformers. And he might conclude from this that because of my "Protestant bias" I have played down the disputes between the Carolines and the Puritans and played up those between the Carolines and the Romans. If my "bias" has actually led me to do this I must ask to be forgiven. But let me emphasize here that this is a theological study and that most of the Carolines, especially the Early Carolines, — surprising as it may seem to
many present-day churchmen, both Anglican and Non-conformist —
did not believe there was any theological difference between them-
selves and the Puritans. The debate with the "papist" was over
matters of faith; the debate with the Puritans was over matters of
"ceremonies and discipline". It is true that the Arminian-Cal-
vinist battle complicates the matter somewhat but let us never
think that in England the lines were drawn strictly between Angli-
cans (Arminians) and Puritans (Calvinists). Not all Puritans were
Calvinists, and certainly not all Anglicans were Arminians. And
there were some Anglicans discerning enough to know that to reject
the "Calvinism" commended by certain 17th century churchmen was not
necessarily to embrace Arminianism. But the point remains that
the debate between the Carolines and the Puritans was, in the opinion
of most of the Carolines at least, over questions of Order, not of Faith. No less a man than Androwes, in his exchange with
Cardinal Bellarmine, has this to say about the Puritans:

"They have no distinct and peculiar religion, but discipline.
And this would have applied ... to the Puritans generally, and to those among them who, except that they are too violent-
ly addicted to their order of church government, are in other
things sufficiently sober-minded; and those, however in-
fatuated is their devotedness to their 'platform', are yet
sufficiently orthodox in the rest of their doctrine. For I
am not ignorant that there are numbered, and indeed are
amongst them unreasonable men (as in your society) over-
inclined to schism; nay, that there is not wanting some who
are scarcely sound in all things as regards some points of
religion. And these I would exclude in this my mention of
them here and in every other place. But with me they are
Puritans from their exterior form of discipline, but not from
their religion, which both is the same and can be, where the
external face of discipline is not the same". 

It may be less surprising, but it is not less important to find

1. Tortura Torti pp. 161f. Found in Welsby, Lancelot Androwes,
p. 152 footnote.
an old Calvinist like Bishop George Carleton saying much the same thing. Replying to Richard Mountague he claims:

"This is the first time that ever I heard of a Puritan doctrine in points dogmatically, and I have lived longer in the Church than he (Mountague) hath done. I thought that Puritans were only such as were factious against the Bishops in the point of pretended Discipline; and so I am sure it hath been understood hitherto in our Church. A Puritan doctrine is a strange thing, because it hath been confessed on both sides, that Protestants and Puritans (sic) have held the same doctrines without variance. The Discipline varied in England, Scotland, Geneva, and other where; Yet the Doctrine hath been hitherto the same "

This then is my justification for dealing with Caroline doctrine primarily in relation to Roman doctrine. It is an undoubted fact that politically and ecclesiastically the King-Parliament, Caroline-Puritan, dispute is the chief fact to be reckoned with in 17th century English history. And who would be rash enough to deny that this dispute had significant theological overtones? But the Carolines consider the important theological battle-line to be drawn between themselves and the Roman Catholics.

It is time that a serious dogmatic reassessment be taken of 17th century English theology. There are surprises waiting for everybody. For example, Jeremy Taylor, who is in certain respect a militant "High Churchman", is theologically very close to the later 17th century Puritans. There is far greater theological difference between the two so-called High Churchmen, Jeremy Taylor and Lancelot Andrewes, than there is between Andrewes and John Calvin. It is only possible to lump men like Andrewes and Taylor together when our attention is limited to certain aspects of their thought.

1. Examination of the Late Appeal, 1626, p. 121.
Since there are serious differences between some of the men, it is obviously not going to be easy to assess 17th century Anglican theological thought as a whole. Moreover, none of the divines except Richard Field, John Pearson, and Herbert Thorndike wrote systematic treatises, and not a few of them manifest serious inconsistencies in their thought. For these reasons I have chosen to proceed somewhat differently than H. E. Woodhouse has done in his excellent book on the 16th century divines.¹ He binds the Reformer and their successors into what might be called one "framework" or "system" so that they all speak with one voice. Individual differences are not given much attention. Even for the 16th century men, who did agree to a remarkable extent, some important things are lost by following this method. With the 17th century it can be used only to a very limited extent, for how can one pass lightly over the fundamental differences between Lancelot Andrews and Isaac Barrow, or between Wm. Beveridge and Wm. Sherlock? I have followed this procedure to some extent in chapter I, which is chiefly a preparatory chapter for that which follows. Thereafter I have considered it necessary to set out the thought of most of the men separately. This involves considerable repetition but on the whole each man is permitted to speak for himself and make his own distinctive comment on the questions under discussion.

One further note: in this thesis when the word "Reformers" is used it means always the Anglican Reformers; by itself it will never be used to refer to the Continental Reformers. The phrase "reformed Anglican tradition" I have employed rather often; if

¹ *Op cit.*
may be worth saying that I am not using the term "reformed" in the generally accepted sense of specifying the Calvinist tradition. I mean rather to indicate the specific tradition emanating from the Anglican reformation. It is fairly obvious that there is a great affinity between Calvin (and Butzer and Martyr) and the Anglican Reformers. My choice of the word "reformed" was not prompted by any desire to draw attention to that affinity. I only felt that to refer simply to the "Anglican tradition" might not necessarily point the reader to the specific theological tradition of Cranmer, Ridley, and Jewel.
CHAPTER I

THE CHURCH: HER FOUNDATION

In order to set out and interpret the doctrine of the foundation of the Church held by the Carolines and their 16th century predecessors, we shall examine their thought in terms of what I call the different "moments" within the Church's foundation. There are not, of course, four foundations; these "moments" are simply the one foundation looked at from different perspectives. We shall study their writings on the subject under four headings: (1) Election; (2) the central fact of God's act in Jesus Christ; (3) the apostles and prophets; (4) the faith and obedience of the Church. The understanding of these "moments" and their relation to each other is of great importance to the thought and life of the Church; a depreciation of one can, in fact, have the effect of turning the Church away from her proper ground.

Section I - The Sixteenth Century

The Anglican Reformers, and their immediate successors, insist that the Church has her ground and being in the call of God. She is not the product of man's thought and endeavor in any sense of the words. The English Reformers stand in the tradition of Augustine, Wyclif, and Calvin, maintaining with them that the holy Catholic Church is composed of those chosen and predestined unto everlasting life. "Christ is present with His Holy Church, which is His holy elected people, leading and governing them with His Holy Spirit, and teaching them all truth necessary for salvation /
salvation . . . "1. Hooper, Bacon, and Jewel, in various places testify to the Church's origin in God's decision before the foundation of the world. In His great mercy God called to Himself a people, a new people that should belong wholly unto Him, and whom He would never allow to be separated from Him. But what has this election of a holy people to do with Jesus Christ? The Scripture does not only point to predestination as the ultimate ground of the Church; it explicitly states that Christ is the foundation (I Cor. 4:11) and the chief corner-stone (Eph. 2:20). The relation of the two moments is clearly set out by Hooker in a remarkable passage on this very theme, which deserves to be quoted in full:

"Life as all other gifts and benefits groweth originally from the Father, and cometh not to us but by the Son, nor by the Son to any of us in particular but through the Spirit. For this cause the Apostle wisheth to the church of Corinth 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost.' Which three St. Peter comprehendeth in one, 'The participation of the divine nature' we are therefore in God through Christ eternally according to that intent and purpose whereby we were chosen to be made his in this present world before the world itself was made, we are in God through the knowledge that is had of us, and the love which is borne toward us from everlasting. But in God we actually are no longer than only from the time of our actual adoption into the body of his true Church, into the fellowship of his children. For his Church he knoweth and loveth, so that they which are in the Church are thereby known to be in Him. Our being in Christ by eternal forknowledge saveth us not without our actual and real adoption into the fellowship of his saints in this present world. For in him we actually are by our actual incorporation into that society which hath him for their Head, and doth make together with him one Body, (he and they in that respect having one name,) for which cause, by virtue of his mystical conjunction, we are of him and in him even as though our very flesh and bones should be made continue with his. We are in Christ because he knoweth and loveth us as parts of himself. No man actually is in him but they in whom he actually is. For 'he which hath not the Son of God hath not life.' 'I am the vine and you are the

branches: he which abideth in me and I in him the same bringeth forth much fruit;' but the branch severed from th vine withereth. We are therefore adopted sons of God to eternal life by participation of the only-begotten Son of God, whose life is the well-spring and cause of ours.\(^1\)

In Christ then we are elected unto eternal life: that is, elected to life in Christ, in His Body, in His Church. We are all adopted as sons of God in the One unique Son of God. This adoption takes place for me, according to Hooker, through the work of the Holy Spirit. God's election, then, becomes actual for me when I am adopted into the family of the sons of God by the action of the Holy Spirit.

But when does this actual adoption into the family of the sons of God take place? In Baptism. G. W. Bromiley points out\(^2\) that only a few English divines make explicit the implicit connection between Baptism and election; nevertheless the connection is undeniable. Baptism is a testimony to the grace of God and an assurance of the divine election and promises.\(^3\) Hooker, again, is the one who most explicitly relates them.

"... We justly hold it (Baptism) to be the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life, a seal perhaps to the grace of Election, before received, but to our sanctification here a stop that hath not any before it." \(^4\) In Baptism we are incorporated into Christ,\(^5\) that is into the Church which is His Body. Baptism therefore not only points to the love and call of God as the ultimate ground of adoption.

---

3. *Ibid*, p,18
it also testifies to the existence of the Church as an objective reality, something which is prior to individual believers.

Thus the Church plays her part in the working out of God's election. When she baptizes God's Spirit reaches out to this particular person and takes him unto Himself. That is not to say that God's election becomes particularized by the action of the Church; election is by its very nature particular. Nevertheless the electing God reaches out into the world, adopting those who belong to Him, by means of the mission of the Church. The Church carries out her mission by baptizing; but not by baptizing only. She is also called to preach the Gospel to every creature. This preaching of the Word is directed toward those outside the Church (i.e. those who are not baptized), and also toward those who are within. Thus by the Word not only are unbelievers called to Jesus Christ and baptized into His Church, but the Church itself is renewed, and continually, as it were, called into being. It is for this reason that the Anglican Reformers have such a high regard for preaching. They believe that the Church has her being out of the Gospel, and they mean by that, in a very concrete sense, the preaching of the Gospel.

But here we come to another "moment" in the foundation of the Church: the apostles and prophets. The Church has not any peculiar

1. Jewel, II, p. 619; III, p. 153; Philpot, Works, p. 135 & 344. Hooker did not have such a high regard for preaching. In the Ece. Polity he is fighting against those Puritans who exalt preaching (and that in a certain form) at the expense of everything else. For that reason he places greater stress on the reading of the Word (i.e., Scripture) than on preaching. See Ece. Polity, V, xxii and xxiv. The Anglican Reformers did not exalt preaching at the expense of the sacraments. The Church was renewed by the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel.
ability of its own to preach the Word of God, any more than it has any power of its own to engraft men into the body of Christ by Baptizing with water. Yet she is bold to preach (as she is to baptize), doing so with the assurance of God’s promise that He is Himself acting on, and speaking to, men by her words. But what is she to preach? Though she has no ability of her own to preach God’s Word, can she nevertheless speak whatever words she wishes? Not at all. She must carefully and obediently speak and interpret what has been said by the apostles and prophets. They uniquely testify to the gospel, to the work that God performed before their very eyes, and the Church must faithfully rest herself upon that testimony. The 16th century Anglicans look upon the writings of this unique company of men as the visible foundation of the Church, from which the Church can move only at the cost of her life.1 Hooker definitely states that “the doctrine of the apostles profest” is the foundation of the visible Church and if this foundation were denied (as he says Rome comes close to doing) then the Church would cease to be the Church.2 This, then, is the gospel, the word of life that the Church is called to declare, by which God is pleased to allow the Church to grow up into Christ, and by which He opens unto her the doors of the Kingdom of God.3

We can see, therefore, that the emphasis with these men is on the gracious decision of God, and the fulfilling of His purpose in Jesus Christ, as the ground of the Church. The correlate of this

---

is their emphasis on the objective Word of God (i.e., Holy Scripture). When we read the various "Examinations" of Archdeacon Philpot, for example, we find him repeatedly claiming that the true Catholic Church is the one that remains faithful to the Catholic faith, which is contained only in Holy Scripture.¹

But what of the faith and obedience of the Church? In general, the 16th century divines did not define the Church in such terms. At times the Church is referred to in terms of all that truly profess the name of Christ; but the faithfulness of the individual members of the Church is not, and cannot be, her foundation. True, it is by faith that they cleave unto the foundation which is Christ. But faith is a part of that foundation only in the sense that Christ calls us by His grace unto faith, trust, and obedience. It is very significant, then, that the Reformers do not point to faith as the reality by which the Church, or a Church, comes into being. It is not that they look upon faith as a secondary matter: it is simply that they see it as the consequence of the Church's ground, not the ground itself. The whole of Bishop Jewel's Commentary upon the First Epistle to the Thessalonians is a marvellous illustration of this way of thinking. He concludes the whole commentary with these words: "God open your eyes, that you may behold the way of righteousness, and direct you, that you may walk in it. Through his grace you have received the word; and it hath been fruitful in you; and by the same grace you shall continue in it for ever."²

But even more clearly is it expressed by Thomas Becon in his

¹. Works, P.3, pp. 9-145
². Jewel, II, p.386
Catechism. On being questioned by his father about the one, holy, universal Church, this rather precocious son replies, "My faith and my belief must be set and reposed in God alone, forasmuch as salvation cometh from him alone, and not in creatures, be they never so holy and perfect. For vain is the salvation that cometh from man, yea, 'cursed be he that putteth his trust and confidence in man, and maketh flesh his arm'... The Church of Christ is called holy, not for the holiness of itself... but for the holiness of Christ, the Son of God, which is the head of the Church, which also hath given to his Church his holiness, innocency, righteousness, and whatsoever good thing he hath more, himself being the fountain of all goodness, and hath with all these things clothed, decked, adorned, garnished, and trimmed the church, as his most dear spouse; so that now, being clothed with Christ's holiness, she may right well be called holy, and without spot or wrinkle." 1

Section II - The Early Carolines

There is no appreciable difference between the Early Carolines and the 16th century theologians over the doctrine of the foundation of the Church. The Early Carolines also believe that the Church rests on the ground provided only by God's decision and God's action... It is the work of grace, and of heavenly call, that give being to the Church, and make it a different society from all other companies of men in the world, that have no other light of knowledge nor motion of desire, but that which is natural; whence, for distinction from them, it is named ecclesia, a multitude called out." 2

1. P.S., p.41; see also p.43. 2. Field, Of The Church Vol. II, p.25
In the midst of the peoples of the earth a new people is gathered together, but the basis of this "gathering" is not that of the voluntary association of men and women of common faith and purposes, not even that of the common worship of the same God. These men were concerned about faith and worship, but they knew them to be but the consequence of the gathering together of the new people by the decision and call of Almighty God. They knew too well that men were not to be relied upon, for their faith was mixed with infidelity. To rest the Church upon the faithfulness of men would be like building a house on shifting sand. But the Church does not rest upon men's faith; they testify that she is founded upon a rock that cannot be moved: the faithfulness of God, who has called her into being. Bishop Joseph Hall, finding himself in a violent controversy with some Puritans after he calls the Roman Church a "true, visible, church," writes to a number of Churchmen asking their opinion on what he had said. One of these is John Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, and his reply bears directly upon our present question.

"In brief, your proposition admits a true sense; and in that sense, is, by the best learned in our reformed Church, not disallowed; for the being of a church does principally stand upon the gracious calling of God, calling men out of darkness and death into the participation of light and life in Christ Jesus. So long as God continues this calling unto any people, though they, as much as in them lies, darken this light, and corrupt the means which should bring them to life and salvation in Christ; yet where God calls men unto the participation of life in Christ by the word and by the sacraments, there is the true being of a Christian Church, let men be never so false in their expositions of God's word.

1. Carleton, Examination of the Late Appeal, pp. 52, 73 and 145. Carleton's thought is deficient in that he does not adequately relate election to Jesus Christ, nor to the Church.
But this gracious calling of God must be understood and interpreted from the person and work of Jesus Christ. In spite of the fact that there are in the thought of the early Carolines manifestations of a separation of the doctrine of election from the doctrine of Christ, most of them appear to see that the call of God which brought the Church into being came to us in and through the person and work of Christ. He is the foundation of the Church because in Him God and man are joined together uniquely and forever. God does not only call us in Jesus Christ to share together in certain benefits which He desires to shower upon us, He goes so far as to wed humanity to Himself so that in Christ we are partakers of the divine nature! It is Lancelot Andrewes, of all the Carolines, who sees this fact most clearly, and he gives incomparable expression to it in many of his sermons. The following is taken from one of his Easter sermons:

"His (Christ's) Father is now become our Father, to make us joint heirs with Him of His Heavenly Kingdom; His God likewise become our God, to make us 'partakers' with them both 'of the Divine nature.' Patrem Deum and Patrem vestrum, Deum Deum and Deum vestrum, run both merrily together, and ascende upon them both."

"Whereof, I mean of the partaking of His divine nature, to give us full and perfect assurance, as He took our flesh and became our Brother, flesh of our flesh then, so He gives us His flesh, that we may become His brethren, flesh of His flesh, now; and gives it us now upon this fraternity. By taking our flesh -- so begun His, by giving His flesh -- so begins ours. For requisite it was, that since we drew our death from the first Adam by partaking his substance, semblably and in like sort we should partake the substance of the second Adam; that so we might draw our life from him; should be ingrafted into Him, as the branches into the vine, that we might receive his sap -- which is His similitude; should be flesh of His flesh,

1. To be found in Hall's Works, Vol. VIII, p. 743. It was written, on January 30, 1628. Davenant was censured by the King in 1630 for venturing to enlarge on Predestination in a Lenten sermon preached before the Court.
not He of ours as before (Andrewes has just mentioned Christ becoming flesh of our flesh in the Virgin Birth), but we of His now; that we might be vegetate with His Spirit, even with His Divine Spirit. For now in Him the Spirits are so united, as partake one and partake the other withal."

We see by this that the ontological ground of the Church is the union of God and man in Jesus Christ. As God shares our flesh in the Incarnation, so are we allowed to share the new flesh of His Son in the Resurrection. Andrewes calls Easter Day the "day of our adoption"; it was the day when the Church was begun because then God raised up for our sake the new flesh and blood, the new body, the new humanity, and gave us to share in it. This is in truth a foundation for the Church that can never be moved, because God will never undo what He has done. "If you cannot conceive, wonder; the Son of God hath wedded unto himself our humanity without all possibility of divorce."²

But what finally is the bond that exists between Christ and His Church, for Christ is in Heaven and the Church is on earth? That bond is the Holy Spirit. It is by Him that Christ maintains His people at one with Himself. Davenant expresses it clearly in his Commentary on Colossians:

The Holy Spirit "is derived unto us by the gracious mediation and intercession of Christ sitting at the right hand of the Father. . . Christ, therefore, as God, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, gives this glorious power of the Holy Spirit to his people. God alone gives God . . .

---


2. Hall, Works, Vol. V, p. 50. See also p. 463; Davenant in his Exhortation to the Restoring of Brotherly Communion Betwixt the Protestant Churches (1641) develops the doctrine in the same way. pp. 20ff
"Hence we gather that Christ, although seated in heaven, is yet the living head of, and really united to, the Church which is on earth. For as the natural head diffuses sense and motion through its body; so Christ, the spiritual head of the Church, communicates the vital power of his Spirit to all his members".1

The Church, then, rests upon Jesus Christ because she is His body. Entrance into this body can take place fully and absolutely only at Baptism. It is Andrewes again who develops this doctrine in most striking fashion. Jesus Christ desires to incorporate us into the new people of God, which is His body, and He does this through the obedient action of the Church in baptizing. A person believes and becomes a member of the Church through baptism.2 By baptism we are no longer strangers but citizens of the commonwealth of the Saints, beloved sons in the family of God.3 But it is not merely the external act of Baptism itself that accomplishes this, but the action of the Holy Spirit that concurs with it.

"There holdeth a correspondence between the natural and the spiritual. The same way the world was made in the beginning, by the Spirit moving upon the waters of the deep, the very same was the world now-made, the Christian world, or Church, by the same Spirit moving upon the waters of baptism".4 It is evident that Andrewes relates Baptism to the sovereign work of God Himself. Baptism can be regarded as part of the foundation of the Church, but not in the sense that the Church has been given control of her own ground.

God commands the Church to baptize, and promises that He will be with her to the end of the world, but Baptism remains His ordinance.

and by it He performs the work of incorporation. Through the presence of the Holy Spirit God continuously exercises His sovereignty over the Church, giving her life and being, and without Him her Baptism, her preaching, her Sacrament, and her prayers are dead things.¹ In fact without Him there is no Church at all. "The Holy Ghost is a Dove, and He makes Christ's Spouse, the Church, a Dove; a term so oft iterate in the Canticles, and so much stood on by St. Augustine and the Fathers, as they make no question, no Dove, no Church."² But in this particular sermon Andrewes is dealing with the Holy Ghost in connexion with Baptism, and we can legitimately infer from the sermon as a whole: no Baptism, no Church. Though he is eager to assert the present sovereignty of the Holy Spirit over the Church, Andrewes has no intention of spiritualizing the Church and God's ordinance. It is God's pleasure to call the Church into being and continually to renew her life by the human physical instruments of Baptism, preaching, and Sacrament. Of these three, Baptism is God's prime instrument for the procreation of the Church. Joseph Hall, therefore, in his treatise Against The Brownists, says, "... I dare conclude, and doubt not to maintain against all the separatists in the world, that England, to go no higher, had in the days of King Henry the Eighth a true visible Church of God; and so by consequence their succeeding seed was by true baptism, justly admitted into the bosom thereof; and therefore, that even of them without any

¹ Andrewes, Sermons, Vol. III, pp. 179f see also Davenant, op. cit., pp. 24f
² Sermons, Vol. III, p. 253
further profession, God's Church was truly constituted."¹

But like their 16th century precursors, the early Carolines lay great emphasis upon another "moment" in the foundation of the Church: namely, the doctrine of the apostles and prophets. This is natural if only because they are constantly engaged in writing polemics against Rome, for their chief objection to that Church is that it has tampered with the Biblical doctrines, adding to them "innovations" of its own. The Reformation had taken place in order to purge the Church of these innovations, and to recall her to the pure doctrine of the apostles and prophets. The early Carolines are insistent that it is not a new Church that has been created, but only the old Church reformed. "Valdus, Wickliff, Luther, did never go about to frame a new church, which was not: that they meant only to be physicians, to heal; not parents to beget a church."² But this reformation first and foremost had to do with doctrine because that is the visible foundation of the Church; if the Church is wrong there she can not be right anywhere. Francis White's book, The Orthodox Faith and Way,³ is a powerful polemic

¹. Works, Vol. IX, p.24; Italics mine. This corresponds almost exactly to a passage in Calvin's Institutes. Calvin compares Rome with the people of Israel. Though the latter were unfaithful, God remained faithful and left among them the sign of His covenant faithfulness, circumcision. "So when he (God) hath left his covenant in France, Italy, Germanie, Spaine, England: since those provinces have been oppressed with the tyranny of anti-Christ, yet that his covenant might remain inviolable, first he there preserved Baptism, the testimonie of his covenant, which being conuerte by his owne mouth retaineth her owne force notwithstanding the ungodlinesse of man" (IV,11,11)
³. Published in 1617.
directed against Rome's claim that she is the only true Church because she alone stands in full historical continuity with the apostles. White rejects this conception of continuity or succession, though he admits that the historic Church does depend upon a succession. However, this succession is one of doctrine, not of persons. He goes on to point out that Rome applies this very rule to the Eastern Church: the latter has personal succession but Rome denies her to be a true Church because of heretical doctrine.¹

To White, then, verity of doctrine is of the very foundation of the Church; without it she cannot be.² But this doctrine to him is not a series of abstract, lifeless, propositions; it is the lively testimony of the apostles and prophets by which the Church hears the voice of Christ.³ His conception of the dependence of the being of the Church on verity of doctrine is, perhaps, most clearly illustrated when he quotes with approval the words of his brother, Dr. John White: "Against all Papists whatsoever, we make it good, that the very faith we now profess, hath successively continued in all ages since Christ, and was never interrupted so much as one yeore, month, or day; to confess the contrarie were sufficient to prove us no part of the Church of God." White goes on to say that his brother is here speaking only of substantial and primitive doctrine and not of "accessorie and secondary points".⁴

Laud, writing against Fisher the Jesuit, makes a similar point. "All the members of the militant Church cannot err, either in the

¹. Pp. 349f; see also p. 351
². Ibid. p.99. ³. Ibid. p.387. ⁴. Ibid. p.265; see also p.322
whole faith, or in any article of it; it is impossible. For if all might so err, there could be no union between them as members, and Christ the head; and no union between head and members, no body; and so no Church; which cannot be. 1

Field, Hall, and James Uasher are also at pains to show that where pure doctrine is truly professed and believed, there is the Church. Field points to Peter's confession at Cassarea Philippi as being the foundation of the Church, not in the sense that it was an expression of the faith abiding in Peter's heart, but in the sense that that form of confession is the rule for all right believing. 2 And Field, like White, advocates the idea that at no time in history has the Church lacked a "remnant" that held steadfastly to the true doctrine of Christ. He is concerned to prove this because of his conviction that the Church's continuity rests upon the doctrine of the apostles and prophets. 3 Hall and Uasher (like White) distinguish between "essential" and "accessories". Both these divines seem to think of a certain indispensable minimum in the realm of doctrine which is necessary for the subsistence of the Church. Uasher, for instance, speaks of "the foundation" and "that which is builded thereupon". In the foundation there must be a general unity among all believers, whereas in the latter there can be a great deal of variety. 4 Uasher's quarrel with Rome is not only that she has built "hay and stubble" on the foundation, but that she has disturbed the foundation itself. 5

Hall, on the other hand, asserts that Rome is a true, visible Church because she still adheres to the indispensable fundamentals, to the main principles of religion, in spite of the fact that she is miserably corrupted, and even dying. But we shall deal with this question further in Chapter IV. However, before we move on from this "moment" it would be as well to remind ourselves that when the early Carolines speak of apostolic doctrine, or of "divine truth and authority", they do not think of it as being a distinct object of faith separated from Christ. Davenant points out that the name "Foundation" is sometimes given to others besides Christ, but that is only because the true personal foundation of the Church, Christ Himself, is laid down by their ministry. "Therefore when the Prophets and Apostles are adorned with this honorable Title, it is rather to be referred to their saving Doctrine concerning Christ than to their own particular Persons." 2

As with the Anglican Reformers, so with the early Carolines, we fail to find any "definition" of the Church given in terms of the faith and obedience of her members. The saints are all called to believe, and to obey their Lord, but they are not thereby called to build the Church. The existence of the Church does not hang upon their faith; the Church exists, and they have been built into it, by means of Baptism and the Word. For this reason they believe and obey. Field, White, Ussher, and Hall are all concerned primarily about the object of faith, and only about faith itself insofar as it is related to this particular object. 3

"... Our faith, and that of the apostles and prophets, being the same, it must needs have the same object, and the same ground and stay to rest upon in both: but they builded themselves upon the sure and unmoveable rock of divine truth and authority: therefore we must do likewise. If any man desire farther satisfaction herein, let him read Calvin and Galus, to whom in these things Galus is much beholding."

But whatever the emphasis upon the object of faith, it is nevertheless true that the Church must believe. It is important that we ask at this point how they look upon the obedient faith of the Church. Is it the one contribution that man can make to the foundation of the Church? Does man at last have a contribution to make that is all his own? It is Andrews who gives us the most profound treatment of this question. To the question, Has man in his response of faith an independent contribution to make in the economy of salvation? Andrews unquestionably answers No.

Even here man depends upon the gracious act of God. The response of faith is the work of the Holy Spirit: God by His Holy Spirit "surrounds" us with His grace and mercy: apart from the Holy Spirit nothing is done for us or by us. It is clear, then, that for Andrews it is a closed circle: God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is the sole provider for the being and continuation of the Church. He asserts this with particular force and clarity in one sermon where he is describing the unity of the Word and Spirit. Continuing in this vein he says, "The seat of the tongue is in the head, and the 'Head of the Church' is Christ. The native place

of heat, the quality in us answering to this fire (Christ's Word is the heart, and the Heart of the Church is the Holy Ghost."

Section III - The Later Carolines

The critical reader, moving from the writings of Bishops Andrewes, Hall, and Davens, to those of Bishops Beveridge and Pearson, would not feel a great change in theological perspective. But if he were to go to the writings of Jeremy Taylor, Herbert Thorndike, and Edward Stillingfleet, he could not fail to discern a very significant change. There is less emphasis upon God's election and more upon man's decision; less upon God's fidelity, and more upon man's faith; less upon God's grace, and more upon man's diligent effort to attain unto holiness; less upon our unique salvation wrought out by God in Jesus Christ, and more upon religion in general. This, though it is a very complex period of theological thought, is the general trend.

In this period the reaction against ultra-Calvinism, among other things, caused many to forsake the important biblical doctrine of election. So much so that at first sight we might be tempted to think that this "moment" has no place in the thought of the Later Carolines. However, it is retained, at least partially, by John Cosin, John Pearson, and William Beveridge, though none of the three expounds it in the way the so-called Calvinists do. It is only when we take their thought as a whole, and see how resolutely they assert the origin and preservation of the Church to rest upon the sovereign work of God's grace - only then is it evident that they do in fact hold a high doctrine of election, or

rather a high doctrine of the active, electing God. They would have none of that cold, brittle, doctrine of predestination that was circulated under the name of Calvin, (Whatever judgment we may make of Calvin's own doctrine of election, he would certainly not have recognised this one as his own) and it made them very cautious about expounding any definite doctrine of their own. Beveridge, in his discourse on the Thirty-Nine Articles, confesses at the beginning of his exposition of Article XVII on Predestination that the doctrine is above man's reason and apprehension, and for that reason he has until now avoided any discourse upon it. In order to keep himself above reproach he says that he will "speak nothing concerning this great mystery, but what Scripture and Fathers have expressly delivered unto me". This is exactly what he does: the whole exposition is made up of quotations from the Bible and the Fathers. In his sermons too Beveridge seldom mention's the word "election", and when he does it is normally a biblical quotation. He is always careful to say that any one who will, can be a true believer in Christ. However, that he sees election to be the ground of the Church's life is made evident in a sermon on the Communion of Saints. The Saints of God are the elect, those who have been selected from the rest of the world to be God's peculiar people, whom He has delivered from the slavery of sin and Satan, and given the glorious liberty of His own salvation, and whom He is leading to the New Jerusalem above. He closes the sermon by saying that if we will, we can all be

fellow-citizens with the Saints, for we have all been called to it. 

Perhaps the most important characteristic of the thought of Cosin, Pearson, and Beveridge is that it is Christologically determined, and this is true of their doctrine of election. If the fact of election is being discussed, and they do not always use the word, it will almost always be in terms of the grace of Jesus Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit. Beveridge calls it the "election of grace". Pearson on this theme first draws attention to three verses of Scripture: "The Lord opened the heart of Lydia" (Acts 16:14); "The word preached profiteth, being mixed with faith in them that hear it" (Heb. 4:2); and "By grace are we saved through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8). Then he comments:

"As the increase and perfection, so the original, or initiation of faith is from the Spirit of God, not only by an external proposal in the word, but by an internal illumination in the soul; by which we are inclined to the obedience of faith, in assenting to those truths, which unto a natural and carnal man are foolishness. And thus we affirm not only the revelation of the will of God, but also the illumination of the soul of man, to be part of the office of the Spirit of God, against the old and new Pelagians."

Since Pearson's thought is Christologically centred he discusses the origin and perpetuity of the Church in terms of the promise of God, and then immediately relates it to Jesus Christ. Because the Word of God has taken to Himself our nature, and has in the Cross and Resurrection destroyed those realities that separate us from God, we are now brought under the dominion of grace and are assured of sharing in the dominion of glory. God has, by taking

our nature, become our brother, that He might become our Lord. Jesus Christ is Lord of the Church because He and the Church participate in the same nature: yes, even more because He has built the Church into His very body, into His new risen humanity.

"He laid down his life, but it was for us; and being to take up his own, he took up ours. We are the members of that body of which Christ is the Head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind . . . The Spirit of Christ abiding in us maketh us members of Christ, and by the same Spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our Head." This is the abiding, life-giving, foundation of the Church, the reality into which she sinks her faith. But upon this too, for Pearsen, she rests her hope; for the humanity of Christ has not only risen, but has ascended to the right hand of the Father.

"That Christ ascended is the ground and glory of our faith; and by virtue of his being in heaven, our belief is both encouraged and commended; for his ascent is the cause, and his absence the crown, of our faith: because he ascended, we the more believe; and because we believe in him who hath ascended, our faith is the more accepted.

"Secondly, it is necessary to believe in the ascension of Christ for the corroboration of our hope. We could never expect our dust and ashes should ascend the heavens; but being our nature hath gone before in him, we can now hope to follow after him. He is our Head, and where that is, the members may expect admission: for in so great and intimate a union there is no fear of separation or exclusion; . . . The first-fruits of our nature are ascended, and the rest is sanctified." Beveridge also insists that Christ in His love has provided for the Church in such a way that He will never forsake her. In

fact, in making Himself Head of the Church Christ, as it were, holds Himself to be imperfect without her, because He would then be without His body. He maintains this close communion through the Holy Spirit: through the Spirit Christ exercises His regal power over the Church, appointing and commissioning her officers to administer His Word and Sacraments, and to exercise discipline over her, by which functions He is pleased to strengthen and govern her. Beveridge strictly insists that the Lord personally exercises His sovereignty over His people, and though He does so through the officers that He appoints, He does not "give over" His power and authority to them.

"It is He (Christ) who still appoints and empowereth officers in His Church, for the edifying and well-governing of His people; they are His ministers, His ambassadors, acting only in His name; and it is He alone who makes their ministry effectual, to the ends for which He hath ordained it . . . He takes particular care of His Church, as His own proper kingdom and people . . . He defends it all along by His almighty power; He directs and governs it by His Holy Spirit." 2

Beveridge indicates the work of the Holy Spirit by pointing primarily to the Sacraments. By means of these ordinances we are put upon the foundation which is Christ. By the Holy Spirit in baptism we are "inserted into Christ's body" and made members of it, and by the same Spirit administered in the Lord's Supper we are "strengthened and refreshed", made partakers of the one bread which is the staff and support of our life. 3

Pearson, too, stresses the office of the Spirit in bringing about our union with Christ. The Holy Spirit joins us to Christ,

3. Ibid. p.139; see also p. 396, and Vol. I, p.76.
making us through Baptism His members, causing us to die and rise with Him, and assuring us of our adoption as Sons.\(^1\) Because Christ was anointed with the Holy Spirit, so we, as members of His body, are anointed, just as kings of old were anointed only on their head, that being sufficient for their whole body.\(^2\) By this anointing the Church shares with Christ in all that He is and does.

But this union with Christ is, in this time of ours, a sacramental union. The Church now has her being in Christ, yet that union has yet to be revealed and consummated. Until Christ comes again the Church waits for Him under the burden of sin and death, tasting the first-fruits of the inheritance that is to be hers through the ministrations of the Spirit whom Christ has sent unto her. Christ is present with the Church through the Spirit, but also and always through the witness of the Apostles and Prophets. By means of the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets Christ pushes His way into the very heart of the Church and claims her for Himself. Their witness is the visible mark that He has left with the Church, by which she learns of Him again and again, and through which she is able to bring herself into conformity with Him. Thus Beveridge says that Christians of all ages must be steadfast in the doctrine which Christ and His Apostles taught for that is "the foundation of our whole religion."\(^3\) He finds the true marks of a Christian Church to be the apostles' doctrine, the breaking of bread, and prayers.\(^4\)

Pearson fully concurs with this, and explicitly states that

---

Church was built and constituted.\textsuperscript{1} The Apostles were the twelve stones in the Church's foundation.\textsuperscript{2} But Pearson sternly insists that the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets is in the end administered by Christ and not by us; it does not in that sense come under our control. "The propagation and perpetual succession of this doctrine must . . . be attributed unto Jesus . . ."\textsuperscript{3}

We see then that with Pearson and Beveridge the Church is built upon the Apostles and Prophets in the sense that their doctrine, or witness, constitutes the visible foundation of the new people of God. But they also think of this "moment" in the foundation in another sense. Not only the Apostles' doctrine, but their office is also a part of the Church's ground, an office which extends down through the ages of the Church. Pearson says that the apostolic office is to feed the flock of God and to assume the oversight of it. The Apostles received the Spirit for this purpose; but they also received power from the Spirit to propagate their own office. "Thus by virtue of an apostolic ordination, there is for ever to be continued a ministerial succession."\textsuperscript{4} Pearson does not assert outright that the apostles in this sense, i.e. in the sense of the apostolic office successively propagated by ordination, are a part of the foundation of the Church along with apostolic doctrine, but that can be inferred from his book. But we must remember that his comments about the "apostolic office" come within his exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and that he places the apostolic activity within the activity of the sovereign

\textsuperscript{1} Op. cit. pp. 894f. \hspace{1em} \textsuperscript{2} Ibid. p. 137; see also pp. 613f. \\
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid. p. 169. \hspace{1em} \textsuperscript{4} Ibid. p. 538
work of the Spirit.

"I believe this infinite and eternal Spirit to be not only of perfect and indefectable holiness in us, revealing the pure and undefiled will of God, inspiring the blessed apostles, and enabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetual succession to continue the edification of the Church, illuminating the understandings of particular persons, rectifying their wills and affections, renovating their natures, uniting their persons unto Christ, assuring them of the adoption of sons, leading them in their actions, directing them in their devotions by all ways and means purifying and sanctifying their souls and bodies, to a full and eternal Spirit of God; in this manner is that Spirit holy; and thus I believe in the Holy Ghost."1

Beveridge, in even more clear-cut language than Pearson uses, asserts the essential nature of the apostolic office successively maintained in the Church by ordination. Christ promises to be with the Apostles unto the end of the world, to be with them in His Holy Spirit at the execution of their office, and "the first and principal part of this office is the ordaining others into it, and giving them power to ordain others, and so successively to the end of the world."2 The Church is dependent upon the apostolic office because apart from it the Word and Sacraments cannot be rightly administered, and without the Word and Sacraments the Church cannot be.3 It is in this sense, in its relation to the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel, that the "Apostolic Succession" can be called the "root of all Christian communion."4

As we come to faith and obedience as a "moment" in the Church's foundation, we immediately find that both Pearson and Beveridge stand strictly within the Reformation tradition. Beveridge, expounding the Articles, finds the words of the nineteenth fully to his liking. He says, "... Though there be a congregation of

faithful men met together, unless the Word of God be truly preached, and the Sacraments duly administered in it, that congregation of faithful men is not a church. The Church must be faithful, but her faithfulness rests upon the proper ground only when the Word and Sacraments are in her midst. Beveridge is very concerned about the faith and obedience of the Church, and distinguishes between the Church on earth that is a mixture of faith and hypocrisy, and the Communion of saints that is made up of the true believers on earth and in heaven. But he cautions us to remember that faith, and consequently sainthood, are the gifts of the Spirit of God, who in Baptism makes us members of His Holy Catholic Church.

We must therefore say that for Beveridge faith and obedience take their places within the foundation of the Church because, and only because, they are the work of God Himself.

Pearson is remarkably similar in thought to his colleague on this issue. He is to a degree moralistic, and sometimes in a wrong sense, in his insistence upon personal faith and holiness.

The Church is holy not only because her calling, her Sacraments, and her offices are holy, but because holiness is communicated to her members by God in an infused sanctity. The Church is called to engage herself in holiness of life. This she undertakes by faith and obedience. Faith, then, joins the Church to Christ and to His holiness, and leads her to walk in holiness herself. But Pearson, like Beveridge, refuses to leave faith as an act of man's independent volition. He immediately attributes it to the

work of the Spirit, who gives faith "both in the object and in the act".¹ Thus even this part of the Church's foundation is the work of grace. Pearson witnesses to the full circle of grace by setting the sanctification of the Spirit in the context of God's election. We are "elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience." (I Peter 1:2)²

Let us turn now to the other divines in this period. We have treated Pearson and Beveridge separately because they stand in the main stream of reformed Anglican thought. Their contemporaries ordinarily do not stand entirely outside of it, but there are significant deviations.

In Jeremy Taylor's thought election takes no integral place. We shall therefore pass on at once to what he says about Jesus Christ as the foundation of the Church. In order to discover how Taylor conceives of the relation of the Church to Christ, we must look to his exposition on the sacraments. He says that by the Sacraments we receive not only certain benefits and gifts from the Lord, but we are given to share in the life of the Lord Himself. In Baptism God becomes our Father, Christ our elder Brother, the Spirit the earnest of our inheritance, and the Church our mother,³ we are by Baptism admitted into the Church,⁴ we become sons of God, and members of Christ's body, dying and rising with Him.⁵ In the Lord's Supper our spirits are united to His body, we are made to participate in the Divine Nature.⁶

"... Now the Lord our God calls upon us, not only to be nigh unto him, but to be all one with him; not only as he was, in the incarnation, flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone, but also to communicate, in spirit, in grace, in Divinity itself." 1

Taylor, then, conceives of the Church as the body of Christ, and he sees the sacraments as the primary instruments by which the Church is joined to Her Head. But whose instruments are they? Taylor would certainly be the first to confess that they were Christ's instruments, used by Him to draw the Church to Himself. Christ's "power is manifest, in making the symbols (in this case he is speaking of the Lord's Supper) to be the instruments of conveying himself to the spirit of the receiver ... " 2 Taylor never suggests that the sacraments have an independent efficacy; he says, for instance, that the act of baptism is merely the "material part of the sacrament"; it is the Spirit that gives life. 3 He asserts that the Church gives the sacrament and God gives the grace of the sacrament; though God does not always give the grace at the same time, if, perhaps, there is some impediment in the person baptized. 4 The sacraments are, therefore Christ's: they are His gift to the Church, and He Himself through His Spirit uses them for the good of the Church and the world.

But for Taylor the activity of the Spirit is in a unique way annexed to the office of the apostles. Christ promised that the Spirit would abide with the Church forever, but He made His apostles "the channels, the minister and conveyance of it." 5

How does Taylor mean this? Are the Apostles the channels of the Spirit in the sense that their witness (i.e. the New Testament) stands in the heart of the Church as the permanent indispensable path to the knowledge of Christ? Taylor may have thought of them in this way too, but he is much more concerned about the Apostles in another way. He sees the apostolic office as such, that office which was given them by Christ, as being the unique channel by which the Holy Spirit flows into the Church. This office is a permanent part of the Church through the power of ordination, by which power the Apostles and their successors can perpetuate the office to the end of the world. Since the Spirit is in a special way annexed to the apostolic or episcopal office, only an Apostle or a bishop has the power to preach, baptize, consecrate, confirm, ordain, and govern, which are "necessary for the perpetuating of a Church."¹ The first three (and the last to a limited extent) can be delegated to presbyters, but the giving of the Holy Spirit in Ordination and in Confirmation is strictly the office of the Apostle or bishop.² Because of this Taylor asserts that the Church is actually built upon the office of the bishop. He quotes with approval Cyprian's words, "When our blessed Saviour was ordering his church, and instituting episcopal dignity, he said to Peter: 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church' Hence comes the order of bishops, and the constitution or being of the church, that the church be founded upon bishops."³ Furthermore Taylor differs from Pearson and Beveridge in a very significant way

¹. Ibid, p.151; see also p.31  
². Ibid, pp.155-8; see also Vol. III, p.23  
way: the latter two men, in spite of everything, do not allow this "moment" in the foundation of the Church to move out of the orbit of Christ's present sovereign action over the Church. Taylor, on the other hand, generally cuts off the gift of apostolic power from the Giver of it, regarding the power, or Charisma, as a depositum that is left in the Church's keeping until Christ comes again. As God, after He made Adam with His own hands, left with him power to beget children, so it was with the Apostles and their office. Apostolic power must come either from the "source" or the "channel". Christ, since designating the Apostles, has called no more: now He leaves those who have been called to call others.1 Thus Taylor has given the Church control over its own foundation.

This can be seen further in what Taylor says about faith and obedience. It is presumably his reaction to hyper-calvinism that causes him so to emphasize personal faith and holiness. But in spite of his obvious desire to hold faith fully within the sphere of the work of the Holy Spirit he does not succeed in doing so. Faith and obedience become virtually autonomous in reference to grace. His comments on Baptism are very revealing. As we noted above he sees in Baptism the act in which we are made members of the body of Christ. At the same time he speaks of it as a "new principle put into us,"2 a "perpetual principle of grace sown in our spirits;"3 by it we are made "capable of the communion of saints".4 But this is only a beginning, it brings us into a state of favor,5 it brings us to birth.6 However, it is then our duty

not to make a breach in that "first state of favour"; we have in
Baptism made a covenant "to live for ever according to his laws"\(^1\) and it is now up to us to keep it.\(^2\) We have been brought to birth
and now we must live. God works, and we work too; He helps and
gives us abilities, and then expects our duty.\(^3\) Baptism takes away
the punishment of our sin, but the "material part of our misery and
sin" remains.\(^4\) We are left to cope with that by the help of the
spirit of grace. Therefore the only evidence we have, outside the
act of Baptism, of our "consignation to eternity", is the perfor-
mance of our duty.\(^4\) Beginners therefore have only a "conditional
eternity", while those who have "grown towards perfection" by "the
strength of the habits of grace" add degrees of moral certainty
(he admits it is only a human certainty) to their expectation.\(^5\)

Taylor is a very complex thinker - it might perhaps be more
accurate to say that he is an inconsistent thinker - and it is,
therefore, difficult to know exactly where he stands. But it is
my contention that his conception of faith and obedience is not
properly related to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. His
conception of the Christian life is moralistic and individualistic.
Therefore each man, to Taylor, has his own independent contribution
to make to the economy of his own salvation; in the same way he
makes his own contribution to this "moment" in the foundation of
the Church.

Isaac Barrow, like Taylor, does not refer to election when he
discusses the nature of the Church. Nor is it possible for us to
infer from his writings that he in any way thought of the two
doctrines together. He quite rightly speaks of the Church as being

the body of Christ, and that its oneness is by its incorporation into that "mystical body"\(^1\), (though even this he tends to spiritualize\(^2\)) but actually his doctrine of the Church is expounded in terms of those who profess and believe the gospel of Christ. In his Discourse Concerning the Unity of the Church he says that the word Church is used in a number of different senses, and he proceeds to list five of them, only the last two of which suggest in any way that the existence of the Church rests upon God's grace. The fourth "definition" says the Church is "The society of those who at present or in the course of time profess the faith and gospel of Christ, and undertake the evangelical covenant, in distinction to all other religions..." The fifth says "The whole body of God's people that is, ever hath been, or ever shall be, from the beginning of the world to the consummation thereof, who having (formally or virtually) believed in Christ, and sincerely obeyed God's laws, shall finally, by the meritorious performance and sufferings of Christ, be saved, is called the Church."\(^2\) Admittedly these are the two that Barrow approves of, but surely even they are very inadequate as definitions of the Church. It is obvious that because he has moved the Church away from its foundation in God's election, he must rest it more upon man's faith and obedience. The Church then is that company of men who undertake the evangelical covenant, who believe in Christ, and who obey God's laws. But because Barrow has not a proper doctrine of election he has lost the one guard-rail that can keep him from falling into Pelagianism. It is possible - in fact almost necessary - to interpret this faith

\(^2\) Ibid, pp. 656f & p. 684.  
\(^3\) Ibid, pp. 636ff
and obedience of which he speaks, as an independent act of man.

Barrow's conception of the apostolic office plays a different part in his thought than it does in Taylor's. He exhibits, first of all, a far more grave concern with the succession of apostolic doctrine than he does with the succession of the apostolic office in ordination. He says the true guides of the Church are those "who constantly do profess and teach that sound and wholesome doctrine, which was delivered by our Lord and his apostles in word and writing..." It is true that he also thinks that the true guides of the Church are those who derive their authority by a continued succession from the Apostles, and he says that it is by means of those pastors that Christ accomplishes His promise to the Church to be with her till the end of the world. But in spite of this, Barrow shows no special interest in the episcopacy as being the only propagator of ministerial power. He defends episcopacy on other grounds: first, on the ground that it is supported by the command of the King of the realm, "God's viceregent and the nursing father of his church among us;" and secondly, on the ground that a distinction of ecclesiastical order is necessary for the proper exercise of discipline. This discipline - in fact this particular form of discipline - is to Barrow extremely important, and it is for this reason that I discuss it here. The episcopal structure of order and government is to be found in Scripture, for it was settled in the Church by our Lord Himself; it cannot and must not be abrogated. It seems that this form is necessary to the being

3. Ibid, p. 340
4. Ibid, p. 278
5. Ibid, p. 280
of the Church only because it assures proper discipline. "All those benefits which arise from holy communion in offices of piety and charity ... will together vanish with discipline. The cement of discipline wanting, the church will not be like a spiritual house, compacted of lively stones into one goodly pile; but like a company of scattered pebbles, or a heap of rubbish."

Herbert Thorndike's difficult, though in many ways brilliant, writings manifest a serious breakdown of earlier Anglican thought concerning the doctrine of the Church. He holds a doctrine of predestination, which he insists takes place "in Christ, or by Christ, or through Christ," but this predestination turns out to be only a "foreknowing and foretelling the conversion of those persons, who have constituted and shall constitute the number of believers from the preaching of Christianity till the world's end." The Church is not, finally, a creation of God in Christ, a new creation that comes down from heaven. It is not prior to individual believers; "the Church is nothing but the souls whereof it consisteth." Baptism, consequently, does not point primarily to God's free grace in election, nor to His almighty hand incorporating us into the body of His Son; it points to our sincere and resolute profession to undertake Christianity, and to live according to it. Thorndike speaks of the excellent effects of Baptism depending upon the engagement whereby we give ourselves up to Christ for the future.

"For that this engagement should not be effectual till consigned unto the Church at baptism, cannot seem strange to him that believes the Catholic Church to be, as I have shewed, a corporation founded for the maintenance and exercise of that Christianity, to which we engage ourselves by baptism".  

Thorndike, like Taylor, was a member of the "High Church" party; but like Taylor again, his thought is so individualistic he actually has a very low doctrine of the Church. His discussion of sin, concupiscence, grace and election, in his work Of The Covenant of Grace shows clearly that he conceives of them in an individualistic and a moralistic way. Thus for Thorndike the Church, this association of believers, rests primarily on man's fidelity and secondarily on God's faithfulness. Or to speak in the categories we have been using, the balance of thought has shifted away from God's act in Jesus Christ (which act has its origin in His own sovereign decision) towards man's faith and obedience. The chief "moment" in the foundation of the Church is therefore the subjective one. But once the proper understanding of the person of Christ as sole object of faith, and true ground of the Church's life, is lost, so the understanding of the work of the Spirit is lost too. Thorndike does not consistently maintain, as does Andrewes, that "the native place of heat, the quality in us answering to this fire (Christ's Word), is the heart, and the Heart of the Church is the Holy Ghost."  

For Thorndike the heart of the Church is in the hearts of all her members. Therefore the "heat" in the Church is man-generated.  

It is not surprising, then, that Thorndike is not chiefly

1. Ibid, p. 21  
concerned with the apostolic witness as the ever-present foundation of the Church; he is more concerned with the Apostles as founders of the Church by means of the power given to them with their office. This office, called the ἐπίτροπος, was theirs before the Church was; it is the root of all ecclesiastical power, and by means of it they founded the Church. This is the power of the keys, given strictly into the hands of the Apostles and their successors, and it is upon this power that the Church is founded.

The next Churchman to deal with the nature of the Church in any detail is William Sherlock. In his book, A Discourse About Church Unity, he says that the being of the Church rests upon its relation and union to Jesus Christ:

"The Nature and Essence of the Church does not consist in religious assemblies, but in its union to Christ, as Head of the body; all acts of Christian Worship, and holding Assemblies for religious Worship, is a necessary Church-duty, wherein our visible Communion with Christ consists; but it is a Covenant-relation to Christ, which constitutes the Church..."

This sounds quite promising: the Church is a corporate body that receives its being from Christ. But we must examine this in the light of the position he sets forth in another of his works, A Discourse Concerning the Knowledge of Christ, where he is writing against John Owen. He points out that to know Christ is not to be "acquainted with his Person" but to understand fully his Gospel; not the Person, but the Gospel of Christ is the Way, Truth and Life. The union of Christians to Christ is by means

of their union to the Church; since the Church is the body of Christ every Christian by being united to this Body becomes a member of Christ.\(^1\) Again, to make himself clear, he says to "abide in Christ" is to make a visible profession of faith in Christ and thus to be members of his visible Church. But he points out that in order to distinguish hypocrites and true believers Jesus adds the words "and I in you," meaning that if His doctrine and precepts take fast hold of anyone's will and affections they will make him fruitful in good works.\(^2\) Continuing in the same vein, Baptism into Christ refers to our admission into the Christian Church by a public profession of our faith in Christ.\(^3\) We have to remember, of course, that Sherlock is generally avoiding the use of such terms as "grace", "love", "freedom", "union", and "communion", because Owen uses them so much. And we must remember also that Sherlock is reacting against what he considers to be Owen's antinomianism. But even taking Sherlock's reaction into account, his doctrine of the Church is inadequate. The Church according to him may have had a "divine beginning", and in that sense may be said to depend upon the Covenant-relation to Christ, but in the same way that he separates the Gospel and Religion of Christ from the person of Christ,\(^4\) so he separates the Church from Christ. This is perfectly natural because Sherlock's starting place is ultimately that of religion, piety, and obedience to laws natural and divine, and his thought is, consequently, individualistic. He does not begin with God, with grace, with the new humanity in Jesus Christ out of which the Church is built,

\(^{1}\) Ibid, p.100.  \(^{2}\) Ibid, pp.103f.  \(^{3}\) Ibid, p.107  
\(^{4}\) Ibid, pp. 6, 22, 30, 94.
into which we are incorporated by grace in Baptism, and over which Christ personally rules by His Spirit. It is true that he approves of Cyprian's doctrine that the Catholic Church is prior to particular Churches, the former being the root and foundation of the latter; but he does not sustain this thought at all. Rather it seems that the Church is that body of men who know God (who is the highest object of religious and saving knowledge.\(^1\)), who are obedient to the Eternal Rules of Righteousness,\(^2\), who are baptized and who make a public profession of faith, and in whose wills and affections Christ's doctrines and precepts take fast hold.\(^3\) And though Sherlock says that God has given His Spirit to dwell with the Church, it turns out that he means certain gifts of Spirit, gifts which were given at the beginning and whose virtue and glory continue with us still.\(^4\) The Church then is plainly an association of Christian individuals who commune together in those things which Jesus taught and in those ordinances which He left; which association is grounded upon Christ's teaching and doctrine and man's steadfast profession of it and obedience to it.

Christ is the Lord and Governor of this people, but because He has ascended into Heaven He no longer governs "immediately". Instead He has left bishops and pastors who preside over the Church in His name and by His authority.\(^5\) This office and authority is from Christ; it is therefore antecedent to the Church, and does no in any sense come from the Church. And it is necessary to admit men into the Divine covenant.\(^6\). But Sherlock believes in "the

Conveyance of Church-power by successive ordinations from the apostles, without which I confess I know not how we should have any Church-power. We see from this that, if we have interpreted Sherlock's rather confusing, and I think inconsistent, thought correctly, the Church has a foundation with three points: Christ's righteousness (which, he says, is the foundation of the Covenant), the Christian's righteousness (which, he says, is the condition of the Covenant), and the apostolic office (which, he says, admits men to the Covenant).

Before we leave this section let us look very briefly at Henry Ferne. In his book, Certain Considerations of Present Concernnant Touching this Reformed Church of England, he is giving an apologia for the Church of England, particularly its government. At one point he very carefully sets out to relate Doctrine and the ministry to the constitution and continuance of the Church. He declares that the Doctrine of Faith and Life is of first "concernment" to all members of the Church, and the ministry is there "to serve unto it". It is the due profession of the Faith that makes a member of the Visible Church, and the true belief and practice of it that makes him a member of what Ferne calls the "Symbolical Catholic Church". Faith and love join the body of Christ to Christ the head, and knits one part to another; faith and love joins the building (the Church) to the foundation which is Christ. The Apostles, Pastors, and teachers work to perfect and edify the body, and to lay the building upon

1. Ibid., p. 315  
2. The Knowledge of Christ, p. 235  
3. Church Unity, pp. 306f.  
its foundation by bringing men to the Faith.

It is true that Fene looks at the union of the Church with its foundation far too exclusively from the side of man's profession and true belief, and in that sense he stands with Taylor and Thorndike; but he does have a refreshing concern for the doctrine of the Apostles without which the Church cannot be, and he emphasizes the apostolic office primarily because of the fundamental need for the Church to be constantly directed toward that doctrine.

In the final analysis there is little theological affinity between the Later Carolines (with the three important exceptions) and the reformed Anglican tradition. They adhere faithfully to the Prayer Book but, consciously or unconsciously, they have left behind the theology of the men who compiled it. God's work in Jesus Christ is no longer in the centre of attention; the regard of the Later Carolines is turned towards man and his need to live the holy life. This means that the Church is no longer seriously considered as a company founded upon the mighty acts of God. They have lost the reformed Anglican understanding of the Church as participating through Word and Sacraments in the work and salvation of God Himself. If they still speak of the Church as the Body of Christ it is no longer in the sense of sharing in the very life of Him who died for all men and who now lives for ever in God's presence, making intercession for us. God's work, the activity of Jesus Christ, the operation of the Holy Spirit, are not the realities that dominate later Caroline thought about the Church. Once having minimized the importance of God's work they are forced to spend their time exhorting man to get on with his.

Chapter II

The Church: Her Unity and Continuity

Section I - The Sixteenth Century

One of the most significant consequences of the Reformation in England (as elsewhere) is the permanent separation of the English Church from the Roman communion. The great medieval structure is broken, and Rome has accused the Church of England of schism, telling her that she is guilty of separating from the unity of the Church. The Anglican Reformers deny the validity of Rome's accusation. They say, first of all, that the breach in the Church is caused by Rome herself: she refuses to be reformed and has cast out those who tried to purge her. But they maintain further that the accusation is false because the unity of the Church is inseparably related to verity of doctrine, and this Rome does not possess. They concede that the Roman Church has a certain institutional unity, but it is not unity according to Jesus Christ, which is of supreme importance.1

The Church is the Body of Christ, the one people of God, confe­derated together by the Word of God: therefore loyalty to the Word of God as it is given to us in the Scriptures is indispensable to the one Church. In fact all four predicates of the Church come together at this point. The Church is gathered together into one body by the Word of God as it comes to us through the apostolic witness. That which the Apostles received from the Lord they delivered unto the Church: the Church is thus made holy as she receives that tradition without corrupting it with innovations.

1. Ridley, Works (F.S.), pp.120f.
and human traditions. Catholicity means fidelity all down the ages to the truth and the retention and proclamation of the true faith. The Church is apostolic as she appropriates and proclaims the one holy Gospel. We can gather, then, that the 16th century divines believe that the Church possesses these predicates only when she is united to her Lord, and that it is the Gospel that effects this union. These predicates are not accidental or incidental; they are essential; they are descriptive of the being of the Church. And the Church has her being out of the Gospel.

It is evident that institutional unity is not, for these divines, the chief goal to be sought after. Rome has successfully achieved this to a surprising degree, and yet she has become anti-Christ. Faithfulness to the Word of the Lord is the chief privilege and obligation of the Church. As for unity, H. F. Woodhouse says it was most commonly stated to consist of loyalty to one faith, one baptism, one Gospel. But he goes on to point out that 16th century Anglicans were not satisfied simply with agreement in doctrine. Anybody who, without just cause, severed himself from obedience either to archbishop or bishop in matters of doctrine, ceremonies, or orders, was a schismatic. The Church is not an invisible, nor (in the wrong sense) a "spiritual" reality. She is visible, and therefore must strive to manifest a visible and bodily unity.

The task of building the Church up into one body, and of

1. Bacon, Catechism, (P.S.) p. 42  
3. Ibid, p. 344.  
5. Ridley, Works, p. 125
maintaining her unity is, of course, primarily the ministry's, though it is perhaps worth mentioning at the outset that the Anglican Reformers do not suggest that the unity (or continuity) of the Church is bound up with a certain "order" of ministry, such as, for instance, the episcopal order. The ministry as a whole builds the Church up and maintains her, first of all by the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and secondly by the exercise of discipline and government. The bishop's chief task is not to ordain, confirm and govern; it is to minister the Gospel. Hence Jewel can write of the pope:

"And as for the bishop of Rome, who now calleth all matters before himself alone, except he do his duty as he ought to do, except he administer the sacraments, except he instruct the people, except he warn them and teach them, we say that he ought not of right once to be called a bishop, or so much as an elder."\(^1\)

This is not to say that the bishop has no special part to play in the preservation of unity. Most Englishmen of this time take for granted the fact that order and unity can only be preserved by a hierarchy of authority. But it is only later in the century, when the episcopal system as such comes under attack from the Puritans, that the Anglicans are forced to give an apologia for episcopal government. John Bancroft and Thomas Bilson claim that the order of bishops is distinct from the presbyterial order and that it has certain immutable powers necessary to the unity and continuity of the Church.\(^2\) But the chief apologists of the period, John Whitgift and Richard Hooker, defend episcopacy on the grounds of function and natural law. The task of maintaining unity in the Church necessitates a hierarchy of jurisdiction.\(^3\)

---

2. We shall deal with this in Chap.IV.  
The bodily unity of the Church ought not to be broken. What, then, of the "schism" that took place at the Reformation? This, the Anglicans say, is the responsibility of Rome. Since she refused to be reformed separation was necessary: she, therefore, caused the schism. But there is another factor in their thought about Church unity that must be taken into account: namely, the idea of the national Church, corresponding in boundary to the national state. It was particularly easy for this idea to take firm hold of the minds of Englishmen because of their unique isolation from the rest of Europe. The Church in England, they say, had been brought under the bondage of Rome, but now she is asserting her rightful prerogative to reform and govern herself. The Church in England has become the Church of England. Later this idea, in relation to a combination of historical factors, is to have harmful consequences. However, the early Anglicans have no intention of cutting themselves off from the rest of the Church.

They have a keen consciousness of the unity of the Catholic Church and they believe that it should take some tangible form. Cranmer never ceases in his efforts to effect a full confessional union of the Protestant Churches; and though his labors come to nothing in the end, they are a significant testimony to the ecumenical spirit that motivates the early reformed Church of England. The later 16th century Anglicans are not so concerned. In 1560, after receiving a letter from Calvin, Archbishop Parker goes to the Queen's Council with a proposal for an assembly of Protestant ministers to frame a plan of worship and government for all. The Council says it likes Calvin's proposal; but that it is determined...
to retain retain episcopacy. Nothing is done; Jewel, Grindal, Whitgift, and Hooker all profess agreement with the continental reformed Churches in fundamental doctrine; but nothing is done towards the creation of a closer association of Anglicans with the other Protestant Churches.¹

Actually the historical circumstances made it absolutely impossible that any supra-national organization be even considered. England having just extricated herself from the ecclesiastical-political body that was the Roman Church, and having asserted in a fresh way her national identity politically and religiously, was in no mood to think of getting involved in another international Church group even if it could have been done without any serious political consequences. But Church affairs in those days could not be conceived of apart from political matters. Even a conference to discuss a common Confession would have been political dynamite.

At any rate by the end of the century the Puritan movement had caused the Church of England (1) to turn all her attention to her own domestic difficulties, and (2) to react against "Calvinism". Further endeavor to promote confessional or any other kind of unity among the Protestant Churches was practically abandoned.

Section II - The Early Caroline

The 16th century men regard the unity of the Church as being dependent upon true apostolic doctrine. Lancelot Andrews' thought is in line with this, but he deals with the conception even more soundly. Andrews never fails to see the office and witness of the Apostles as standing within the activity of the Holy Spirit. The apostolic witness is necessary to the unity of the Catholic Church, but it affects unity only as the instrument of the Holy Spirit. He is the only source of the Church's oneness because He is, in a unique sense, the only source of her being. Andrews reiterates again and again that the Church lives by the fact of the union of God and man in Jesus Christ, Who performed for us the work of salvation by making the Church one Body with Himself. But Andrews declares that all the work of Christ is of no avail for us apart from the work of the Holy Spirit. "... If the Holy Ghost come not, Christ's coming can do us no good; when all is done, nothing is done."¹ It is the Holy Ghost Who brings to us the things of Christ; it is He Who joins the Church to Christ. Christ has ascended to the right hand of the Father and without the Spirit Christ and the Church are as far apart as Heaven is from the earth. But the Church is not thus left separated from her Lord; the Spirit effects the union. Andrews calls the Holy Ghost the "love-knot" between Christ and His Church. He is "essential unity", "essential love", being the "love-knot" in the Trinity between the Father and the Son; the "love-knot" between the two natures united in Christ; and the "love-knot" between Christ and the Church.²

1. Sermons, Vol. III, p.171; see also p.195
2. Ibid, pp. 112f, and p. 148
Therefore, by means of the Spirit the Church is given to partake in the life of the Trinity itself: This is begun for us in the work of Christ, but only brought to fruition for us by the Spirit.

"... We will not compare them (i.e. the Incarnation and the descent of the Spirit), they are both above all comparison. Yet this we may safely say of them: without either of them we are not complete, we have not our accomplishment; but by both we have, and that fully, even by this day's (Pentecost) royal exchange. Whereby, as before He of ours, so now we of His are made partakers. He clothed with our flesh and we invested with His Spirit. The great promise of the Old Testament accomplished, that He should partake of our human nature; and the great and precious promise of the New, that we should be consortes divinae naturae, 'partake His divine nature,' both are this day accomplished."

To speak of unity, then, without relating it directly to the work of the Spirit is, for Andrewes, impossible. The Church is, and is one, because of the sovereign activity of the one Spirit of God uniting her to her one Lord, Jesus Christ. Church unity is God's gift in the same way that the very being of the Church is His gift. The Hand that reaches out to present the gift is the Hand of the Holy Spirit.

The Spirit is sovereign, and He can and does work His own mysterious way. But the Church has been given ordinances through which it has been promised that the Holy Ghost will propagate and renew her life. Andrewes thinks that there are four of these ordinances: Baptism, Preaching, the Sacrament, and Prayer. By means of these the total life of the Church is maintained. But we are here primarily concerned with the unity of the Church. If there is one of these ordinances that Andrewes thinks of as being the chief instrument of the Spirit to effect unity, it is

the Eucharist. It is the prime representation, and effector, of the Body of Christ.

"Of 'one accord', we spake at the first, as an effectual disposition thereto; and this Sacrament of 'breaking of bread' is the Sacrament of 'accord', as that which representeth unto us perfect unity in the many grains kneaded into one cup; and what it representeth lively, it worketh effectually."

The Church, and her unity, then, for Andrewes come strictly within the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But there is a significant suggestion in one of his Whit-Sunday sermons that we must take into account here. He is speaking against those who look upon the workings, and "revelations", of their own private spirits, as the activity of the Holy Ghost. To confute them he insists that "the Spirit must come from the Word, and the Holy Ghost from Christ's mouth..." His text is John 20:22, so he is referring here to the time when the risen Christ breathed upon the disciples and told them to receive the Holy Ghost. But in the context it is clear that "the Word" refers also to the Scriptures. This reference, taken in relation to other suggestions in his sermons (take for example the place where he says that the gifts that were given miraculously to the Apostles by the direct action of the Spirit must now be gained, in part at least, by diligent study of the Scriptures, and of the Fathers), permits us to infer that he sees the Spirit coming to the Church from, or by way of, the Scriptures. He would, therefore, have been in full agreement with the 16th century divines when they regarded the Bible so highly, and when they refused to admit that there was any

3. Ibid, p. 291. 4. See also Ibid, p.198
genuine Church unity apart from the Biblical Faith.

It is in attempting to come to terms with the disunity of the Protestant fold that Bishop John Davenant gives us the most complete treatment of the nature of the unity of the Church to be found in the early Caroline period. In his two short works, An Exhortation to Brotherly Communion Betwixt the Protestant Churches, and An Exhortation to the Restoring of Brotherly Communion Betwixt the Protestant Churches,¹ he tries to demonstrate that there is no sound reason for division among the Protestant Churches because they are in agreement over fundamental doctrines. Davenant does not press for unity merely for the sake of convenience; he insists that the Catholic Church is either one or she does not even exist.² He, therefore, begins with unity; it is the fundamental fact without which there is no Church. This unity is bound up with the Church’s relation to Christ, for the members of the Church are bound to one another with the same Spirit that binds them to Christ. Speaking about the Lord’s Supper he affirms, "With the common bond of the Holy Spirit, we are joyned to Christ the onely head of the Church; That by the types of the selfe same holy Spirit, and saving Faith, and Charity, we stick together amongst ourselves, and as it were are made up into one Body . . . "³ The unity of the Church is obviously the basic fact.

But there is another fact, the existence of which caused Davenant to write these two short treatises: namely, that the Church is divided. He does not attempt to give a careful

2. Exhortation to, Brotherly Communion, p. 2.
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explanation of how it can be that the Church is both one and divided, but he does say why the wounds of discord "grow more raw, and bleed afresh."

"If one may speak the plain truth, there is in all mortall men an inordinate love of themselves, and of their own inventions, and pleasing conceits, and this fault causeth that we see not all the falsehood of those opinions we have once entertained, nor vouchsafe admittance to the truth which is shewed unto us by others." Sinful pride is the breeder of divisions, and the consequence of sin is separation from Christ. That is why it must be taken seriously; the groundless separation of one church from another threatens separation from the Catholic Church, and therefore from Christ Himself.

"With those Churches it is fitting to retain Brotherly Communion, which we will not deny but that they retain Conjunction and Communion with Christ, the Head and Foundation of the Holy Catholic Church: Yea, except we will yield and confesse ourselves to be estranged from the body of Christ, we cannot but be their brethren, who are esteemed to hold brotherly Communion with Christ our elder Brother. For the band of holy Brotherhood betwixt the Churches themselves, cannot be broken at men's pleasures, except they be also broken betwixt them and Christ, who is the head of all Churches." But this passage indicates that Davenant distinguishes between "churches". If he specifies that there are some that "retain Conjunction and Communion with Christ", there must be others that do not. How are they to be distinguished? By their fidelity to the fundamental articles of the Christian Faith. That Church which holds fast to fundamentals is a genuine Church because she is thereby joined to the foundation which is Christ. Where the fundamentals of apostolic or catholic doctrine are faithfully confessed,

1. Exhortation to the Restoring of Brotherly Communion, p. 8
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there is the Catholic Church. Great error in non-fundamentals may exist, but this does not move a church away from Christ, the Foundation; therefore one church may not separate from another on account of such error. "... Charity forbids us, by unjust dissensions to start asunder from those erring Churches, who (nevertheless) stick to the foundation, because this is Schismatical."

We see, then, that Church unity is for Davenant inseparably bound up with the true doctrines of the Faith: it must grow up around the pure, uncorrupted Gospel. Rome is destructive both of the unity of the Catholic Faith and of the union of the Catholic Church, not because she denies any fundamental article, "truly and properly so called", but because she forces her own "uncertain opinions" upon the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith. He warns the Protestant churches against creating divisions over non-essentials: to do this is to be guilty of doing the very thing of which Rome is rightly accused. The Protestant churches are now united in fundamental doctrine, and it is to their eternal peril that they refuse to manifest their essential unity in full "Spiritual and Ecclesiastical Communion." It is not only not impossible that they should be united, it is God's command that they should be so.

"If in the meantime the Schisms of the Churches may be taken away (as out of doubt they may) I had rather a milestone were tied about my neck, and I cast into the depth of the Sea, than that I would hinder a work so acceptable to God, so necessary to the avoiding of scandals, or not with all my mind and might further and advance the same."

We might sum up Davenant's argument thus: The Church is truly the Church and is truly one because the fundamental doc-

3. Exhortation to Brotherly Communion, p.30
doctrines of the Catholic faith are in her midst. This is so because only the fundamentals bind her to her one Foundation, Jesus Christ. This unity must be manifested to the world in outward peace and concord, and mutual charity of Christians for one another. The Protestant churches, who alone are faithful to the fundamental articles of the Faith (he does not mention the Eastern Church), fail to manifest this peace and charity in full brotherly communion. He therefore calls them to repent of their sinful pride, and to accept one another as full brothers, since they are all brethren of Christ.¹

Most of the early Carolinists give the same primacy to verity of doctrine as does Davenant. But since they are concerned, not only about the unity of the Church, but also about her continuity, and since, also, they normally do not separate the two questions, I shall treat them together in the following section.

Richard Field, writing in the first decade of the 17th century, says that "there never was a time when God was without a Church among men. The origin of the Church rests upon God's call to Adam, "Adam, where art thou?", and her continuance in the world rests securely upon God's promise "that the seed of the woman should break the serpent's head."² Since "it is the work of grace, and the heavenly call, that give being to the Church, and make it a different society from all other companies of men in the world,"³ and since the unity and continuity of the Church are a part of her being, so it must be that they rest upon the work of grace.

¹. It is remarkable that, though these two works were published in 1641, no mention at all is made of the "schism" in England between the Puritans and the Prelates.
². Of the Church, Vol. I, p. 16.
³. Ibid, p. 25
However, Field does not emphasize this fact. He is more concerned to go on and deal with the conditions which the Church must fulfill in this world in order to retain her oneness and her perpetuity.

The first condition is faithful adherence to that sum of Christian doctrine that has been left to us by the Apostles and which must ever be the rule of our faith. Field insists that "bare and naked succession" is not a mark of the Church, but a true and lawful succession in which no new or strange doctrine is brought in, but the ancient religiously preserved. He answers the question put by Rome to all Protestant Churches, "Where was the true Church before Luther?", by saying that it was where it now is. The reason is that the errors and superstitions of Rome were never really held by all the members of that Church. That is, Field tries to demonstrate the continuity of the true Church by pointing to a continuous "remnant" within the Church that did not accept the innovations imposed by the pope and his followers; this remnant remained true to the ancient Gospel once delivered to the Church by the Apostles.

The Fathers, according to Field, "did not reason barely from personal succession, but by shewing affirmatively the faith they defended to have been received by all those bishops, whose succession they urged against their adversaries..." Fisher, the Jesuit, in his disputation with Laud argued that the continuity of the Church depended upon a "continued visible succession". Laud replied that it is nowhere said in Scripture or Fathers that there

1. Ibid, p. 160. 2. Ibid, p. 34 3. Ibid, pp.166f; see also pp. 171, 175. 4. Ibid, p. 330
should be "personal, uninterrupted succession." The succession is nothing if the faith is not brought down without change. The true faith must continue successively or the Church cannot live. Francis White quotes his brother, Dr. John White, with approval: "Against all papists whatsoever, we make it good, that the very faith we now profess, hath successively continued in all ages since Christ, and was never interrupted so much as one year, month, or day; and to confess the contrarie were sufficient to prove us no part of the Church of God." Francis White adds that his brother is here speaking only of substantial and primitive doctrine and not of "accessorie and secondary points." This, then, is the condition that the Church must fulfil if she is to continue in the world as the Church: fidelity to the ancient catholic faith.

"This being the way for particular Churches to demonstrate themselves to be catholic, by proving they hold the catholic faith, it is easy from hence to conclude, that the Reformed Churches are the Catholic Churches of God." It is as the Church actively appropriates, and confesses to the world, the one Gospel that she continues to be herself and perpetuates her life on earth. To Field this is important enough to make him assert that should the whole Church err damningly (i.e. err in the one rule of faith) she would cease to be, which he says is impossible. Individual Christians, and even particular churches may err damningly; but not the whole Church at one time, for then "the Church should cease utterly for a time, and so not be catholic, being not at all times . . . "

Joseph Hall, too, maintains that only apostolic doctrine should be propagated within the Church, and from the Church to the world. A Church can be a true church only if it holds to an indispensable minimum of the main doctrines of the Faith. It is on this basis that Hall maintains that the Roman Church is a true Church: in spite of the fact that she is miserably corrupted, she professes the main principles of religion. But Hall is not satisfied to stop there in his thinking about Church continuity. Not only the holding and preaching of pure Christian doctrines, but also the administration of Holy Baptism is necessary to the perpetuity of the Church. The Church, it would seem, does not exist and perpetuate herself for her own sake. It is as she actively exercises herself in her mission of preaching the one Gospel, and of baptizing, that she is continued in the world, for it is then that her doors are opened to admit men into the company of the people of God. Yet the good bishop does not stop there either: there must be some in the Church who have authority to preach and to administer the Sacraments. Who are they? The successors of the Apostles, without which succession the Church could not subsist. To him the full successors of the Apostles are the bishops, because they have the authority not only to preach and administer the Sacraments, but also to ordain. The bishops are, therefore, extremely important for the continuity of the Church. Hall asserts that the episcopal order is a creation of the Lord Himself, but he admits that it is not of absolute necessity, for those Churches that do not have it "lose nothing of the true essence of

3. Ibid, pp. 194f.
a church, though they miss something of their glory and perfection ... 

With regard to the unity of the Church we find that Field makes it to consist principally in three things: (1) in observing and holding the rule of faith once delivered to the saints; (2) in the subjection of the people to their lawful pastors; (3) in the connexion and communion, which many particular Churches and their pastors have among themselves. Thus the one rule of faith is important, but the unity of the Church must manifest itself visibly and bodily in the world. Congregations are gathered into one as they are subjected to their pastor in his ministration of the Word and Sacraments, and in his exercise of discipline. So too "particular Churches" (by this Field means the churches under one bishop) must not behave as independent units, but must responsibly relate themselves to, and commune with, one another. Field insists that all this goes to make up the unity of the Church, yet in another place he appears to suggest that even though the last condition is not fulfilled, the unity of God's people is not destroyed. He suggests that churches that are guilty of schism, "notwithstanding their separation, remain still conjoined with the rest of God's people, in respect of the profession of the whole saving truth of God, all outward acts of religion and divine worship, power of order, and holy Sacraments, which they by virtue thereof administer, and so still are and remain parts of the Church of God: but ... they (are not fully and absolutely of the Church."
Schism, then, does not fully cut a section of people off from the one Church. And neither does heresy. If heretics are not of the Church they cannot baptize, for there is only one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism. But, "heretics notwithstanding their heresies, do in some sort still pertain to the Church, and consequently have that degree, order, office, ministry, and calling, which is holy; by virtue whereof they do administer the holy sacraments." It is possible that Field would distinguish between one heresy and another in terms of their seriousness. Since he considers it impossible for the whole Church to err damnably because it would thus cease to be the Church, perhaps it is possible for a particular church to err damnably and be cut off from the unity of the Church. He does not, however, enter into that question. But Field further contends that excommunication does not wholly cut people off from the visible Church because (1) they may, and often do, continue to confess the whole "saving truth" and (2) they retain the character of Baptism which is the mark of Christianity. It would thus appear that the failure of a particular church to fulfill one of the three conditions of Church unity does not fully debar it from the unity of the Catholic Church. Field tries not to close the door upon those who are carried away by ignorance or "unenlightened consciences". But he makes it clear that wilful and stubborn minds have no excuse for their waywardness. In discussing schism again he says that those who willingly separate from the pastors who are lawfully and rightly set over them, and are carried away by the streams of contention

1. Ibid, pp. 45f.  
2. Ibid, p. 50
and faction, are guilty of a damnable schism.  

Bishop Hall holds that it is one Lord, one faith, one Baptism that make the Church one. Wherever those are truly professed to be, even though there may be differences of administration, ceremonies, and of opinions, yet there is *columbia una*. The fundamentals of the faith must be honestly believed, and if and when they are, there the one Church is.

"Christian articles are the principles of religion necessary to a believer; theological conclusions are school-points, fit for the discourse of a divine ... That church then which holds these Christian articles both in terms and necessary consequences, as every visible church of Christ doth, however it vary in these theological conclusions, is *columbia una*." 2

But Hall is not content to leave the matter there. As I indicated above, he has a keen sense of historical and institutional continuity, and this plays a full part in his thought concerning the unity of the Church. He deplores the anarchy produced by separatist congregations and sects. Whether they retain the fundamentals of the Faith or not, they are nevertheless tearing the visible Church asunder; Hall prays that God will put it into the heart of the king and parliament to take quick action in the suppression of this wild variety of sects. 3 The Church of England is the established Church of the nation, an ancient Church whose continuity can be traced back, not to Rome, but to the very early days of Christianity. At the Reformation a new church was not begun, but the old one was mended and reformed. 4 It is from this ancient Church of England, which was for some time under the tyranny of Rome, but is now reformed of her errors, that the sectaries have separated themselves to create new churches. They have done so

out of a desire to have a purer church; but Hall warns them that "If there be Christ with us, if the Spirit of God in us, if calling by the Word; whatsoever is or is not else in the constitution, there is whatsoever is required to the essence of a Church. No corruption, either in gathering or continuance, can destroy the truth of being, but the grace of being well. If Christ have taken away his Word and Spirit, you have justly subdued; else you have gone from him in us."¹ There is thus only one Church in England, and that is the ancient, visible Church that has been there since the Gospel first was preached; since there is now no valid reason for separation from this Church, the Separatists have moved away from Christ. Hall shares fully in the conception, held in common by almost all his Anglican contemporaries, that the Church of England has from the very beginning been an independent national church that possesses the right to order her own domestic affairs. Her separation from Rome was not only a revolt against the "abominable doctrine" of that communion; it was also a repudiation of the tyranny that the popes had illegitimately come to exercise over England's national church. Hall obviously is convinced that the Church of England's separation from Rome and the Brownist's separation from the Church of England are two entirely different cases. This can be seen by his warning to the Brownists: "... If we be a true Church, you must return; if we be not, (as a false church is no church of God), you must re-baptize. If our baptism be good, then is our constitution good."² Hall in

later writings openly confesses that Rome is a true Church, but he never for a minute suggests that the Church of England was wrong in severing herself from that communion. We see, then, that his ideas about church unity are greatly conditioned by his conception of the autonomous (i.e. autonomous in relation to the Church or the churches elsewhere) national church. He is not alone in this however; most of his colleagues are of the same mind.1

There is yet one more feature of the thought of the early Carolines about the unity of the Church to which we must refer. Field says that when the Apostles and their successors planted the churches, they divided the new people of God in such a way that each city and the surrounding district "did make but one Church". And since the unity of each particular church depended upon the "unity of the pastor", and because one church generally needed many presbyters, one of them was in a special sense the pastor of the whole to whom "an eminent and peerless" power was given to maintain the peace and unity of the whole. This pastor was called a bishop; the others, who were but his assistants, were merely called presbyters. Field is careful to show that the bishop's office is not "a distinct and higher order, or power of order", but it exists only for the sake of order and for the preservation of the peace and unity of the Church.2 There is one place in Hall's writings in which he expresses a similar conception of the Church unit. When, he says, churches are joined under one government, they may be called not churches but the Church. He uses as

1. See Francis White, Op cit, pp.392f. All of Laud's writings presuppose one national church under one head, the King. See also George Carleton, Jurisdiction, Regall, Episcopall, Papall, and Richard Montagu, Appello Caesarum, p. ill.
an analogy the churches of Crete becoming one Church under Titus.¹

Thus both Field and Hall seem to see in the bishop and the people under him, the basic church unit. For Field, the association and communion of these bishops and pastors of various "particular churches" among themselves, is one very important element in the all-embracing unity of the Catholic Church.

Section III - The Later Carolinns

Many of the men with whom we must deal in the Later Caroline period were writing either during the time of the Long Parliament and the Commonwealth, or in the first years of the Restoration, and it ought not, therefore, to be surprising if in their thought about the question of Church unity we find different emphases than we have discovered in the divines earlier in the century and before. The Puritans, not the Papists, now appeared to constitute the immediate threat to the Church of England, and against the Puritans different arguments had to be employed. However, the general trend is not only a change in emphasis, but a change in substance of doctrine. Bishops Pearson and Beveridge, and to a large extent Bishop Cosin, are the only notable exceptions to this rule.

We have seen above that Pearson holds a fairly well-developed doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. It is the Spirit that makes us to be members of Christ and gives us to share in the blessings of Christ.² If this is the case the unity of the

Church must depend upon the Church's union with Christ, for He can have only one Body. But what are the external means by which the oneness of the Church is effected and manifested? Pearson sets forth six means by which this is achieved, and they will serve as an outline with which to deal, not only with his thought on the subject, but with the rest of the Later Carolinian as well.

1. The first unity of the Church "considered in itself, beside that of the Head, which is one Christ, and the life communicated from that Head, which is one Spirit, relieth upon the original of it which is one..." It appears that by "the original of it" Pearson means that body of apostles and disciples who followed Jesus and who were together before the descent of the Spirit. After the coming of the Holy Ghost, by means of Peter's preaching many repented, believed, and were baptized, and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the sacraments, and joining in the prayers. This, Pearson declares, was the Church that was daily increased by the addition of other persons received into it on the same conditions. It was built upon the sure foundation, Christ being the chief cornerstone. It is that particular Church which has continued ever since. Whoever in all ages has been, or shall be, converted to the true faith, was or shall be added to that Church, and thus laid upon the same foundation, which Pearson calls "the unity of origination."

This same thought is developed by William Sherlock. He asserts that the Catholic Church is not merely an arbitrary con-

combination of particular churches, but is the "root and foundation of Unity, and, in order of Nature, antecedent to particular Churches, as the Sun is before its Beams . . . Particular Churches are made by the increase and propagation of the Catholic Church, not the Catholic Church by the combination of particular Churches". The one Catholic Church, then, is a reality which is given and which has grown from the beginning. The beginning, Sherlock suggests, was not at the coming of Christ, but goes back to the Jewish Church. The Jewish Church, perfected by the Gospel, is the root of the one Church, and it is unto this that Gentile Christians are grafted, growing up into one Church.  

2. According to Pearson the Church is one because the members agree in one faith. The foundation, as was mentioned above, is one because it is made up of the Apostles and Prophets, with Christ Jesus as the chief cornerstone. The Apostles were part of the same foundation as Christ because they all taught the same doctrine that they received from Him. Therefore all those who believe the same doctrine that Christ delivered to the Apostles, since they are all professors of the same faith, must be members of the same Church.  

Here Pearson is re-echoing the position held strictly by his forbears since the Reformation. As might be expected Bishop Beveridge also takes up this train of thought. He says that though there are many congregations they are neverthe less one because they are built upon one foundation, they are all members of one and the same Head, and they all agree in one and the same faith. With Pearson and Beveridge the one faith

is clearly the means by which the Church is united to Christ, and thus made into His Body which is one.

The rest of the outstanding men in the later Caroline period are either more subjective in their thinking about the one faith, or they show little or no concern at all with the part played by apostolic doctrine in the oneness of the Church. Henry Ferne shows a keen concern for the "Doctrine of Faith and Life", for he says it is the due profession of it that makes one a member of the body of Christ. But his emphasis soon shifts from the objective content of the Faith to the subjective act of faith. He, therefore, sees faith (primarily subjective?) as joining the body of the Church to Christ, and charity (also subjective?) as knitting one joint or part of the body to another. The unity of the Church then ceases to be defined in reference to Christ and is defined instead in terms of the Church’s faith and charity.¹

This new subjective emphasis is conjoined with a hardening of the conception of doctrine. The one Faith is seen less as a lively testimony of the Gospel by which the Church is united unto the Lord, and more as a series of abstract propositions, a depositum, committed to the Church, in which she is called to believe and which she is required to propagate.² Since this depositum has become partly, or fully, separated from Christ something else is needed to unite us to Him. Many of the later Carolines therefore see in the subjective act of faith (that apart from the depositum reaches up to Christ) the means by which

union with Christ takes place; and they see in the exercise of charity the means by which the members of the Church are united with one another. An example of this changed conception of the nature of doctrine is to be found in Isaac Barrow. He says that in the same way that a man who differs in any principle doctrine from Plato is not a Platonist, so any one who dissents from any important doctrine taught by Christ renounces Christianity. "All Christians are delivered into one form of doctrine; to which they must stiffly and steadfastly adhere, keeping the depositum committed to them ... "1 When doctrine is seen in this light it is natural for it no longer to be an integral part of the union of the Church with Christ and the consequent unity in herself. When Barrow says that the Church is (among other things) united by the pastors' "consent in doctrine, their agreement in peace, etc.," there is an undue emphasis on their consent, and their agreement, at the expense of the substance of the doctrine and the peace in which they agree. Herbert Thorndike manifests a similar strain of thought when, in referring to the problem of schism as raised by the Novatians in the early Church, says that the unity of the Church is of greater importance "than much understanding in the scriptures."2 The same orientation of thought can be found in Jeremy Taylor's writings.3

These men have almost completely overturned the original Anglican understanding of the Word of God, the Gospel, Apostolic doctrine, by isolating it from Christ, and thereby cutting it off from the sacraments, and from the faith, hope and charity of

3. e.g. Works, Vol. II, p.294
the Church. The cause of this is not far to seek: they lack an adequate doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Because they do not properly see that these earthen vessels are nothing unless the Spirit breathes life into them, because they do not properly see that they are but the instrument of the Spirit to unite the Church to Christ, the one Faith becomes a series of lifeless propositions, the Sacraments become magical rites, and the faith, hope and charity of the Church become subjective exercises of the Church. Taylor, who sees so many things with an amazing clarity and penetration, at one point sets the apostolic witness fully within the work of the Spirit: the Apostles were, he says, directly taught by the Holy Ghost and "the Holy Ghost abides with the church for ever, by transmitting these revelations, which he taught the apostles, to all Christians in succession." However, he does not maintain this idea constantly in his writings: he would always attribute the apostolic doctrine to the work of the Spirit, but his constant lapses into gross subjectivism reveal the inadequacy of his doctrine of the Spirit. Many of the later Carolinians, because of this deficiency in their thought, do not look upon the true Faith as an indispensable instrument in the unity of the Church, as did the Anglican Reformers and their successors, but rather see in it the potential instrument of division. They know how the Church has been torn asunder by bitter wrangling over the "one, true doctrine", and their emphasis is therefore more upon the necessity of charity and of peace, than it is upon fidelity to the one Faith.

1. Ibid, p. 267.
3. Pearson states that many churches are "considered as one Church, because they acknowledge and receive the same sacraments, the signs and badges of the people of God." Because there is only one Baptism, in the same way that there is only one Lord and one faith, those who receive it are made one. The Lord's Supper performs the same function. All believers and churches, by virtue of being washed in the "laver of regeneration", of eating and drinking the same bread and cup, are united in one Church, in the one "original" Church which has as its foundation the apostles and prophets, who are joined to Christ the chief corner-stone. That which distinguishes Pearson from most of his contemporaries is his consistently clear conception of the Sacraments as instruments of the Holy Spirit. It is the office of the Spirit to join us to Christ, to make us members of His body, and Pearson seems to see in Baptism the main tool of the Spirit in this work.

The important role the Sacraments play in the unity of the Church is universally recognized by the divines in this period. William Sherlock articulates most clearly and definitely the place of Baptism in relation to Church unity. To him the unity of Baptism is the primary expression of the oneness of the Church. In Baptism we are not baptized into a particular church, such as the Church of England, or the Church of France, but into the Catholic Church. One of the saving features of the Anglican divines at this time was their keen respect for

the Sacraments. However, because their conception of the relation of the "earthen vessel" to the Spirit is inadequate, they generally have to qualify whatever they say about the Sacraments by referring to what man has undertaken to perform. For example, Henry Hammond maintains that when Paul told the Galatians they had "put on Christ" in their Baptism, he cannot be interpreted to mean that they actually put Him on, for that was obviously not true of the foolish Galatians. Rather, Hammond suggests, Paul was referring to the obligation that lay upon them from their Baptism to undertake to put on Christ.\(^1\) A similar conception can be seen in Isaac Barrow's treatment of the Sacraments.\(^2\) Thorndike and Stillingfleet make the unity of the Church to consist, in part at least, in communion in the Sacraments of the Church. It will not be to any advantage to develop this further because the Sacraments will be given full treatment later. Sufficient to say that most of the later Carolines, in one place or another, repeat the Pauline language about Baptism and the Lord's Supper.\(^3\) But there is in the thought of these divines, excepting Pearson, Cosin and Beveridge, a serious theological inconsistency, so that as soon as they cease to repeat New Testament words and begin to interpret them, their doctrine of the Sacraments of the Church as God's instruments for creating and renewing the unity of the Church shows itself to be very weak.

4. Pearson also refers to the unity of hope. Though he deals with this point with extreme brevity, I believe he is here consistent with what he has said previously. If that is the case, then the "hope" of which he is here speaking must not be understood primarily in terms of its subject, but in terms of its object. There is a unity of hope because the Church's hope rests upon the one ascended Christ. That hope must be understood in these terms is clear when we examine his exposition of the article in the Creed on the Ascensions. The only hope the Church has is given by the fact that "our dust and ashes" have already ascended the heavens in Christ.

"We are already seated there in him, and hereafter shall be seated by him; in him already as in our Head, which is the ground of our hope; by him hereafter, as by the cause conferring, when hope shall be swallowed up in fruition."

Because Pearson properly sees the Church's hope in terms of the object which is Christ, he also sees it properly in terms of the subject. The subject is, certainly, the Church, but the Church hopes only through the Spirit. Pearson does not neglect to point out that we all "through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith", (Gal. 5:5) which is the only reason he can talk seriously about Church unity being bound up with hope.

By this hope, prompted by, and resting upon, the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, we are all united to that one original Church of which Christ is the foundation and Head.

5. There is also, according to Pearson, the unity of charity. On this he has only one very brief paragraph which, taken by

1. Op. cit., p. 602. 2. Ibid., p. 486; see following
3. Ibid., pp. 487f. 4. Ibid., p. 602.
itself, lends itself to no particular interpretation. I shall therefore leave it without comment since we have in the other points a clear picture of Pearson's thought. Bramhall,\(^1\), Ferne,\(^2\) and Barrow\(^3\) refer to the exercise of charity in reference to the unity of the Church. They appear to treat charity merely as a human virtue, but since they deal with it so briefly it would not be fair (nor is it necessary) to attempt to interpret their meaning.

6. Finally, Pearson contends that "All the churches of God are united into one by the unity of discipline and government, by virtue whereof the same Christ ruleth in them all. For they have all the same pastoral guides appointed, authorized, sanctified, and set apart, by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God, in the same way of eternal salvation: as therefore there is no Church where there is no order, no ministry; so where the same order and ministry are, there is the same Church. And this is the unity of regimen and discipline."\(^4\) This is the whole of Pearson's paragraph on this point, quoted in full in order that we might be under no misapprehension about his thought on the matter of Church government in relation to Church unity. Considering that he published his book in the last year of the Commonwealth (1659) we might expect that he would take every opportunity of asserting the necessity of episcopacy. We know how fervently he believes in it and what extravagant claims he is

prepared to make for it.\footnote{See a letter written by him in 1668 in his Minor Works, (ed. by Churton) Vol. II, pp. 231f.} But in spite of everything he does not suggest here that Church unity consists in episcopacy. He knows rather that it consists in the ministry that exists by the appointment of God; i.e. wherever that ministry is that has been appointed by God and that ministers at the direction of the Spirit, there is the one and only Church. Pearson believes in episcopacy and he knows the great importance of historical succession; but it is my contention that he does not refer to either of them here because he recognizes that they are *servants*, not *lords*, of the Spirit. Pearson resolutely refuses to be pulled away from the one indispensable fact: where Jesus Christ through the Spirit calls men, there is the one Church. This call is given through the work of the ministry; there is only one ministry simply because the gift of ministry comes only from Christ.\footnote{Pearson, like most Anglican divines, thought many churches were made into one Church by being under one ruler, i.e. a bishop. He did not attribute this to the fact that a bishop possessed special powers of ministerial order, (though he certainly believed that they did possess such powers – see his Minor Works, Vol. II, pp. 231f) but simply to the fact that they were under the care and inspection of one man.}

But let us look also at Pearson's conception of the ministry in relation to the continuity of the Church. He says that "the existence . . . of the Church of Christ . . . is the continuation of it in an actual being, from the first collection in the apostles' time unto the consummation of all things."\footnote{Creech, p. 604.} He means by "actual being", the "actual existence of believing persons and congregations".\footnote{Ibid, p. 604} The continuity of the Church, then, must be a historical
continuity. However, he maintains that the Church is not of such a nature as would necessarily, once begun, preserve itself forever. It continues because it is grounded upon the promise of God: that promise assures the Church of the presence of Christ. His presence is thus the cause of her existence, and her continuance. But how must we understand the nature of the ministry in relation to this? Pearson sees that Christ is present with the Church in the sending of the Holy Spirit, and it is the Spirit that sanctifies and sets apart persons for the duty of the ministry. The Spirit gave the Apostles power to perform their apostolic functions and also fitted them for the ordination of others, "and the committing of a standing power to a successive ministry unto the end of the world . . " Pearson thus believes in a historic succession of the apostolic ministry. That he believed in an exclusive episcopal succession is not suggested in his Exposition of the Creed, but is categorically asserted elsewhere. However, what we must remember is this: "The belief of the Holy Ghost is necessary for the continuation of a successive ministry . . unto the end of the world." It is always and forever the Holy Spirit Who exercises Christ's ministry over the Church. There is definitely a tension, even a contradiction, in Pearson's thought between his high doctrine of the Spirit, and his almost equally high doctrine of the succession of episcopal orders; but he can never forget that the Spirit is sovereign and that the Church's ministry comes within His sovereign activity. It is His presence and ministry in the Church that guarantees her continuity.

1. Ibid, pp. 604f. 2. Ibid, p. 585
Beveridge's doctrine of ministerial succession is more explicit, and perhaps less ambiguous, than Pearson's. The unity of the Church is inseparably bound up with this succession. He warns the English schismatics that they are hazarding their salvation by separating from a church in which the Apostolic Succession, "the root of all Christian communion", has been so fully preserved, and in which the Word and Sacraments are so effectively administered. Where the apostolic ministry is, there too is the one Church; and because this ministry has the power to ordain its successors, so it guarantees the continuity of the Church. This guarantee of ministerial succession rests upon Christ's promise, "Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world", which, Beveridge maintains, was given only to the Apostles and to their successors. It is not that Christ promises to leave a residue of power with the Apostles, to be used by them and passed on to their followers, a power to consecrate, confirm, and ordain. Rather He promises that through His Holy Spirit He Himself will be present with them in the execution of their office; because He is present their work of edification and government in the Church will be effectual. Beveridge at this point is in exact agreement with Pearson: the Church's ministry is operative only when and because it is also Christ's own ministry in her midst. Because he sees this so clearly Beveridge knows that the mere historical succession of the ministerial office does not guarantee that it will be the true apostolic ministry, and therefore cannot in

Itself guarantee that the one Church is continuing in this or that particular place. He recognizes that the Papists have retained the Apostolic Succession, but they "have clogged the several offices with so many superstitious ceremonies, that they quench the Spirit which should inflame and quicken them, or else perform them so imperfectly and irregularly, that they are not the same that were instituted by Christ, and so not capable of having this promise fulfilled to them."¹ It is, then, the fulfillment of the promise of Christ to be present with His Apostles to the end of the world that insures Church continuity.

The Apostles and their successors, it seems, must on their part execute their office according to the institution of Christ or else they may prevent the fulfillment of that promise.

The other later Carolines have a great deal to say about the government and discipline of the Church in relation to her unity and continuity. Isaac Barrow, who was most concerned with the peace and unity of the Church, has very high regard for Church discipline. But he differs greatly from Pearson and Beveridge in his conception of the ministry. They see in the exercise of the one and only ministry that has been from the beginning one of the signs and insurances of the presence of the one and only Church which has been from the beginning. Barrow sees in the exercise of the ministry the guarantee of that discipline and order which will maintain the peace and unity of the Church. He insists that no matter what else is present, if there is no discipline, the Church can never be a "spiritual

house", but only a heap of rubbish. He justifies at this point the retention of episcopacy for the simple reason that subordination of some under others is always necessary for the maintenance of concord. In the bishop he sees a centre of unity, so that all churches under a bishop are one Church. And these units are fully autonomous. He insists that one over-all political unity is not only unnecessary, it does not agree with "the nature and genius of the evangelical dispensation".

Then what sort of relation do these units have with one another? It is a relation of free communion of all parts together, not the subjection of all the rest to one part. It is a relation of free consultation and discussion, and wherever it goes beyond that toward the framing of a constitution between church units, it is but a human arrangement, not divine. It is of course convenient that the subjects of each national state should live in what Barrow calls a "spiritual uniformity, in order to the preservation of good-will and peace among them ...". And though he would acknowledge that this was, in a sense, a human arrangement, still God has given the princes of states certain ecclesiastical power to order all the Churches in their dominions. This ordering, according to Barrow, is of such importance that it is no longer expedient that there should be any General Councils of the Church because

"their resolutions may intrench on the interest of some princes; and hardly can they be accommodated to the civil laws and customs of every state."\(^1\) It seems, then, that there are two different units within the Church: the diocese, which is of a definite divine appointment and ordering; and the kingdom, which is in its own way a divine appointment and ordering. Every bishop is, as far as his fellow bishops are concerned, free of all external restraints and authority; but the prince of the domain in which the bishop has his diocese may use the ecclesiastical authority given him by God to establish certain laws or canons by which the bishops shall be ordered and governed — perhaps some might even be placed under the authority of one of their brethren. By virtue of the bishop exercising discipline over his diocese, of many bishops peacefully consulting and communing with one another for the better ordering and governing of their flocks, and of the prince exercising his God-given ecclesiastical powers to govern and discipline, the peace and the unity of the Church is maintained. The first two of these factors seem to be the most important, however, for he says that schism consists in disturbing the order and peace of any single church, in refusing obedience to that church, in obstructing correspondence and peace between several churches, and in unjustly condemning or censuring other churches.\(^2\)

It is evident that in Barrow faith and order are almost entirely separated: his conception of Church unity is completely political (ecclesiastical) in nature. He is, therefore, able

to discuss the function of the ministry in this connection without any serious reference to the ministration of That which gives both being and unity to the Church: the Gospel.

When we come to Jeremy Taylor we encounter the most extreme and most exclusive conception of episcopacy in relation to Church unity and continuity. The stewardship which the Apostles had over the Church was to last forever, for the power of ministering their office, and the office itself, were to be perpetual. The Apostles propagated a succession by their power of ordination, and Christ, Who promised His Spirit to abide forever with His Church, made the Apostles and their successors "the channels, the ministers, and conveyances of it." Because the Spirit adheres to this particular succession, and because he sees the succession coming down strictly within the office of the bishop, it is easy for us to understand why Taylor can say that it is the episcopal order that is the principal of unity in the Church.\(^1\) When he says this he means it in a very definite, exclusive sense. Only the bishops have that power which is necessary for founding and perpetuating a church which is truly a part of the One Church. When someone draws his attention to the reformed Churches on the Continent, and suggests that by necessity they are non-episcopal, Taylor says outright that a church cannot be founded without the ministry of bishops. Bishops are a necessity, and where God wishes to found a church He will provide the necessities.\(^2\) He admits there may be a situation where it is necessary to separate from a bishop if he is a heretic or a schismatic, but he declares

that "in no case is it lawful to separate from episcopacy; that is the quintessence and spirit of schism, and a direct overthrow to Christianity, and a confronting of the Divine institution." If this is true then both the unity and continu

ity of the Church are absolutely dependent upon the episcopal office.

The last divine that we shall deal with in this section is Edward Stillingfleet. He shows a marked deviation from the general trend of thought in the later Caroline period. He declares that it is impossible to prove a succession of apostolic power by merely producing a catalogue of names in apostolic churches without any evidence of what power they had. The question is whether the persons listed enjoyed the same power which the Apostles had over their churches while they lived. He maintains that the succession so much pleaded by the writers of the primitive Church was not a succession of persons in apostolic power, but a succession in apostolic doctrine. He acknowledges that a certain personal succession is asserted in the primitive Church, but it is as often as not attributed to presbyters, even after the distinction between them and bishops was made. Thus Church continuity is depen-

1. Ibid, p. 235. Taylor nevertheless refuses to condemn the reformed churches. Though he cannot justify their ordinations he says that they stand or fall to their own master. See Vol. II, pp. 198f
2. For Taylor's comments on set forms of prayer in relation to Church unity see Vol. II, p. 294.
3. Some reference to Herbert Thorndike should be made but it has been found convenient to leave him untouched here. His doctrine of the ministry and order of the Church will be dealt with fully in Chapter IV.
dependent upon the continual propagation of apostolic doctrine. Stillingfleet maintains that in antiquity episcopacy was ex- tolled because it best preserved the peace and unity of the Church. 

With this sentiment he appears to agree. The episcopal ordering of the church is the most satisfactory for the maintenance of peace and concord. Like his contemporaries he says that many churches gathered together under one bishop became one Church.

When Stillingfleet thinks of the apostolic office he does not think of the power of ordination, consecration and conformation; he thinks primarily of the preaching of the Gospel.

That is the apostolic office and it is to that that the ministers of the Church succeed. Therefore, he suggests, let them begin to exercise their apostolic ministry of preaching the Gospel, because "there is the same necessity now that there was then." The Apostolic Succession consists in the apostolic doctrine, and the chief function of the ministerial office is the preaching of that doctrine. Thus is the continuity of the one Church insured.

The trend to be discerned in the later Carolines is an increasing separation of ecclesiastical from dogmatic unity. The fact that they were able to discuss the political unity of the Church apart from her unity as the Body of Christ, apart from the unity that is given by Grace, is indicative of this. And they cannot be excused simply by referring to the difficult historical situation in which they stood. England in the

1640's and 50's was to them a nightmare of ecclesiastical anarchy; this partly explains their excessive concern with ecclesiastical discipline and unity. But outside the writings of Pearson and Beveridge we can find no serious, consistent discussion of Church unity that sets the political unity of the Church in the context of the unity of the Spirit. When they do relate the unity of the Church to Christ, they discuss it primarily in terms of that continuous historicopolitical body that had its origin with the historical Jesus. As we have seen, Pearson and Beveridge, too, were very much concerned with that visible body of men which has continued since the time of Jesus and the Apostles; but in spite of their doctrine of the episcopate's power to propagate itself, they knew that the "Church is not of such a nature as would necessarily, once begun, preserve itself forever." Only the promise of Christ that He will be with her till the end of the world gives "the assurance of the continuance of the Church." But it is Christ's present fulfillment of that promise that guarantees the Church's being in the present.

Christ is now present in and with the Church by the present gift of His Spirit. The Church is now one as Christ through Word and Sacraments makes her to be part of that one "original" Church which is His Body. Thus the promise of Christ guarantees the being and the oneness of the Church. The other men in this period either do not discuss this at all, or else they

1. Pearson, Creed, p. 480  
2. Ibid, p. 480
point to the historical body of the episcopate, that by succession runs back to Christ, as being in itself the guarantee of the presence of the Spirit through apostolic ordination. It is therefore the episcopate, which necessarily is conjoined to that body of men originally called and ordained by Jesus, that insures the oneness of the Church.
CHAPTER III

THE CHURCH: VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE

John Calvin points out that Scripture speaks of the Church "after two sortes". (1) Sometimes it refers to the Church as she is before God, which includes only those who by the grace of adoption and by sanctification of the Spirit are children of God and true members of Christ. This Church comprehends not only the holy ones now on earth but also all the elect since the beginning of the world. But since she rests upon God's secret election and inward call, we cannot see this Church "with our eyes, or feel it with our hands." She actually exists but is to be discerned only by faith. At any rate we are not commanded to discern the elect from the reprobate, but merely to know that those by God's mercy are made to partake in Christ are separated into a peculiar company, and to know, further, that we are members of that company. (2) But often Scripture signifies by the word Church the "universall multitude of men scattered abroad in the world, which profess that they worship one God and Christ, by Baptisme enter into his faith, by partaking of the supper testifying their unity in true doctrine and charity, have an agreement in the word of the Lord, and for the preaching thereof doe keep the ministery ordained by Christ". In this church hypocrites are mixed with true believers. But since we cannot discern the one true company of the elect from those who are reprobates, we are commanded to look only to the visible Church and keep strictly in the communion of it.

1. Institutes, IV, 1, 7  
2. Ibid, IV, 1, 3  
3. Ibid, IV, 1, 7
However, the question is, How can we tell where this Church is? Calvin says the face of the Church is visible to us wherever we see the Word of God to be purely preached and heard, and the sacraments ministered according to the institution of Christ. He does not refer to the Word and Sacraments here as outer garments by which the Church can be discerned. They tell us where the Church is, because where they are, there is Christ Himself in the midst, forgiving the sins of men, by which He adopts them into His Church and preserves them in her. Only by the forgiveness of sins are men made into the company of Christ's people, but it is distributed to men by the preaching of the Gospel or by the administration of the Sacraments. The ministration of the forgiveness of sins is the power of the keys, but Calvin says the keys are "unseparably knit with the word." On this ground he depreciates Rome's claim that she is the one, true, visible Church because she has a visible, historical succession. He says succession is vain unless "the posteritie doe keep fast and abide in the truth of Christ, which they have received of their fathers from hand to hand." When Calvin holds up the Word and Sacraments as the true signs of the presence of the Church, true doctrine is fully involved.

"... So soone as lying is broken into the chief tower of religion, so soone as the summe of necessarie doctrine is perverted, and the use of the Sacraments faieth, truly the destruction of the Church followeth..."

H. F. Woodhouse points out in his recent book that the

1. Ibid, IV,1,9  2. Ibid, IV,1,9,20,21  3. Ibid, IV,1,2

See also IV,1,12.
Anglican Reformers were influenced by current ideas about predestination, coming from Augustine via Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin (and Wyclif?). These ideas substantially affected their views concerning the nature of the Church, particularly concerning her visibility and invisibility. \(^1\) We have given this brief outline of Calvin's position on the subject, first because his influence upon early Anglican theology was greater than Luther's or Zwingli's, and secondly because he deals with the question so succinctly. He sets the stage for us to deal not only with the 16th century Anglicans, but with the Carolines as well.

Section I - The Sixteenth Century

The doctrine of predestination, and the firm conviction held by all the Anglicans in the 16th century that the Church of Rome had been, and continued to be, partly or wholly corrupt, brought the concept of the invisible Church into full prominence. As Woodhouse shows, the Anglican Reformers and their immediate successors are not always fully agreed as to the exact relation of the invisible Church to the visible, and even less as to the relation of either to the "mystical body of Christ." \(^2\) It is difficult to say how severe a distinction they make between the invisible and the visible, and whether or not they really believe there are two churches, or only one spoken, as Calvin put it, "after two sortes". In the Church on earth there are gathered many evil men along with those who truly belong to Christ. They are in the Church but not of it. \(^3\) But it is not possible to tell who are truly of that company of people who

\(^{1}\) Op cit, p. 58  
\(^{2}\) See Ibid, chapters IV and V.  
\(^{3}\) Whitgift, Works, Vol. I, p. 385
have been made true members of Christ, because "the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether from sense." ¹ It is in this sense that Hooker calls the Church the "mystical body of Christ", not that it is an invisible "spiritualized" body, but the relation to Jesus Christ that gives this Church its being is not to be discerned by the ordinary senses. This, then, is the important thing to be noted: this mystical body does not contain all the members of the visible Church, but whom it does contain is God's secret, not ours. Those who are members of it are so only through the grace and election of God.² It was the tremendous realization of God's providential care, of His Almighty Grace, acting in spite of the iniquity of the visible Church, that caused the Reformers and later 16th century divines to emphasize the one true company of God's people that was known only to the Lord Himself.

But God has established in the world a Church that is visible, in which men are to be gathered unto Christ. Like Calvin, the early Anglicans make the Word and Sacraments the outward marks by which this Church is to be discerned. It is by His Word and Spirit that God gathers together His people and rules over them.³ The Anglican Fathers therefore greatly emphasize pure and sound doctrine when they refer to the marks of the Church. The preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments are always mentioned, and sometimes ecclesiastical discipline⁴

Woodhouse writes,

"... Sometimes there are two notes and sometimes four; sometimes instead of doctrine, preaching and prayer are to be found. If two notes are picked out and a third omitted these selected ones are preaching and sacraments, though the same writer may also give three marks and also, in a list of three, include both preaching and pure doctrine. There is one case where all the notes appear to be subjective, while charity, a subjective note, is found as a note in several writers and obedience is once mentioned as almost a note."[1]

In spite of the reference to the "subjective" notes, it is significant that the Word and Sacraments, and frequently doctrine, are set as the real signs of the Church's presence. The preaching of the Word is not looked upon as an impotent "spiritual" meditation, the Sacraments are not considered to be a christening and a memorial, doctrine is not a series of abstract, authoritative statements setting forth religious truths; they are marks of the Church because they are the human tools that God uses to act mightily among His people. They are His chosen vessels, and for that reason where they are, there is the Church. By the preaching of the Word the Spirit of God pierces to the hearts of men and inflames them.[2] By the administration of the Sacraments faithful Christians are joined unto Christ, and also together among themselves, thus making "one mystical body of Christ".[3] "As by his word and voice

---

1. Op cit, p.30. This diversity of expression should not cause us to assume that there were great differences of opinion among the Anglican Fathers. Even Calvin did not always name the marks of the Church in the same way. In his Commentary on Galatians he says that the external marks of the Church are the profession of Christianity, the worship of one God, observation of the Sacraments, and some kind of Gospel ministry. (Chapter I, verse 2)  
4. Cooper, Anglican Ministry (ch.7).
Christ calleth them into his fold, so by his sacraments there he marketh them. The right Church therefore, as the fold of Christ, hath the true word of God and use of his sacraments according to the same, for the due marks thereof. The emphasis on Word, Sacraments, and doctrine is a testimony to the Church's full dependence upon the sovereign work of God for her being. What Woodhouse calls the "subjective" notes must be distinguished sharply from the same notes mentioned in the Later Caroline period. Some of the early Anglicans were willing to mention charity and obedience as marks of the presence of the true Church because they were the manifestations of the work of the Holy Spirit. It was a move to the "subjective" only in the sense that it testified to the presence of the objective ground of the Church's life.

Before we go on to the Carolines one more observation ought to be made. The 16th century divines do not ordinarily refer to the visible continuity of institution or of order as a sign of the presence of the Church. It is, perhaps, natural that this should be the case if only because Rome is applying against them the argument that they are outside the one Catholic Church whose visible succession goes back unbroken to antiquity. When Philpot is being examined for heresy after Queen Mary's accession, the Archbishop of York makes the claim that the Catholic Church is to be known by universality and by succession of bishops. Philpot denies it to be an infallible point by which to know the Church; but he says if with the succession of bishops is put succession of doctrine, he will grant it to be a

"good proof" for the Catholic Church. But, he insists, "a linel succession is nothing withal."\(^1\) Morton analyses all the marks that Rome holds up as being indicative that she is the true Church, such as Episcopal Succession, antiquity, Catholicity, doctrinal agreement with the primitive Church, etc., and proves, to his own satisfaction at least, that either they are not true marks at all, or Rome fails to possess them. To him there are only two proper notes of the Church, the Word and the Sacraments.\(^2\)

And so with Whitgift: "The essential notes of the Church be these only; the true preaching of the word of God, and the right administration of the sacraments . . Government, or some kind of government, may be a part of the Church, touching the outward form and perfection of it, yet is it not such a part of the essence and being, but that it may be the church of Christ without this or that kind of government; and therefore the 'kind of government' of the church is not 'necessary unto salvation'."\(^3\) It is not that they thought institutional or episcopal succession unimportant; they simply thought it wrong to call it a true sign of the presence of the Church. Their overwhelming discovery of the true primitive doctrine caused them to rest almost everything upon it; though they had an appreciation of visible, historical, continuity, its trustworthiness as a mark of the Catholic Church taken by itself was very much questioned. Later in the century Hooker and Bilton give greater weight to the succession of bishops than had been done hitherto, but whether they would have called

---

it a true mark of the Church is difficult to determine. 1

Section II - The Early Carolines

The Early Carolines hold a doctrine of the Church invisible that is much like the one to be seen in the 16th century divines. The theme does not, however, arise in their writings so frequently perhaps it is because they are a full generation removed from the time when the Church was reformed, from the time when the old "visible" church persecuted those who attempted to purge her of "superstition and error"; this persecution helped to convince those that labored for reform that the visible Church was far from being synonymous with the true company of God's faithful people. Or perhaps the concept of the invisible Church is discussed less frequently because the visible, established, reformed, Anglican Church by the turn of the 17th century is faced with the task of dealing with people who think the Church of England is full of error, and who consequently separate themselves from it and think themselves to be the true Church. Nevertheless, the doctrine of election and the conception of the Church triumphant that the Anglicans hold make it inevitable that they will have some comments about the invisible Church.

Richard Field says that only those whom divine grace leads

infallibly by the means of grace to the certain possession of God's final blessedness are fully and absolutely of the Church. The ground of the Church is grace, for it is the work of grace, God's call, that gives being to the Church. The Church is ecclasia, a multitude called out. Therefore all who have been called from the world by the grace of God are of the Church. But only some of these, according to Field, are "principally, fully, and absolutely" of the Church. These are the elect, the chosen of God whom He has loved with an everlasting love. However, others share with them in the means of salvation (Word and Sacraments?) and receive much good from them.

"When we say, therefore, none but the elect of God are of the Church; we mean not that others are not at all, nor in any sort of the Church, but that they are not 'principally, fully, and absolutely'; and that they are not of that especially number of them who partake and communicate in the most perfect work, force, and effect of saving grace." Field insists that this does not imply that there are two Churches. The words "invisible" and "visible" are used merely "to distinguish the divers considerations of the same Church." And this is the first sense in which we think of the Church being invisible: i.e. only God knows who are among the number of His elect. There is another sense in which Field uses the word "invisible", but to understand it we must first consider what he says about the visibility of the Church.

The Church is visible by virtue of (1) the profession of the "super-natural verities revealed in Christ", (2) the use of

the Sacraments, (3) the order of ministry, and (4) the due obedience yielded to that same order of ministry. Field goes on to say that all that are of the Church must make an open profession of the truth; by their profession and practice they can be discerned from other men. However, the truth and excellence of the faith and profession of Christians is not to be discerned except by faith. Therefore the "excellency" of the Church in relation to the normal "profane" societies of the world is invisible and unknown to natural men, and is known only by those who are "spiritual."

But then Field proceeds to deal with another side of the question, and what he appears to be suggesting is this: though the open and known profession of saving truth is preserved in the Church, and though the ministry of salvation is continued and known, yet error and heresy subtly creep into the Church, often into her highest courts, and leave the truth to be defended and maintained by only a few, who are generally persecuted and treated as enemies of the peace of the Christian world.

"In this sense then the Church is said to be sometimes invisible, not because there are none seen, known, or found that possess the truth of God; but because even in that company which is the true Church of God, many, and those the greatest, are carried into error, so that but some few, and they such, as (if we should judge by outward appearance,) are most unlike to uphold and maintain the truth, are left to defend the same multitude, authority, reputation and opinion of greatness in others,

1. Ibid. p.31  2. Ibid. p.32
obscuring them in such sort, that they which measure things
by outward appearance, can possibly take no notice of them.\textsuperscript{1}

It seems then that the four marks mentioned above certainly tell
us where the true visible Church is to be found, though those
who are the true upholders of the truth may be "invisible" within
it. Whether Field thinks that this "invisible" company is
synonymous with that other "invisible" society of the true elect
is very difficult to determine, because, surprisingly, he does
not explicitly relate the two in this section.

Francis White speaks of the Church's invisibility in two
ways: First he says the whole society of the Saints including
those triumphant in heaven, and militant on earth, is invisible
because Christ the Head of the Church is invisible to us.
And secondly, that part of the Catholic Church on earth which is
"effectually called and united to Christ", is invisible because
God’s election, and the operation of the Spirit, and faith,
"which constitute the same", are spiritual.\textsuperscript{2}

Bishop Carleton, writing against Rome's claim that there
must be a visible ministerial head over the Catholic Church on
earth, says that no such head is necessary. Visible, particular
Churches must have such heads or governors over them, but over
the Catholic Church there is only one head, Jesus Christ, from
whom grace is infused into the whole body. This Catholic Church,
Carleton says, is like her Head, perfectly known to God, not to
man.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p.33.  \textsuperscript{2} Op.cit., p.91. Richard Montagu advocates
a similar position in this regard. See his A Gagg For the New
\textsuperscript{3} Jurisdiction, Regall, Episcopal, Papall, pp 5f.
necessarily true children of God. The Church judges them to be so but this is based only on the charity of the Church. Many who receive the Sacrament of regeneration, and are judged by the Church to be regenerate and justified, may make great progress in the Church, be enlightened, be made partakers of many graces of the Holy Ghost, and even taste the power of the world to come, and yet may fall away totally and finally. But they that are truly called, may fall into many temptations and sins but they will never fall away totally or finally. These are known only to God.

Joseph Hall refers to that "true, inward, universal company of God's elect and secret ones". Among them only is there to be found true unity; among them baptism is the "true laver of regeneration"; among them the one faith is a genuine "saving reposal upon Christ"; among them the one Lord is the true "Saviour of his body." There are many who do not belong to the election of God who are enlightened by the truth and give their assent to it, who from that knowledge and faith find some change in their lives, and who nevertheless never attain "to that hearty renovation which is joined with justification. They were therefore never in the true style of adoption and may completely fall away from the Faith."

Thus we see that there is in the early Carolines a similar emphasis to that found among the representative divines in the previous century. They too believe that there is among the

visible company of churchmen a society of people who have been called to be members of Christ unto eternity, though they maintain that we cannot tell who they are. They would agree with Hooker when he says, "the mystery of their conjunction (with Christ) is removed altogether from sense." ¹

But the divines in this period are far more concerned about the visible Church, and about those things that mark the Church out from the rest of the world, and about the vehicles used by God to nourish and care for this Church. Lancelot Andrewes, for instance, though he constantly points forward to the yet invisible Church of glory in which all, faithful Christians shall be given a share, yet he does not discuss the Church in terms of the distinction between those who are truly God's people and those who are not. Neither does he state explicitly what the marks are by which the visible Church is to be discerned, though his concern is always with the visible Church, with the Church as it presents itself to men, with the Church that he is called to minister to. It is not difficult, however, for us to discover what he believed those marks to be.

Andrewes always thinks of the Church as standing utterly dependent upon the work of the Holy Spirit. It is the Spirit Who gives life and being to the Church, for He alone draws her into the work of Christ. The Spirit comes from Heaven: He blows into the Church, filling her with the breath of Heaven, and carries her with Him as He completes His circular route, taking her to see

¹. *Ecc. Polity, III, i, 2*
the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.1 Without
the Spirit none of Christ's work makes a particle of difference
to us.2 But because the Spirit has and does come, there is a
"royal exchange". In His Incarnation Christ took our flesh
upon Himself; with the coming of the Spirit we are given to
partake in Christ's glorious body.

"He clothes with our flesh and we invested with His Spirit.
The great promise of the Old Testament accomplished, that
He should partake our human nature; and the great and
precious promise of the New, that we should be consortes
divinae naturae, 'partake His divine nature,' both are
this day (Pentecost) accomplished."3

The Spirit is Sovereign and can therefore come when and as He
pleases. But the Lord has established certain ordinances in
the Church that are "arteries" to convey the Spirit to us.
These "arteries" are the Word, the Sacraments, and Prayer.4
Where these three ordinances are, there the Spirit is at work,
and when the Spirit is at work there is the Church. But these
ordinances are visible ceremonies. This is exactly what
Christ intended. In a sermon on John 20:22, "And when He had
said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye
the Holy Ghost", Andrews says that Jesus could easily have
given the Spirit without any ceremony: He could have held His
breath and still sent the Spirit; but He would not have it
that way. He performed it by means of an outward ceremony.5
So the outward ceremonies of Prayer, Word, and Sacraments are
the marks by which the Church is to be discerned from the world.

By these the Holy Spirit can be presented to the senses, to the

4. Ibid, p. 129.  5. Ibid, p. 277
ear (the Word), and to the eye (the Sacraments). 1

Andrewes differs from the English theologians of the previous century in that he does not constantly emphasize pure doctrine. With them it was frequently mentioned as a mark of the true Church. We say without hesitation that to Andrewes the Word, Sacraments, and Prayer are the signs of the presence of the Church. Can we say the same about right doctrine? Or to put it another way, does Andrewes implicitly include within his concept of the Word, the concept of pure biblical doctrine? I believe we can safely say that he did, though this does not mean that he had a rigid or static conception of the proper kind of preaching. There are two places in particular where he definitely suggests that the Spirit comes to us via the Scripture. He says first that the Spirit must come from the Word, from Christ's mouth. But in the context it appears that the Word refers to Scripture, and also the preaching of the Word in the Sanctuary. 2 Then shortly afterwards (in the same sermon) he says that what the Apostles received miraculously from the Spirit we must now gain, in part at least, by diligent study of Holy Scripture, and also the ancient Fathers. 3 We see, then, that for Andrewes departure from the Scriptures would mean departure from the Spirit. We must therefore remember that when he mentions Word and Sacraments he has a very concrete conception of the content of the Word. Preaching must be interpretation of Holy Scripture. Andrewes' sermons themselves bear witness to this fact in being from first to last nothing

else but that. There were undoubtedly many preachers in 16th and 17th century England that were more simple and communicative. But we shall search in vain if we look in that period for sermons that can touch Andrewes' for sheer biblical content and depth of theological elucidation. Pure biblical doctrine, then, takes its place within Andrewes' concept of the Word, and therefore must be included within the ordinances that constitute the marks of the Church.*

Finally we must ask if, for Andrewes, a certain form of Church government constitutes another mark of the presence of the Church? Andrewes firmly believes that the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters is a creation of the Lord Himself. Jesus distinguishes between the Twelve and the Seventy, and they are respectively the first Bishops and Presbyters. The Bishops were superior to the Presbyters and that distinction and superiority ought to be maintained.¹ It seems clear that Andrewes would not place the form of Church government or historical continuity on the same level as the Word, Sacraments, and Prayer as notes of the Church, but I think there can be no doubt that he sees in episcopacy and in historical succession secondary or derivative signs of the Church.

Looking again at Richard Field, we find that he has three well-defined, and rather comprehensive "notes" that "perpetually distinguish the true Catholic Church from all other societies of men." They are: (1) the entire profession of the supernatural verities that God revealed in Christ; (2) the use of the holy

¹. *Sermons, Vol. V, pp. 64f.*
ceremonies and sacraments instituted and appointed by Christ "to serve as provocations to godliness, preservations from sin, memorials of the benefits of Christ, warrants for the greater security of our belief, and marks of distinction, to separate his own from strangers"; (3) a union of men in this profession and use of the sacraments, under lawful pastors and guides. 1 With the first two Field does not vary at all from his 16th century precursors, except that his conception of the supernatural verities and of the sacraments is more externalized than theirs. But in the third note we can notice a change of emphasis, that may be significant. In the 16th century some of the men point to discipline as one of the marks of the Church, but they did not generally concern themselves to say that this discipline is to be under lawful pastors and guides. Perhaps one of the reasons for this was that they had no Separatist congregations to worry about. By Field's time, however, the Puritan criticism of the Church had broken out in places into full separation from the Establishment, and was causing grave concern among the bishops and conforming ministers. This appears to be one of the reasons for his wording the third note in the way he does. He confesses that the entire profession of the truth revealed in Christ, though it does distinguish right believers from heretics, is not sufficient by itself to denote the company of Catholic Christians, for schismatics may, and sometimes do, hold an entire profession of God's truth. 2 But when Field says that "lawful and holy ministry . . . is an inseparable and perpetual note of the Church;

for no Church can be without it", he is not merely writing polemic against the Puritans. He means exactly what he says: it is an "inseparable and perpetual note"; this is true no matter what the Church's situation.

"The ministry of pastors and teachers is absolutely and essentially necessary to the being of the Church. For how should there be a Church gathered, guided and governed without a ministry?"

But Field's words about "lawful" ministry must not be interpreted to mean those only who stand in the personal historical succession, for he says that Succession (he means here personal succession) is not a mark of the Church.¹ He does not, however, reject the whole idea of succession. He merely insists that "bare and naked succession" is not a note of the Church. Only true and lawful succession where no new doctrines are brought in, but the ancient doctrine fully preserved, is a mark or note of the Church.² This means Field thinks that historical continuity is important, but that it is dependent upon doctrinal continuity. He agrees with Stapleton who says,

"Wheresoever we find a Church once established under a lawful ministry in the undoubted profession of the truth, if afterwards there be a succession of pastors and bishops in the same place, and that none of them depart from the faith of the former, then it may be evident, that what faith was first holden is still holden by them that presently are in place, there we may assure ourselves to find the true Church."³

Field's comment on this is,

"Thus still we see, that true doctrine is a necessary note whereby the Church must be known and discerned, and not ministry and succession, or anything else without it."⁴

Before we leave Field we must ask of him one further

1. Ibid, p. 82.  2. Ibid, p. 84.  3. Ibid, p. 84
4. Ibid, p. 32.
question: to what is the Church made visible by her notes and marks? To the eyes of the world? Or only to faith? I think we must say that he believes the Church is by her marks made visible only to faith. Because true doctrine is to him so important among the notes of the Church, and because he says the truth and excellence of the faith and profession of Christians is to be discerned only by faith, there seems to be no question but that the presence of the true Church is recognized only by believers.

And this is certainly Francis White’s position too. True doctrine, as we have seen previously, is of overwhelming importance to him, and he makes it, in his discussion of the Church’s notes, the very Touchstone of the Church. He says that Rome makes "externall accidents" like universality and personal succession to be the properties and infallible marks of the Church, while the Protestants call those the marks of the Church that flow from the being of the Church. Rome argues that, since at the "first planting" of the Church God appointed that there should be miracles and other visible gifts to act as outward testimonies through which ignorant persons, before they understood the Christian doctrine, might know that these particular teachers had the truth, so in future ages He has appointed certain "visible testimonies" whereby the "unskillful" might be brought to a knowledge of the true Church without penetrating into her doctrine. White denies the truth of this argument. He admits that in the Apostles’

time God confirmed the truth by miracles, but he insists that
He does so no longer. Now God gives only that truth contained
in Scripture, and the preaching and profession of it by the
ministry of some part of the Church, as the outward means of
bringing men to faith. 1 This means that for White the notes of
the Church are inseparably related to her mission, which is, of
course, what he meant when he said that they flow from the being
of the Church. The marks of the Church are not, and cannot be,
signs that have only an accidental relation to the Church's
commission from Christ to feed His sheep. White maintains that
true Scriptural doctrine is the prime note of the Church because
it is by the proclamations of that doctrine that people are made
to be members of Christ.

"Thos are notes of the Church, which make people to be
the sheepe of Christ and household of God, and demonstrate
them to be such. But hearing of Christ's voice, and
building themselves by faith upon the foundation of the
Prophets and Apostles, make people the sheep of Christ and
household of God, and demonstrate them to be such, Joh 10.27
Eph. 2.20.

Ergo hearing Christ's voice, and building themselves by faith
upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, are notes
of the Church.

Object 1. But this proveth not true doctrine to be a note.

Answ. The voice of Christ and true doctrine are equi¬
 lent (1), and of the same notion. John. 17,17. I Tim. 2.4.
II. These. 2.12. Jam. 1.18.

Object 2. It proveth not true doctrine contained in the
Scripture to be a sufficient note.

Answ. Presupposing the Scripture to be the only object of
Catholic faith (which Doctor (John) White hath elsewhere
confirmed) it proves, that true doctrine contained in the
Scripture is a sufficient mark." 2

Since the notes of the true Church are the very media by which
men are converted, come to be members of the Church, and to the

---
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knowledge of Christ, it necessarily follows that only believers recognize them for what they are. It is only when unbelievers are led by these true notes to belief in the true Faith that they know those who teach them to be of the true Church.

Richard Mountagu, though writing at almost the same time as White, presents us with a different point of view. He is very concerned about the visible, historical continuity of the Church. He says that from the days of Adam there has continued a perpetual Church upon earth, "in the Families of the Faithful, a visible company, in a continual succession without interruption all along..." If we ask what it is that constitutes the Church's visibility, the answer seems to be historical succession and continuity of ministry and of institution. It is true that Mountagu quotes D. Willet with approval when he says that "only absence of the Word and Sacraments doe make a nullity in a Church", and he would therefore never think of the succession in abstraction from them, but it is nevertheless the succession (and he means by this personal succession) that makes for the visibility of the Church.

Bishop Davenant says that we can know whether a Church is a true church (i.e. so far as it is lawful for men to know and judge) by the works that are daily exercised within it. By "works" he does not mean the virtuous behavior of the members of the Church, but those acts whereby men "may be united to Christ, remaine in him, and by him be brought to eternall life..."

Where these are performed we may know that the Church is truly coupled to the Foundation that is Jesus Christ. Davenant then immediately refers to Baptism whereby we are grafted into Christ.\(^1\) Strangely enough, however, he does not here directly mention the Lord's Supper or the preaching of the Word. It is true that after he discusses Baptism he goes on to mention the Protestant churches where men are "enlightened to know God, and Christ, and furthered to believe in him",\(^2\) but one would expect that after referring directly to the problem of what it is that reveals to us the true Church, he would specifically mention the Supper and the preaching of the Word, as well as Baptism. That he believes the Word and Sacraments are the marks whereby the Church is known is obvious from his letter to Bishop Hall.

"Where God calls men unto the participation of life in Christ by the word and by the sacraments, there is the true being of a Christian Church, let men be never so false in their expositions of God's word, or never so untrustworthy in mingling their own traditions with God's ordinances."\(^3\)

However, we must not assume that Davenant holds doctrine with little regard. On the contrary; that Church which moves away from the Fundamental articles of the Faith is severed from Christ.\(^4\) There is therefore a limit to how false a Church can be in its exposition of God's Word. The above quotation from his letter to Hall refers to Rome; Davenant could in that letter agree that Rome was a true visible Church because he believed that she did not deny any Fundamental point, in spite of the fact that she dangerously deformed the body of Catholic Faith by adding to

---
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it "many members, both useless and monstrous". We must therefore remember that when he is speaking of the Word and Sacraments, Davenant assumes that the Preaching of the Word will not deviate from these fundamental articles. The fundamentals of the Faith, then, in this sense form one aspect of the face of the visible Church.

To Joseph Hall Baptism seems to be the chief sign of the presence of the (or a) true Church. In his argument with the Brownists he tells them that they must decide about the Church of England in terms of her Baptism. If her Baptism is good he insists that the Brownists must agree that her constitution is good also.

"Thus", he says to them, "your own principles teach. The outward part of the true visible Church is a vow, promise, oath, or covenant betwixt God and the saints. Now, I ask, is this made by us in baptism or not? If it be, then we have by your confession (foresmarch as is outwardly required) a true visible Church: so your separation is unjust."2

So also in a sermon a number of years later,3 he refers to Baptism as the "face" of the Church. However, in the very same place he attempts to distinguish between "Christian articles", and "theological conclusions", the latter being only "school-points, fit for the discourse of a divine", the former being the principles of religion necessary to a believer. The Church that holds these Christian articles "both in terms and necessary consequences", is a true visible Church.4

Baptism then does not alone form the full "face" of the Church; adherence to the main principles of the Faith also forms a part

1. Ibid, pp. 24f. 2. Works, Vol. IX, p. 25
of it. Wherever these two "marks" are, there, we can be sure, is a "true, visible Church." Hall got himself into trouble with the Puritan element in the Church because he called Rome a true, visible Church. He admits that Rome is miserably corrupted, that she is even a "sickly, languishing, dying Church" but he insists nevertheless that she is a church. He then goes on to say that the reason so many have criticized him for calling Rome a true visible Church lies in a misunderstanding of terms.

"The difference is in the acceptance of 'true' and 'church'; both which have much latitude and variety of sense. While by true they mean right believing, and by church a company of faithful, which have the word of God rightly understood and sincerely preached, and the sacraments duly administered; it is no marvel if they say the church of Rome is neither true nor church; who would who can say otherwise? But while we mean by a true church a multitude of Christians professing to agree in the main principles of religion, how can they but subscribe to us; and in this sense yield the Church of Rome both a church, and truly visible?"

When we interpret this statement in relation to his comments about Baptism we are forced to the conclusion that Baptism and the profession of the main principles of the Faith are the two indispensable marks of the Church, - or at least they are the indispensable minimum, without which there can be no Church at all. The implication in Hall's statement above is that in Rome the Word of God is not rightly understood and preached, the sacraments are not properly administered, and the people do not rightly believe. For this reason she is not a healthy Church; she is even a corrupted Church. The two indispensable marks alone indicate a true visible Church, but

only the proper ministry of Word and Sacraments and right belief shows us a church that is healthy and — and this is important — worthy of our loyalty.

But what of apostolic succession and form of Church government? Does Hall consider both, or either, of these to be marks of the Church? There is certainly no question about the former. Even in his treatise *Emissary By Divine Right* he makes nothing of it. In his controversy about whether or not Rome is a true visible Church he does not employ the argument of historical succession except in relation to Baptism, and no reference at all is made to episcopal succession. We can therefore safely say that Hall did not consider apostolic (episcopal) succession to be a mark of the Church. With regard to the episcopal form of Church government it is a little different. There is certainly no question of his placing it on the same level with the Word and Sacraments, and faith in the biblical message. But we can note also that in his treatise on *Emissary By Divine Right* he does not attempt to demonstrate that the Church of England is a true Church because she has episcopacy; he simply insists that she has the proper form of government because it is the same as that instituted by the Lord Himself. He goes on to say that the substance of Church government must ever be the same, but later explains that if particular churches are unable to have episcopacy they lose nothing of the essence of a church, but only something of their glory and perfection. Thus for Hall episcopacy is a real but secondary mark of the Church. He

2. Ibid, p. 251  
never at any time suggests that it is a primary mark, or that the others, the Word and Sacraments, are dependent upon it for their validity.

Finally, before we leave Bishop Hall, we must refer to a most interesting point that he raises in connection with the visibility of the Church. What sort of glory does the people of God manifest in this world? If the Church is actually made up of the children of God then surely she ought to show forth to the world a glory suitable to her status. Hall warns the Church against the temptation to show to the world a face not fitting to her station under the Cross. Rome has fallen to this temptation: she has a "hierarchy mounted above kings", "pompous ostentation of magnificence", "garish processions", "gaudy altars", "fine images", "flourishes of universality", and "rumours of miracles". If appearance were the rule then Rome would be the true Church. But this would be entirely misleading, and would take us away from our crucified Saviour.

"Should appearance be the rule, how scornfully would the carnal eye overlook the poor ordinances of God? What would it find here but foolishness of preaching, homeliness of sacraments, an inky letter, a priests lips, a savourless message, a morsel of bread, a mouthful of wine, a handful of water, a slanderbeaten cross, a crucified Saviour, a militant Church, a despised profession. When yet this foolishness of preaching is the power of God to salvation; these mute letters the lively oracles of God; these vile lips, the cabinets of heaven to preserve knowledge; this unplausible message, magnalia Dei; this water, the water of life in the midst of the Paradise of God, δρι-τος μιν ὕδωρ; this bread, the manna of angels; this wine, heavenly nectar; this Church, the king's daughter, all glorious within; this dying sacrifice, the Lord of life; this cross the banner of victory; this profession, heaven upon earth: Judge not therefore according to appearance." 2

The Church in the world is not the triumphant, glorified, Church; she is the militant Church and she lives in the midst of a sinful world only by grace, showing forth the Lord's death till He comes. She waits for the final hope of glory, but she is glorified only as she takes up the Cross and follows her Lord. This is the way she is visible to the world.

Section III - The Later Carolines

In the previous chapter it was noted that in John Pearson's thought we have a re-affirmation of the reformed Anglican tradition. Here too, over the question of the Church's visibility and invisibility he is in fundamental agreement with that tradition.

The Church on earth, as it embraces all those who profess Jesus Christ and who have been baptized in His name, contains not only true believers but also many hypocrites. Many have been "called", and are in the Church. But, according to Pearson, of all those who are promiscuously contained within the Church some are void of all saving grace. Though they communicate with the others in the ordinances of the Church, they have no true internal communion with the Head and the members of it. By their own "demerit" they fail to attain the glory to which they were called, so that when death separates them from the external communion of the Church, they are fully and finally severed from the Church of Christ. On the other hand, there are some few amongst those who have been called and are truly "chosen". They are "efficaciously called", and
therefore have true internal communion with Jesus Christ and with the members of His body. Death does not separate them from the Church, and they who were saints on earth become the saints glorified in heaven.¹

This does not in the least depreciate the whole visible Church, because Pearson says that that Church which contains all who have been baptized, and profess the name of Christ, is to be called holy. He nowhere suggests that we can distinguish between the hypocrites and the true believers in the Church. It is true that he suggests that the saints are holy by a personal sanctity,² and we might therefore think that he believes this sanctity can be discerned for what it is, marking out for us the true Church in the midst of the false. But Pearson does not slip into the Donatist camp. He says,

"I conclude . . . as the ancient Catholics did against the Donatists, That within the Church, in the public profession and external communion thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and hereafter to be saved, and together with them other persons void of all saving grace, and hereafter to be damned: and that Church containing these of both kinds may well be called holy . . . "³

The true Church on earth, then, is not just the society of those who have been "chosen", not just the true saints; it is the total body of those who have been baptized and who profess the Christian Faith. It is for this reason, Pearson maintains, that in the Creed the phrase "the Communion of saints" was introduced. It bears witness to the fact that, though we do not know who is included in it, there is within the Church a group of persons who are called by a holy calling and are not disobedient to it, who

¹ Of the Creed, pp. 607ff.  ² Ibid, p.609.  ³ Ibid, pp.608f
are sanctified by the Spirit of God and thereby lead a holy life. These are the true saints who have a special communion with Christ and with one another, and who will appear with the Lord in glory.¹

Thus we see that Pearson attributes true "sainthood" and salvation to God's choice and reprobation and damnation to our own demerit. In spite of the fact that Pearson believes so passionately in the necessity of a holy life, and a real "infused sanctity",² (and he unquestionably thought that holy life ought to make itself in one way or another visible) he is prevented from using the "holiness" of the true saints as a mark by which men can discern who are the saved because he knows that salvation rests upon God's decision and that it is therefore His secret. Only one thing Pearson does insist upon, and that is this: "None shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, which belong not to the Church of God." All those who are in the militant Church may not attain unto the triumphant Church. But only those who are members of the militant Church can attain to the triumphant. Christ has appointed the Holy Catholic Church as the only way to eternal life. He did not ordain the Church for the salvation of some and another institution to save others. Only those who were in the ark were saved from the flood; so only those who are in the Church will be saved from eternal death.³

But it must be noted that Pearson uses the word the Church, not a church. It is not sufficient to belong to any institution
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that calls itself church. "That Church alone which first began
at Jerusalem on earth, will bring us to the Jerusalem in heaven..."
If this is true, where do we find this Church? How can we discern
it? Pearson answers the question (in part at least) in the next
half of the sentence just quoted: "... And that alone began
there (at Jerusalem), which always embraceth 'the faith once de-
ivered unto the saints'." We are back again to that which is
indispensable to the Church to remain the Church: the original
faith. This, then, is one of the marks of the Church. What,
if any, are the others? Pearson refers to them again and again
in his chapters on the Church, and the Communion of Saints. For
instance in describing what are the external, distinctive things
in which all churchmen, saints, as well as hypocrites, have com-
munion, Pearson says:

"They communicate in the same water, both externally bap-
tized alike; they communicate in the same Creed, both
make the same open profession of faith, both agree in the
acknowledgement of the same principles of religion; they
communicate in the same word, both hear the same doctrine
preached; they communicate at the same table, both eat the
same bread, and drink the wine, which Christ hath appointed
to be received..."2

It is therefore evident that the marks of the Church are
the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, and public confession
of the true faith.3 These are the notes (though he does not call
them that) of the true Church that Pearson repeatedly mentions.
To these we could add Prayer, because he does at one point mention
that in Acts the Church is described as that group of baptized
believers which continued in the Apostles' doctrine and fellow-
ship, and the breaking of bread, and prayers.4 To these also

we could, and I think must, add order and ministry. But this mark of the Church ought not to be placed alongside of the others as though it were one of like nature. There is naturally no question but that Pearson thought the ministry to be indispensable, and in that sense he would have called it a mark of the Holy Catholic Church. But it serves unto the others. Through the ordinances of Word and Sacraments God calls men into the fellowship of Jesus Christ, and they respond in prayer and in confession of the Faith. Where this is taking place, we can be assured that there is the Church. But God has raised up men to minister His ordinances, the channels through which He works. There is only one ministry, the ministry of the Word and Sacraments; therefore that ministry is a mark of the Church.

But not just anyone can undertake to minister God's Word and Sacraments. Pearson has a high regard for historical continuity and succession. It was to the Apostles that Christ gave the commission to minister to His people, and He sent the Holy Spirit to sanctify them for their work. Among other things Pearson says that the Spirit has fitted them for the ordination of others and the committing of a standing power to a successive ministry to the end of the world. In his work on the Creed Pearson does not tell us if Bishops are the sole successors of the Apostles, nor does he tell us if strict unbroken succession is necessary. Later on, however, we find him affirming that bishops only succeed the Apostles,

and exalting the "honour of succession". In fact he asserts the need of episcopal ordination and of succession in a way that is rather startling.

"That the order of the ministry is necessary to the continuation of the gospel according to the promises of Christ, as it was to the first plantation of it according to his institution, is a doctrine indubitable. That this ministry is derived by a succession and constant propagation, and that the unity and peace of the church of Christ are to be conserved by a due and legitimate ordination, no man who considereth the practice of the apostles and ecclesiastical history can ever doubt."

"... If we once admit a diversity in our ordinations, we have lost the honour of succession, we have cast away our weapons of defence..."

This is startling simply because in his exposition of the Creed he makes so little of the matter. In his chapter on the Church he does not refer to it at all. It is strange that when he repeatedly refers to the other "marks" of the Church he does not once mention historical succession. The few comments that we can find on succession are contained in the chapter on the Holy Spirit, and he is there describing the varied and sovereign work of the Spirit. But in the chapter on the Church he has only one reference to the ministry as such (!) and he says nothing at all about succession. We cannot escape the fact that Pearson in some sense thought episcopal succession to be a sign of the Church's presence. But we are forced to conclude from his exposition of the Creed that he, like many of his forbears, refused to place it on the same level with the Word and Sacraments. The Church can be without bishops who stand in the Succession; she cannot be without Word and Sacraments.

Finally, before we leave Pearson let us note one further thing. It was pointed out above how Hall portrayed the Church as manifesting in her life the reproach of her crucified Lord. There is in Pearson a suggestion of this in his chapter on "Jesus Christ", as he describes the work of Christ and the mission of the early Church. However, since there is no reference to the question in his section on the Church it is very doubtful that he saw clearly that the Church is to bear in its body the marks of the Lord Jesus.

In discussing Baptism Jeremy Taylor points out that the act of Baptism itself, and its effects, do not always go in conjunction, but may be separated. Baptism is only the material part of the Sacrament; it is the Spirit that gives life. But there may be something in us to hinder the work of the Spirit, and if this is the case He waits until we have put away the impediment before He comes to us. Since, however, all who are baptized are considered to be members of the visible Church, it means that "a man may be of the church, and yet not be of the number of God's secret ones." Nevertheless, only those who are of the Church have any chance of being one of God's secret ones. Taylor says that in Scripture the secret effects of election, and of the Spirit, are attributed to those who are of the outward communion of the Church. Thorndike makes the same point when he says that "baptism is the gate, as well of the invisible Church as of the visible".
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Henry Ferne sees in the profession of the Doctrine of Faith and Life that which makes a man a member of the visible Catholic Church, and in the true belief and practice of it that which makes him a member of the "Symbolical Catholic Church." The latter he identified with the mystical body of Christ. It is the ministry's task to bring men to a profession of the Faith, and on to be "true and lively members of the body of Christ." It appears that Ferne will not have the latter without the former: men must be members of the Visible Catholic Church in order to be part of the Symbolical Catholic Church. Thus we can say that with all three men the Church on earth is not to be fully identified with that body of people that shall receive ultimate salvation, for it contains many who are Christ's in presence only. However, only through the earthly visible Church do men come into the invisible which is in Heaven.

But again we must ask the question: out of all those who are growing in the field of God's earthly kingdom, can we distinguish the tares from the wheat? They do not say so. Even Taylor who was in many ways the most moralistic of all, does not suggest that we can judge who are God's and who are not. What he does say is that there are certain signs by which a man can tell if he himself is one of the elect. He points out that all the confidence that God's Spirit creates in the elect is built upon duty. Quoting I John 3:4, "We know we are translated from death to life, by our love unto the brethren," he says that "the performance of our duty is the best consignation to eternity."

and the only testimony God gives us of our election.¹ Those who are only beginners in the faith have a "changeable and fallible" certainty (from their own human point of view) that can become more sure and confident as they grow towards perfection. None, however, can be sure except those to whom God has given "confirmation in grace,"² what this means he does not explain. However, he does say at one point that "there is no state of a Christian, in which, by nature of the covenant of the Gospel, it is effectively and fully declared, that his sins are actually pardoned, but only in baptism, at our first coming to Christ."³ But this is the mark of membership in the visible Church. Ultimately, then, there is no way that the sheep and the goats in the Church can by man be segregated.⁴

But it is Beveridge who treats this question with a penetration, depth, and clarity far exceeding that found in any of the other later Carolines, including Pearson. He indicates that in Holy Scripture the phrase the Kingdom of God (or Kingdom of Heaven) refers not only to the holy place of the saints in heaven, but also to the way that leads to it. Since God
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"addeth to the Church those who shall be saved", the militant Church on earth, as well as the triumphant in heaven, is called the Kingdom of God. And this does not only refer to that part of the militant Church which is invisible, "as being governed by the secret influences of God's special grace and Holy Spirit", but also to the visible, which consists of all who profess the true faith, even though they do nothing but profess it. As the Jewish nation, including both good and bad, was once the people of God, of which God was in a special sense the King, so now the whole Church of Christ is properly the Kingdom of God, where

"in the administration of His Word and Sacraments, He exerciseth His power in the hearts of men, enlightening, renewing, and sanctifying them, so as to fit them to live with Him in the other world; and then re-translates them into His Kingdom in Heaven, or rather to that part of His Kingdom that is there settled: for properly speaking, it is one and the same Kingdom, in different places, and under different circumstances; here it is militant, there triumphant; here it consisteth of sinners as well as Saints, there they are all Saints; here the Saints themselves have many imperfections in them, there they are all perfect. But though many be admitted into the Kingdom of God upon earth, and yet, through their own default, may not get to that which is in Heaven; yet none can get to that which is in Heaven, but only such as are first admitted into the Kingdom of God upon earth".

It is, therefore, the Church on earth that God uses to bring men to Christ. She is the instrument of the Spirit. But though she is called the body of Christ, Beveridge does not think that any one who is in the Church is necessarily in Christ. He insists that "they are said to be in Christ who are not only in His Church, but in His Person..." But

union with Christ is utterly impossible as far as we are concerned, because we are so far below Him. Only He is able to effect such a union by His own Spirit. By that Spirit He incorporates us into His body; we become the members of Christ, and belong to Him because the same Spirit that is in Him is likewise in us, moving and animating us. But because we have the very same Spirit that is in the only-begotten Son of God, we, according to our own capacities, thereby stand in the same relation as He does. It is, then, the work of the Spirit that decides whether or not we shall enter into the inheritance of Christ; it is the Spirit that sets His seal upon us, and marks us out for His own.

"It is by this that the sheep shall be known from the goats, the heirs of heaven from the children of disobedience, at the last day; and then it will appear to all the world, that 'if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His'."

But how may a man have and keep the Spirit? By believing. But he who believes in Christ must be baptized into Him. For it is by Baptism that we are inserted into the Body of Christ. In the very act of Baptism the Spirit unites us to Christ and makes us members of His Body. But if we are members of His body then we are also of His Church and Kingdom, that being His body. Therefore, those who are rightly baptized with water, being at the same time baptized with the Spirit, they are "ipso facto, admitted into the Kingdom of God, established upon earth; and if it be not their own fault will as certainly attain to that which is in Heaven".

The remarkable thing about Beveridge is that He testifies

consistently to God's sovereign saving activity on our behalf. God's purpose is to bring us to full union with Christ. He has established upon earth the visible Church, which is in reality Christ's body. When we are baptized into the Church the miracle is that we are baptized into the body of Christ. What more can be said? If this is true then the visible Church on earth and the invisible in Heaven must be fully one. Yes, Beveridge confesses that this is the case, though the "two Churches" are in different places and under different circumstances. All this God has provided that we might be redeemed. But in spite of this Beveridge always distinguishes the "two" bodies or kingdoms, because men's iniquity is such that some of those who are baptized into the "earthly body" do not, through their own fault, attain unto that internal communion with Christ which brings them in the end to the "heavenly". Thus in Beveridge's doctrine we see that God has done all that He can: He has done everything; yet some men default. All of us can be numbered among the saints if we are called to be; but some reject the call. Thus with Beveridge our membership in the invisible company of the redeemed is attributed absolutely to the work of God; our failure to be members of that company is entirely our own fault.

Turning now to the question of the visible Church and its marks, we discover that the later Carolines do not in one sense break with the earlier tradition. In the true Anglican fashion they assert the Word, the Sacraments, and right doctrine to be

the marks of the Church. Bramhall, for instance, maintains that the "entire profession of saving truth, a right use of the Word and Sacraments, and an union under lawful pastors", taken jointly distinguish the Church "from all other societies in the world."\(^1\) According to Isaac Barrow, retention of the faith, discipline and practices given by the Lord and His apostles are what mark out the Catholic Church.\(^2\) Henry Ferne mentions that there are two things necessary for the continuance of the Church: (1) The due profession of the Doctrine of Faith and Life; and (2) The order of ministry and government for bringing men to profess that doctrine and to be true members of Christ's Body.\(^3\) But in each of these something other is mentioned besides doctrine, and Word, and Sacraments. These men always include, in one way or another, ministry, government, and discipline, in the number of tangible signs of the true Church's whereabouts. With Stillingfleet no particular form of Church government is made to be a distinguishing mark. He says the Word and the Sacraments are the ordinances that are appointed by Christ for perpetual use, and since they are the "proper object of the ministerial function" it necessarily follows that the function itself must be perpetual as well.\(^4\) But this does not mean that the ministry must be ordered into one particular distinguishing form of government.

"... Any one particular form of Government in the Church is neither expressed in any direct terms by Christ, nor can be deduced by just consequences; therefore no such form of Government is instituted by Christ".\(^5\)

4. Irenicum, pp. 215f.  
This means that there is no one form of Church government that can be seriously called a mark of the Church.

This opinion was not held, however, by most of Stillingfleet's colleagues. The other later Carolines to whom I shall refer take up the position that episcopacy is the form of government that Christ decreed for His Church. Farnes does not make it indispensable: he acknowledges that those churches which preserve the Doctrine of Faith and Life, and which give recognition to those bodies that do preserve episcopacy, are true churches, though they are not completed or regularly formed.\(^1\) But the point is that he does make it a mark of the Church, even though not in an equal sense with right doctrine.\(^2\) Isaac Barrow insists that the order, government, and ministry that God appointed (meaning episcopacy) must be upheld in all its substantial parts; the main form of discipline ought not to be abrogated.\(^3\) Jeremy Taylor asserts that a church cannot be founded without the ministry of bishops.\(^4\) He says further that whatever was the regimen of the Church in the time of the apostles (i.e. episcopacy) must be perpetual.\(^5\) In his book on Church Unity, William Sherlock takes the position that parochial churches do not have the complete essence of a church because they have not full power of discipline and government within themselves, but are only parts of the diocesan Church.\(^6\) Sherlock admits that Christ Himself did not institute any particular form of Church, but sent the Apostles forth to do so.\(^7\) Nevertheless, he seems to suggest that

2. Ibid., pp. 100ff.  
5. Ibid., p.159.  
6. Ibid., p.293.  
7. Ibid., p. 303.
the bishop's jurisdiction over his diocese is analogous to the jurisdiction that Christ, the great bishop and shepherd of our souls, has over the whole Church. At any rate he attributes to the bishop full Church authority, for he acts by the authority of his office; the Presbyter's authority is derivative: he acts only by the authority of the Bishop. We see, then, that for those men episcopacy is definitely a sign of the visible Church, a distinguishing mark of the people of God.

This mark is not, of course, to be isolated from the rest. The statements by Bramhall, Barrow, and Ferne to which I have referred indicate how they thought of them together. But can we say that they gave precedence to the mark of episcopacy and/or succession? Among the necessary notes of the true Church, is this one required as a necessary prerequisite to the others? In any absolute sense, we can answer No for every divine. None of them would completely close the door on the Continental churches that lacked episcopacy. As Taylor says, "they stand or fall to their own Master". But this reservation aside, in practical terms do they think the bishop is the first necessary sign of the true Church without which the other marks lose their validity? This is a very difficult question to answer. The Church of England was episcopal; yet for many years the Church had been plagued with people who refused to acknowledge episcopal authority; some of these rebels even separated from the established Church altogether. During the 1640's and 50's episcopacy was completely overthrown and ecclesiastical anarchy (or freedom?) took the field. The Restoration
brought the re-establishment of episcopacy, but many persisted in their refusal to submit to the jurisdiction of bishops. Some of the later Carolines are writing during the Long Parliament, others shortly after the Restoration. For them the bishops are not merely lawful regents of the Church, they are also the guarantors of order and peace, and of proper doctrine and practices. For them the troubles of the Church can be traced almost entirely to disobedience to the bishops. It is for this reason that we find them constantly emphasizing the necessity of submitting to lawfull pastors. The Separatist Churches are not, to them, true churches because they do not submit to the authority of the bishops. But we ought not to assume that this necessarily means that all the later Carolines think that the ministry of bishops is the one "essential" ministry, and therefore the chief mark of the true visible Church. It was the problem in England with which they were concerned and we must remember that their statements refer primarily to that.

Bearing all this in mind, we must again ask the questions: do all the later Carolines think episcopacy to be the first necessary sign of the true Church without which the other marks lose their validity? As far as Taylor is concerned we must answer Yes to this query. He definitely believes that episcopacy is the "essential" ministry that continues in the Church by virtue of a personal succession from the Apostles. William Sherlock and Henry Hammond take the same position with a few reservations. By contrast John Cosin, Barrow, Ferne, Thorndike, and Stillingfleet, in spite of their firm belief that episcopacy
is the proper government for all churches, do not make it a necessary mark of the true Church. But because this question of church order and government will receive detailed treatment in the next chapter, we shall leave it without further comment.

However, before we go on to look at Bishop Beveridge on this question, let us enquire further of those divines with reference to the other marks of the Church. We have already pointed out that the preaching and confession of the fundamental truths of the Faith, and the proper administration of the Sacraments, are held by them to be indispensable to the Church's life and to be the distinguishing signs of God's people. In this they do not vary from the Anglican tradition since the Reformation. But from what has been said in previous sections we might expect to find some differences in the actual understanding of what we are calling the "marks" of the Church. This is certainly the case. It cannot be denied that the later Carolines see the Word and Sacraments as God's instruments, given by Him to the Church that He might speak to her and draw her to Himself. They are marks of the Church because they are the signs of God's presence and of His work. They are the channels of His grace. But because their doctrine of the Holy Spirit is hopelessly inadequate (Cosin, Pearson and Beveridge are excluded from this analysis) several things happen: First, doctrine tends to become a deposit of

supernatural truths which it is necessary to know in order to be saved; and preaching becomes either the communication of these truths, or almost entirely moral exhortation. Secondly, the Sacraments are looked upon either as semi-magical rites with an inherent efficacy in their very performance, or as purely symbolical rites, part of the substance of which is the new resolution and "faith" that they excite within us. Jeremy Taylor, it is true, knows that it is always by the Holy Spirit that the Word and Sacraments perform the work God intends them to do, and he expresses it magnificently in a number of places. But if we look at the writings of men like Barrow, Ferne, Hammond, Thorndike, and Sherlock, we see no consistent reference to the work of the Spirit. This being so the marks of the Church take on a quite different character. It is inevitable that when the Word and Sacraments cease to be Christ's gift to the Church to be used immediately by Him through the sovereign work of the Spirit, they should become ordinances left as a legacy to the Church for her own use and manipulation. 2

William Beveridge cannot be distinguished from the men we have just considered by the marks that he sets forth as being the distinctive manifestations of the presence of the true visible Church. "... 'They continued steadfastly in the apostles'
doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers, which are plainly the true marks or notes of a Christian Church. He assumes, of course, that all those referred to here were baptized, Baptism being for him the chief, or should I say the first, mark of the Christian Church. Circumcision was the distinguishing mark of the Jews, and now Baptism distinguishes Christians both from the Jews and the rest of the world. We have Beveridge's explicit statement that the preaching of, and adherence to, apostolic doctrine, and the proper administration of the Sacraments, are the notes of the Catholic Church. In this way he does not differ from those of his contemporaries whom we have just examined. But in his hands these marks become very different because of his high and consistent doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Christ is peculiarly present in the public offices of the Church. "And therefore ye, whosoever you address yourselves to the public prayers of our Church, to hear God's Word read or preached, or to receive the Holy Sacrament, still keep the eye of your faith fixed upon Christ, as there really present, according to His promise, ready to dispense His heavenly blessings by His Holy Spirit, working together with the ordinance, to make it accomplish the end of its institution, even your sanctification in this world, and your eternal salvation in the world to come." This is Beveridge's position in a nutshell. These ordinances of the Church, which we are also calling the marks of the Church, are nothing more than earthen vessels which God condescends to use. They are not magical, semi-divine devices by the operation of which the Church is able to infuse "grace" into herself or to propitiate God. They are nothing more than

human acts that the Church has been commanded to perform.
But Christ has promised that they will be used by His Spirit to unite the Church to Himself. It is only by virtue of the Promise that these ordinances are the marks of the Church, not by virtue of any inherent power or efficacy of their own. They are marks of the Church because they are the tools which Christ, who is ever faithful, has promised to use. And because Christ does use them they become the miraculous means by which He makes the Church into His very Body, diffusing through them the Holy Spirit into every part and member of that Body. They are marks of the Church, then, because the Lord Jesus Christ Himself exercises His Lordship over His people through them.

Therefore without the Holy Spirit the Word and the Sacraments are nothing but dead things. But whence comes the Spirit? He is sent from the Father and the Son: He is therefore fully and completely sovereign. But Beveridge believes that the Spirit comes by way of the apostolic ministry. He is, so to speak, attached to that office. From the days of the Apostles the apostolic office has been handed down from one to another, and with it has been transferred the same Spirit whom Christ first breathed upon His Apostles. It is because of this that the Church is truly Apostolic. The various offices of the ministry are therefore as effectively performed now as they were when the Apostles were still alive. It is the

apostolic office, "influenced and assisted by the Spirit of God", that makes the administration of the Sacraments valid and the preaching of the Gospel effective.

"And so it is to this day: all the efficacy that there is or can be in the administration of an ecclesiastical office, depends altogether upon the Spirit of God going along with the office, and assisting at the execution of it: without which, the Sacraments we administer would be but empty signs, and our preaching no more than beating of the air." 1

The apostolic succession is the root of all Christian communion. 2 Beveridge in a sermon calls his congregation to give thanks that God has allowed them to live in a church in which the "Apostolic line" has been preserved, and in which, therefore, the Holy Spirit powerfully moves upon the Word and Sacraments to make them effective. 3 There can be no question, then, that bishops in the Apostolic Succession are marks of the true Church.

If the Church has any distinguishing marks at all, the lawful episcopal ministry and jurisdiction is one of them. However, it is not a self-sufficient mark of the Church. Rome possesses the Succession but has abused it so badly, and clogged it with so many superstitious ceremonies that it is no longer capable of having Christ's promise fulfilled in it. 4 It appears that Beveridge holds it to be a mark only if it fulfills its task of properly ministering the Word and Sacraments. He is convinced that in the Church of England this is faithfully done, and he therefore believes that the sectaries in England are guilty of

schism for separating from the Succession. He says nothing, however, about the Protestant churches of the Continent, which makes one wonder, in spite of his astonishingly strong language on the subject, whether or not he actually would make it an indispensable mark of the Catholic Church.

1. Ibid, pp. 23f.
CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCH: HER MINISTRY AND GOVERNMENT

Section I - The Sixteenth Century

"The power whereby they (the Apostles) did conquer the world was not in them, but in the word they preached. 'It is the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth'. 'It is like a fire, and like a hammer that breaketh a stone.' "When ye received of us the word of the preaching of God," saith St. Paul to the Thessalonians, 'ye received it not as the word of man, but as it is indeed, the word of God; which also worketh in you that believe'.

"If any hide this word, he slayeth the people: he is a dumb dog. Of such God saith: . . . Thou hast the room of an evangelist, and pastor, and teacher; but thou gatherest not the saints together, thou doest not the work of the ministry, thou buildest not up the body of Christ. They shall perish in their wickedness; but their blood will I require at thy hands.

"Here note, this ministry of the church was not ordained to offer sacrifice for forgiveness of sins. Whosoever taketh that office upon him, he doth wrong and injury to the death and passion of Christ . . . He alone is our High Priest, the Lamb of God, the Sacrifice for sins, the Altar, the Propitiation for sins, and Redeemer of the world. He only hath appeased the wrath of God. He only appeareth in the sight of God, to make intercession for our sins. All others whatsoever, apostles, prophets, teachers, and pastors, are not in office to offer any propitiatory sacrifice, but are called to the ministry of the saints, to the edification of the body of Christ, and to the repairing of the church of God.

"Thus much of the holy ministry of the church, which standeth in the setting forth of the mystery of our salvation, both by the preaching of the word of God, and by the due and reverend ministration of the sacraments. The principal part of this office is to preach repentance; that so we may amend our lives and be converted unto God." 1

Here in brief is Jewel's understanding of the ministry. In fact it not only expresses Jewel's position, it is a convenient and, I think, accurate summary of the position held by almost al

the outstanding Anglican divines in the 16th century on the nature and function of the ministry. Yet surely this is to say too much. It is true that Jewel speaks here of the function of the ministry, but what does he say about its nature? He has said nothing about the inner character of the ministerial office, nor does he deal with the question of the ministerial power given at ordination. But when one reads Jewel and the other early 16th century Anglican divines, looking for their treatment of these matters, one is disconcerted to discover that they do not think in such terms. Not only do they reject the Roman idea that ordination gives the power to sacrifice, but the whole conception of "ministerial power" seems to be foreign to them. The ministers of the Church do not possess a special sacerdotal power, or, for that matter, any other kind of power which might be thought of as being "added to" their personal existence as men or as churchmen. The power is, as Jewel says, in the word they preach and not in themselves. Cranmer too, because he has no conception of any "thing" or "character" being passed on at ordination, points out that in the early Church the making of a priest could be done either by a bishop, or by a Prince or a Governor, or by the election of the people; no consecration was essential because the appointment or election itself was sufficient. He thinks that in the committing of the ecclesiastical office there is no more promise that grace is given than there is in the committing of the civil office.1 Cranmer is not here suggesting that the ministry can be performed apart from grace, but simply that grace is in Christ, not in the ministry, not even

the ministerial office. The ministry is essential to the Church because it is the ministry's task or vocation to minister the Word and Sacraments. Through the ministry of the Word and Sacraments Christ gathers His people together. As we have pointed out in previous chapters, to the Anglican churchmen of this century the Word (including pure biblical doctrine) and the Sacraments are of supreme importance to the life of the Church because they are the unique instruments by which Christ manifests Himself to His people and draws them to Himself. The ministerial calling is also of supreme importance because it is related to the administration of these instruments.

It is true of course that in the Roman Church the ministry, or rather priesthood, is also defined in relation to that which is ministered. The nature of the priesthood is understood in terms of the Mass, and specifically in terms of Transubstantiation. The priest's glory is his power to transubstantiate the elements. Ernest C. Messenger, the Roman Catholic scholar who gave this question such thorough treatment, is therefore dead right when he charges that Cranmer's change of view with regard to the Mass obviously involved a change in his understanding of the priesthood. "If he rejected the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, as Catholics understood it, together with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he cannot have believed in the Sacrificing Priesthood."¹ Don Gregory Dix claims that the Anglican Church in the 16th century meant the same thing by its ordinations as the Church did in the 3rd or the 13th

The 16th century Anglicans would agree that they intend to do what the Church did in the 3rd century; but they would deny that they mean the same by their ordinations as the papists meant in the 13th century. That is the whole point of the Reformation; the Reformers believe that the Roman Church has corrupted Catholic faith and practice.

It might be said that since the Anglican Reformers and their Elizabethan successors think it lawful for only those to minister who have been properly ordained, they must therefore believe that some "essential power" is given by ordination. But a careful examination of their writings compels us to say that their thought does not run on such lines. Jewel, for instance, says that a minister ought "lawfully, duly, and orderly be preferred" to the holy ministry and that no one has the power at his own pleasure to take it upon himself. Not every man is allowed to be a priest, a teacher, and an interpreter of the Scriptures. Does Jewel mean by this that the Church of England forbids men to enter upon the ministry on their own authority without lawful ordination because they would not have the necessary "ministerial power"? Not at all. He simply means that the accusation of Rome that the Church of England does "nothing orderly and comely, but all things troublesomely, and without order", has no foundation in

1. The Question of Anglican Orders, 1944, pp. 19ff.
It is true that Christ has given His ministers the power to bind and to loose, to open and to shut. But the office of loosing is performed as the minister, by the preaching of the Gospel, mediates God's forgiveness to sinners, or else reconciles believers who have become alienated from the body of Christ; the office of binding or shutting is performed by pronouncing to stubborn unbelievers God's wrath, and by excommunicating some from the bosom of the Church.  

"And touching the keys, wherewith they may either shut or open the kingdom of heaven, we with Chrysostom say they be 'the knowledge of the Scriptures': with Tertullian we say they be 'the interpretation of the law'; and with Eusebius we call them 'the word of God.'" Seeing then the key, whereby the way and entry to the kingdom of God is opened unto us, is the plain word of the gospel and the expounding of the law and scriptures, we say plainly, where the same word is not, there is not the key.  

---

1. Works, Vol. III, p. 60 - p. 330. Surely Miss Thompson's interpretation of this passage in Apostolic Ministry (ed. by Kirk), pp. 408f has little foundation in fact either. But then her whole article must seem incredible to any one really familiar with the 16th and 17th century Anglicans. This is not, however, the case with Mr. B. D. Till's treatment of these divines in The Historic Episcopate (ed. by K. M. Carey). His is a careful, fair-minded exposition, and if he has an axe to grind (who has not?) he does not use the axe to chop away what he finds to be inconvenient. It is all the more regrettable, therefore, that he should begin his article with this sentence from Jewel, - "We succeed the bishops that have been before our days, we are elected, consecrate, confirmed, and admitted, as they were", and not comment on its context. What does Jewel mean by "succeed"? Unless some other interpretation is explicitly demanded the word naturally falls for most people into the concept of "Apostolic Succession" in the technical sense. But that is not what Jewel is talking about here. He is not concerned with an unbroken line. In the early part of this very division he questions the whole principle. At this point he is simply defending the lawful and orderly practice of the Church of England. Though Jewel does admit that there has been a succession: the doctrine of Christ has succeeded error as the day succeeds the night.  

2. Ibid, p. 304.  

3. Ibid, p. 61
It is evident that for Jewel (and for the Reformers as well) the power is in the gospel, in Jesus Christ Himself, not in the minister or in the ministerial office. It is true that the Church is given authority to ordain men to the ministry, and only those ordained can in normal circumstances lawfully undertake the task. But a man is truly a minister only as he exercises his ministry, that is, as he administers the Word and Sacraments. Jewel denounced the pope and asserts that unless he administers the Sacraments and instructs and teaches the people, then he "ought not of right once to be called a bishop, or so much as an elder."  

What Jewel is getting at is obviously this: when a man, whether he be a pope, bishop, or presbyter, ceases to dispense the Word of God, then he gives up his ministerial office. We can tell if a man is a true minister or not by looking to see if he preaches "the secrets of God's gospel, and the glory of his name". That which makes his ministry effective is the Holy Spirit Who comes from God. Commenting on I Thessalonians 1:8, Jewel says, "That you have yielded obedience unto the word, and that my ministry hath been effectual amongst you, it cometh not of any power in yourselves, or in me: it is the work of God". Jewel, and the Reformers before him, had a tremendously high regard for order and for authority, but they did not endeavor to fortify ecclesiastical authority by attributing to

1. Ibid, p. 60  
2. Works, II, p. 1051. This whole sermon (pp. 1046-1054) is an eloquent testimony to Jewel's conviction that faithfulness to God's mysteries is the criterion by which we can discern the true ministry.  
3. Ibid, p. 821. See following
bishops and presbyters certain indispensable ministerial powers.

There is, however, one very important 16th century figure who does believe that the clergy at ordination receive a unique power in the strength of which they perform their ministry. That figure is Richard Hooker. He asks whether or not anything is actually given to a man at his ordination. The Ordinal contains the words, "receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained". Hooker insists that these words mean what they say: something is actually given.

"... The hand which imposeth upon us the function of our ministry (Hooker is here speaking of the hand of God's Spirit, not the hand of the Bishop.) doth under the same form of words set the spirit thereunto, that he which receiveth the burden is thereby for ever warranted to have the Spirit with him and in him for his assistance, aid, countenance and support in whatsoever he faithfully doth to discharge duty ... Whether we preach, pray, baptize, communicate, condemn, give absolution, or whatsoever, as disposers of God's mysteries, our words, judgements, acts and deeds, are not ours but the Holy Ghost's." 1

By the gift of the Spirit at ordination unique power is bestowed upon the ordinee, power for the raising of men from the earth and the bringing of God down from heaven, for the blessing of visible elements to make them invisible grace, for the daily giving of the Holy Ghost, for the disposing of that flesh which was given for the life of the world and of that blood which was poured out to redeem souls. 2 This power once given constitutes a mark that is indelible. Thus ministerial power is a mark of

1. Ecc. Polity, V, xlvii, 8 2. Ibid. V, xlvii, 1
separation, for it severs those that have it from others and makes them to be a distinct order. Those who once have this power cannot put it off. Suspensions or degradations may stop or cut off the use and exercise of the power, but it is not in the power of man to separate what God has joined together.

Hooker here deviates significantly from his predecessors. All of them would have admitted that at ordination God by His Spirit sets men aside for a peculiar office or vocation, and gives them the power to execute their task properly as ministers of the gospel. In the sense that they have a unique task, they are a unique order. But that a minister is given a special ministerial power which, once given, ever after cleaves to his person without any possibility of removal, this they would not have claimed. In spite of the fact that Hooker says the gift at ordination is the gift of the presence of the Spirit "with him and in him", he goes beyond that and sees some power or character to be added to the ordinand's existence as a man. He believes that Christ exercises a personal Spiritual rule and government over the Church, and that by means of Word, Sacraments, and discipline He Himself gives life and salvation to the Church. But to the ministry of the Church is given a special power to administer these ordinances.

"As for the power of administering these things in the Church of Christ, which power we call the power of order, it is indeed both Spiritual and His; Spiritual, because such duties properly concern the Spirit; His, because by Him it was instituted. Howbeit neither spiritual, as that which is invisibly and invisibly exercised; nor His, as that which He Himself in person doth exercise."

This seems to suppose a capacity or power that is detached from Christ's personal Lordship over the Church.

The following three factors are largely responsible for the retention of episcopacy as the government of the Church of England after the Reformation: (1) In contrast to the continental Reformation, the bishops (in conjunction with the civil authority) were responsible for the reform of the English Church; (2) Episcopacy had been the form of Church government since the early days of the Church and had in the eyes of the English Reformers proven itself to be the most effective way of preserving the order of the Church; (3) Queen Elizabeth, on her accession to the throne, refused to allow the government of the Church of England to be changed. These appear to be the most determinate factors, though doubtless other elements entered into the situation. However, to suggest that one, or the most important, reason for the retention of bishops was the conviction that they constitute the essential ministry without which there can be no Church, is to ignore the evidence. Certainly the writings of the Reformers and of Jewel do not yield such a view. Admittedly in the early years of the Reformation episcopacy was not under severe attack and not a great deal of attention had to be given the question. We shall therefore not analyse the writings of the early divines, but move on in the century to the time when the Puritans in their Admonitions

2. Episcopal ordination was not deemed necessary to hold a benefice. In the parliament of 1571 an act was passed making it necessary that all who held livings but had not been ordained in the way prescribed by the P. B. should before the bishop of the diocese, or someone else in authority, declare his assent to the doctrine of th-39 Articles. *Statutes & Constitutional Documents*, ed. Prothero

Oxford Press, 1949, p. 64
to Parliament advocated the complete overthrow of episcopacy and forced the "Anglicans" to defend it.

When Elizabeth came to the throne the reforming churchmen who had fled to the Continent at the beginning of Mary's reign returned, and those who had remained under cover in England came forward, to begin work again. Many of them were not content to have the Church restored to what it had been at the death of Edward VI. Some thought further reforms of a moderate nature ought to be implemented, while others believed that their work would be well done only when the Church of England bore the same form as the Reformed churches of Switzerland and France. Elizabeth however had the Edwardian Church re-established and she refused to countenance any major changes. Since all the Marian bishops but one opposed the Queen's efforts to undo the work performed in Mary's reign, Elizabeth had to deprive them and instate some of her own. Most of these, and most of the rest of the clergy, accepted the Queen's decision to restore the Edwardian Church, and thereafter supported it, in spite of the fact that some of them would have been agreeable to further "reform". Quite a number, however, believed that the Queen had put a stop to a task that was essential. They were not at first an organized group; they had no coherent, positive programme, and they simply contented themselves with specific criticism directed against the wearing of the surplice, pluralities, non-residence, interference on the part of civil officers in the spiritual affairs of the Church, and certain aspects of the English episcopate. It was only after ten years or more of
Elizabeth's reign had passed that the Puritans began to grow into a unified party of some considerable political influence. In 1572 they published two "Admonitions to Parliament". In these they reiterated the above-mentioned criticisms but then go on to make a direct frontal-attack on episcopacy as such. The New Testament, they maintain, tells us that the Church is to be governed by ministers (Pastors and Teachers), Seniors, and Deacons. Each parish ought to have a pastor and teacher, plus a consistory made up of the elders, plus deacons to dispense alms to the needy. They go on to say that there is no scriptural warrant for inequality among ministers: the affairs of the Church beyond the parish level ought to be ordered not by bishops and archbishops, but by local conferences of ministers, and above that again by provincial councils of ministers.

In the "Admonitions" the Puritans also strike out at the "worldly glory" of the clergy of the Church of England, and insist that by taking upon themselves titles, and by wearing "rochets, hoods, cappes, clokes, tippets and gowmes", they are disobeying Christ's injunction in Matthew 23:5-11. Here, then, they set forth a positive alternative to episcopacy as the government of the Church of England, an alternative that became known as Presbyterianism. But it is important to remember that they claim this "presbyterian" form of Church polity is set down in the New Testament, and is therefore the only proper regiment of the Church.

"Either must we have right ministerie of God, and a right government of his church, according to the scriptures sette up (bothe which we lacke) or else there can be no
"right religion . . . " 1

It is Dr. John Whitgift, later Archbishop of Canterbury, who undertakes to answer the Puritans and defend the Church government as it was established. The gist of his argument can be found in the preface to his Defence of the Answer To The Admonition Against The Reply of T.C. 2 There we read:

"... This reply of T.C. (Thomas Cartwright) .. consisteth of two false principles and rotten pillars; whereof the one is, that we must of necessity have the same kind of government that was in the apostles' time, and is expressed in the scriptures, and no other; the other is, that we may not in any wise, or any consideration, retain in the church anything that hath been abused under the pope: if these two posts be weak, yes rotten (as I have proved in this my Defence), then must the building of necessity fall ... The external government (of the Church) hath both a substance and a matter about which it is occupied, and also a form to attain the same, consisting in certain offices and functions, and in the names and titles of them. The substance and matter of government must indeed be taken out of the word of God, and consisteth in these points, that the word be truly taught, the sacraments rightly administered, virtue furthered, vice repressed, and the church kept in quietness and order. The offices in the church, whereby this government is wrought, be not namely and par particularly expressed in the scriptures, but in some points left to the discretion and liberty of the church, to be disposed according to the state of times, places, and persons, as I have further declared in my Answer and Defence following". 3

The latter words of Whitgift are echoed by Thomas Cooper in his "Admonition To The People of England Against Martin's mar-prelate". In answer to Martin's claim that a government of the Church of England by Doctors, Pastors, Elders and Deacons is imperative, Cooper points out that "other reformed churches

1. Puritan Manifestoes, ed. by Prerce and Douglas, p. 6; see also, for other references pertaining to this section, particularly pp. 15f, 97ff, 102f.
2. The Parker Society, 1851.
3. Works, Vol. I, p. 6; see also pp. 60f, 64, 121, 175, 185ff, 190f, 353, 360, 412 (N.B.), 416; Vol. II, pp. 83f, 212.
have by the direction of the Spirit of God retained their liberty in the realm of external government, and other outward orders", to choose "such as they thought in wisdom and godliness to be most convenient for the state of this Countrey, and disposition of the people". Why then, he asks, should this liberty be taken away from England?  

A sound defence of government by bishops is given by Whitgift, but not on the grounds of divine right, nor by arguing for a doctrine of Apostolic Succession. He refuses to acknowledge that any particular form of government is an essential part of the Church. The only essential notes of the Church are the true preaching of the Word of God, and the right administration of the Sacraments. Some kind of government may be a part of the Church with reference to the outward form and perfection of it, but it is not such a part of the essence and being of the Church that she cannot be without it. This is as true of episcopacy as it is of presbyterianism. However, since the apostles appointed bishops in the churches that they planted, since episcopacy was the government of the Church in the first five hundred years of her life, and since during that time no function or office was brought into the Church (allowed by any general council or "creditable" writer) which was not proper for the time and "allowable" by the Word of God, the Puritan argument that equality among ministers is necessary in the Church holds no authority for us at all. Whitgift says that "in Justin's time there was

1. Puritan Discipline Tracts, 1847, p. 66.
2. Works, Vol. 1, p. 135; see also pp. 294f.
one that governed the rest of the ministers; ergo, there may be
one to do the same now in like manner. ¹ This is not to say
that government of the Church, by archbishops, bishops, presbyters,
and deacons means that there are several orders of ministry.
Whitgift insists that archbishops are ministers of the Word and
Sacraments, and equal ministerium they do not differ from all
the other pastors of the Church. They differ only in respect
of governing and the preservation of order and discipline.²
Not that order and discipline are to be separated from the
ministry of the Word; it is simply that all who minister the
Word and Sacraments are not given equal authority in the exer-
cise of the government of the Church.

Whitgift is thus not hierarchical in his conception of the
ministry of the Church (there is only one ministry) but he is
hierarchical in his conception of order and government. He
defends episcopacy, in that sense, on the basis of function.
Episcopacy is the best way, the proven way, of preserving order
and unity. As it is necessary to have one bishop over many
priests for the avoidance of schism and contention, so it is
necessary to have an archbishop over every province of bishops.³
Whitgift does not here say so, but he unquestionably believes
that it is necessary to have some one over the archbishops for
the proper ordering of the whole. Who is this to be? The
pope? No, the Queen! Church and Commonwealth are gathered
under one head who is the godly prince. And this provides a
further reason for the retention of episcopacy in the Church of

² Ibid., p. 89; see also pp. 117, 122, 256, 257.
³ Ibid., p. 257
England. The Church, Whitgift insists, must correspond in
government to that of the commonwealth, otherwise the realm would
be divided into two and the Queen would be spoiled of half her
jurisdiction and authority. It would be an impossible situation,
with the Commonwealath being a monarchy, if the Church were a
"democracy" or an "aristocracy".1

Richard Hooker's Erastianism is as complete as Whitgift's.
He suggests that the English estate is patterned on that of the
ancient people of Israel, "which people was not part of them the
commonwealth, and part of them the Church of God, but the self-
same people whole and entire were both under one chief Governor,
on whose supreme authority they did all depend." It is in this
sense that the monarch of England is supreme head of the Church
of England. The Puritan objection that there is no need for a
visible head of the Church because Christ, the true Head, is
never absent from His Body, is, according to Hooker, the result
of a confusion of the visible with the invisible Church.2 It
is true that Christ by the invisible working of His Spirit exer-
cises His rule over His people. But He has also committed the
external and visible regiment of the Church to certain members
of it, the head of whom is, in England, the monarch.3 It is
the Queen's will that the Church in England should be governed
by her through archbishops and bishops, and therefore that is
the form of the Church's regiment. F. J. Shirley contends that
the Elizabethan bishops all held this Erastian viewpoint in that
they rested the government of the Church on the civil ruler.4

1. Ibid., pp. 263f; see also pp. 357 and 399; see also Cooper,
3. Ibid, VIII, iv, 10. 4. Op cit, p. 108
Certainly that is what Hooker does.

But Hooker does not justify episcopacy solely on the basis of the Queen's supporting it. He believes that bishops of some sort have governed the Church since the beginning. It is natural that this should be so because

"where the clergy are any great multitude, order doth necessarily require that by degrees they be distinguished; we hold there have ever been and ever ought to be in such case at leastwise two sorts of ecclesiastical persons, the one subordinate unto the other; as to the Apostles in the beginning, and to the Bishops always since, we find plainly both in Scripture and in all ecclesiastical records, other ministers of the word and sacraments have been."

Bishops, then, are necessary for the preservation of order.

It is to be noted, though, that in the above quotation Hooker traces the distinction back to Scripture. Can we infer from this that Hooker believes episcopacy to be the immutable form of government for the Church? To do so would be to misrepresent him seriously. He distinguishes between matters of faith which are necessary to salvation, and matters of polity which are accessory. The former come directly from Scripture; the latter indirectly. Scripture does not, as the Puritans claim, contain a definite plan of Church government. That is left to the careful discretion of the Church; but the Church must exercise this discretion through reason. By the use of reason (which is a divine gift) the laws of Ecclesiastical Polity must be made according to the general laws of nature, and without contradiction to any positive law in Scripture. Shirley points out that Hooker believes the laws controlling man in civil and ecclesiastical life to be alterable and that they must vary with circumstances. He sees that a distinction

between ministers goes back to New Testament time, but that one form of government is prescribed he does not believe. Bishops have lawful power over the Church, but that authority is not necessarily permanently theirs. It is the law and custom of the Church that this should be so, but "proud, tyrannical and unrebuckable" bishops can by the decision of the Church have their power taken away from them. In fact, if the Church decides that it is convenient to do so, she can do away with her order of bishops.¹

But what of the distinction between the members of the clergy? He says the clergy can be divided into two degrees: presbyters and deacons.² That he refers to only two degrees may be surprising to those who know Hooker to be such a firm supporter of episcopacy. But examination reveals that he considers bishops to be merely ruling presbyters, created for the sake of order. The authority was, however, given by Christ Himself, part of the office being to ordain and consecrate. Therefore all three degrees of ecclesiastical jurisdiction can be traced back to Christ and the Apostles.³ We conclude, then, that Hooker believes in episcopacy and thinks it is the right government for the Church of England, not only because it agrees best with the times and the will of the Queen, but because it is the government that was begun in the primitive Church. But Shirley is right when he says that in Hooker there is no theory of "monarchical episcopacy", and no doctrine of apostolical succession in the sense that a church forfeits its validity if an historic and lineal descent

Hooker's emphasis upon episcopacy arises out of his desire to strengthen the Anglican position against the Puritans, not to erect it as the \textit{case} without which a church would forfeit its title to validity.

The last figure in the 16th century that we need mention in this chapter is Thomas Bilson. He was not only a contemporary of Hooker's, but published his \textit{Perpetual Government of Christ's Church} in 1593, just when Hooker was working on \textit{Ecclesiastical Polity}. Bilson is very close to Hooker in his conception of episcopacy, but appears to find in the New Testament more definite Scriptural warrant for government by bishops than does Hooker. He does say that if the Puritans will agree to Jerome's words that bishops are above presbyters only by the custom of the Church rather than by the "Lord's disposition", and ought to rule the Church in common - if, he says, the Puritans will agree to this, he will do the same. But then he proceeds to show that Jerome believed that though presbyters in ordination hold their hands near the bishop's hand, yet they do not ordain as the bishop does. If the Puritans want to prove that presbyters are able to ordain then they must prove it from Scripture. If they cannot prove it (as Bilson believes they cannot) then bishops are of a distinct degree that have, by God's law, distinct powers and actions. These distinct powers are continued through succession, after the manner of the Aaronic priesthood. In spite of all that he says in support of episcopal church government he does not claim it to

\footnotesize{\begin{tabular}{l}
1. \textit{Op. cit.} p. 103. We have not here dealt with Book VII of Ecc. Polity because we believe that Shirley has proved that much of it is not genuine. \\
2. p. 273. \\
3. \textit{Ibid}, pp. 323f \\
4. \textit{Ibid}, p.333. For Bilson's response to the Puritan claim that the Lord has forbidden his ministers to be lords and masters over their brethren, see pp. 95-106
\end{tabular}}
be essential for the Church, but contents himself with saying,

"the first distinction of bishops from and above presbyters was, if not commanded and imposed by the apostle's precepts on the church, yet at least ordained and delivered unto the faithful by their example, as the best way to maintain the peace and unity of the church ... "

It is evident, then, that the 16th century Anglican Church did not believe episcopacy to be the only possible form of church government. It is true that there is a significant change at the end of the century in the declarations of Bancroft and Bilson, for with them the Church of England begins the line of attack in its arguments for episcopacy that puts the Puritans on the defensive. However, the 16th century Anglicans did not see in episcopacy the guarantee either of the Catholicity or of the Apostolicity of the Church. It is difficult to see how Miss Beatrice Thompson has been able to reach her conclusions about this period. She asserts that the Elizabethans thought

"It was to the bishops, and the bishops alone, that by divine ordinance and Catholic custom certain essential and unique apostolic powers had fallen, of perpetuating their own ministry, with the inevitable corollary that, though the presbyters share with the bishops the power to administer the sacraments, and various pastoral functions, yet they were expressly excluded from the authority to constitute in themselves that essential body of persons without which there could be no Church".1

This could be accepted as an accurate description of the situation only if we were to ignore the works of the other 16th century divines, and read only Bancroft and Bilson, plus certain sections of Book VII of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, in the light of modern Anglo-Catholic doctrines. We cannot help but think of those words

of John Keble in the preface of his edition of Hooker's

Ecclesiastical Polity:

"Now, since the episcopal succession had been so carefully retained in the Church of England, and so much anxiety evinced to render both her liturgy and ordination services strictly conformable to the rules and doctrines of antiquity, it might have been expected that the defenders of the English hierarchy against the first Puritans should take the highest ground, and challenge for the Bishops the same unreserved submission, on the same plea of exclusive apostolical prerogative, which their own adversaries feared not to insist on for their elders and deacons. It is notorious, however, that such was not in general the line preferred by Jewel, Whitgift, Bishop Cooper, and others, to whom the management of that controversy was intrusted, during the early part of Elizabeth's reign. They do not expressly disavow, but they carefully shun, that unreserved appeal to Christian antiquity, in which one would have thought they must have discerned the very strength of their cause to lie. It is enough, with them, to shew that the government by archbishops and bishops is ancient and allowable: they never venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the holy Sacraments: and yet it is obvious that such a course of argument alone (supposing it borne out by facts) could fully meet all the exigencies of the case."

Section II - The Early Carolines

The first and most important figure in this period is, of course, Lancelot Andrewes. From his sermons a considerable amount of material can be gathered on the subject of the ministry, though he has only one sermon devoted exclusively to the topic.

It will not be surprising to us, after what has been said about him in the preceding sections, to notice that he refers to the ministry most often (and most naturally) when he is preaching on the work of the Holy Spirit.

he sets the work of the ministry. The Spirit is, in fact, given for that very purpose, that the work of the ministry can be performed. Referring to Pentecost Androwes says that the Spirit is given "to set forth the Word, and the Holy Ghost to spread abroad the knowledge of Christ". If the Spirit had not come the work of the ministry could not be done at all:

"1. Not Baptism; for nisi ex Spiritu, if He come not, well may it wash soil from our skin, but no stain from our soul; no 'laver of regeneration' without 'renewing of the Holy Ghost'. 2. No preaching neither; for that is but 'a letter that killeth,' except the Spirit come too and quicken it. 3. No sacrament; we have a plain text for it, 'the flesh profiteth nothing', if the Lord and Giver of life, the Spirit be away. 4. To conclude, no prayer, for nisi, 'unless' the Spirit help our infirmity, and make intercession with us, we neither know how, nor what to pray." 2

Because he sees the ministry's relation to the Spirit in this way Androwes believes "Holy Orders" are given by the words "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye remit, etc." He insists that if Rome had not retained these words in her ordination service it might well be doubted if she had any priests at all, in spite of her accipere potestatem sacrificandi pro vivis et mortuis. 3 Only the Spirit makes a minister and only the Spirit makes a man's ministry effective.

There is no doubt that Androwes believes that something is given at ordination. But how does he understand it? What is given? The Spirit is given; but he goes on to qualify this by saying that not the Essence or Person of the Holy Ghost is given but only certain impressions of the Spirit, which are known to the Psalmist as "gifts", and to the Apostle as "graces". 4

But we can best understand Andrewes' position on this if we examine a section of a sermon of his on John 20:23, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained". The Vulgate reads, Quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis; et quorum retinseritis, retenta sunt. Here Andrewes makes a careful play on the words Remittuntur and Remiseritis. Remittuntur, he says, means that men may have deliverance from the fetters of their sin. God places the power of remitting first, which shows to which He is most inclined. To remit sins is more proper to Him and is first in His purpose; the retaining of sins is a secondary purpose and takes place only when remitting cannot. The ground of the remitting of sins comes entirely from God and "not from any other", whereas the cause of retaining sins is in the hardness of the heart that cannot repent.

The powers of remitting and retaining, though concurrent to one end, are yet distinct in themselves. Remiseritis is in the second person, referring to the Apostles, but Remittuntur is in the third person, referring to God Himself. Though latter in place, Remittuntur is by nature and order first, and from it proceeds the other Remiseritis.

"So that thus the case stands between them: Remittuntur, which is God's power, is the primitive or original; Remiseritis, which is the Apostles' power, is merely derived. That in God sovereign; this in the Apostles dependent. In Him only absolute, in them delegate. In Him imperial; in them ministerial."

Since this is solely invested in God He could have kept it entirely to Himself, and without the means of Word and Sacraments.
and without ministers, have exercised it immediately by Himself. But He desired to make men "workers together with Him". What men? The Apostles.

But the commission concerning the remitting and retaining of sins was not given to the Apostles personally, nor to all Christians in general. How then are we to understand it?

"It being then neither personal nor peculiar to them as Apostles, nor again common to all as Christians, it must needs be committed to them as Ministers, Priests, or Preachers, and consequently to those that in that office and function do succeed them, to whom and by whom this commission is still continued. Neither are they that are ordained or instituted to that calling, ordained or instituted by any other words or verse than this (i.e. John 20:23). Yet not so that absolutely without them God cannot bestow it on whom or when He pleaseth, or that He is bound to this means only, and cannot work without it. For Gratia Dei non alligatur mediis, 'the grace of God is not bound but free', and can work without means either of Word or Sacrament; and as without means, so without ministers, how and when to Him seemeth good. But speaking of that which is proper and ordinary in the course by Him established, this is an Ecclesiastical act committed, as the residue of the ministry of reconciliation, to Ecclesiastical person. And if at any time He vouchsafe it by others that are not such, they be in that case ministri necessitatis non officii, 'in case of necessity ministers, but by office not so'."

"Now as by committing this power God doth not deprive or bereave Himself of it, for there is a Remittuntur still, and that chief, sovereign, and absolute; so on the other side where God proceedeth by the Church's act as ordinarily He doth, it being His own ordinance, there whosoever will be partaker of it by the Apostles' means; there doth Remiseritias concurre in his own order and place, and there runneth still a correspondence between both. There doth God associate His ministers and maketh them 'workers together with Him'. There have they their parts in this work, and cannot be excluded; no more in this than in the other acts and parts of their function. And to exclude them is, after a sort, to wring the keys out of their hands to whom Christ hath given them, is to cancel and make void this clause of Remiseritis, as if it were no part of the sentence; to account of all this solemn sending and inspiring, as if it were an idle and fruitless ceremony; which if it may not be admitted, then sure it is they have
their part and concurrence in this work, as in the rest of the ministry of reconciliation. 1

Andrewes' insistence that, in giving power to the ministry of the Church to remit and retain sins, God does not in any way deprive Himself of it, is extremely important. "Ecclesiastical power" is never detached from the power of God. Andrewes' doctrine of the Holy Spirit is fully thought out in relation to the Church's ministry and it is therefore impossible for Him to conceive of the latter as being in the slightest independent. But though it is not independent there is nevertheless a definite gift to the apostolic office, the "gift" or "grace" from the Spirit for the remitting and retaining of sins. The very office itself is a grace, not a saving grace, or Judas should have been saved. It is the grace of the apostles' calling whereby they are enabled to do something about the forgiveness of sins that others could not do, even though others might be more learned and virtuous than they. Andrewes, to guard against "an old worn error of the Donatists", is quick to point out that this "grace" is not some internal quality infused into the person called, but the grace only of their spiritual and sacred function. 2 To the Apostles, or rather to the apostolic office, therefore, God gave the effective ministry of reconciliation, or in different words, the Keys to His Kingdom. It is God's will that the Church should minister His forgiveness and also His judgment. The remission of sins is applied unto us by the ministry of the Church even though it can come only from God. But how is this applied to us? By Baptism, Lord's Supper,

1. For this quotation and the preceding discussion, see Sermons, Vol. V, pp. 90-95. 2. Sermons, Vol. III, p. 277
Preaching, and Prayer (priest's prayer). All of these are acts for the remission of sins, and in all of these a minister is required to "despatch" them.

Was Christ then, in John 20:23, giving the Apostles the power to minister these four ordinances? Andrews answers No. He says that he is forced to conclude that this act has particular reference to the giving of the power of absolution; it is this which is, in a special sense, the power of "the keys", which Jesus had promised in Matthew 16:19, that He would give them. Absolution is not the only way for the giving of remission of sins: the Word, Sacraments, and Prayer are, it seems, the chief ordinances in the ministry of reconciliation. But absolution has its own time and place in this ministry, and Christ by sending the Apostles, gives them the key of authority for this work. The power of absolution is thus a real power. Whence does it come? By the giving of the Spirit. But we must see that this is not merely a special priestly power which gives efficacy to the pronouncement of the words of absolution. That is involved; but Andrews relates to the "key of authority" the "key of knowledge", and the latter part of the sermon testifies to his concern with the use of the key of knowledge in the ministering of absolution. What it comes to is this: the minister's task is to discern upon whom he ought to pronounce absolution; membership in the Church is necessary but not sufficient in itself; a person must also be truly repentant. The key of knowledge is given so that a minister can tell who is repentant and who is not. But it is also given for "counsel and direction", and "to advise and direct ourselves no less in the cure of sin than in the sorrow for
it. In other words, involved in the act of absolution is the ministration of the Gospel. Andrewes never divorces the one from the other.¹

Because of this, it would be serious injustice to his thought if we were to place a Roman interpretation upon his conception of the ministry. Certain passages taken out of context could easily be made to fit in with the doctrine of the ministry found in Roman and modern Anglo-Catholic theology. But taken in their full and proper context it is impossible honestly to interpret them in this way. Andrewes believes ordination gives to the ordinе something he did not have before. What is it? Grace for his spiritual and sacred function.² But grace, for Andrewes, means the presence of the Spirit, the presence therefore of Christ Himself who by means of the Church’s ministry spreads abroad the knowledge of Himself.³ This is the reason Andrewes is willing to make such high claims for the power and efficacy of the ministers of the Church.⁴ But he sees the Spirit to be closely related to Holy Scripture: in fact he says that the Spirit must come from the Word,⁵ and that what the Apostles received miraculously we must, in part at least, gain from diligent study of the Bible, and also from the Fathers.⁶ The gift of ministry, then, cannot be looked upon as the sheer power to consecrate elements, to confirm, to preach, and to absolve, but rather as the authority and power given by the promise of the presence of the Spirit, to minister the whole gospel.

Richard Field, Dean of Gloucester, seems close to Andrewes in certain respects with regard to his conception of ministerial power, though it is difficult to tell exactly how he conceives of it. That he believes ministers of the Church are given a special power for their peculiar work there can be no doubt.

"The power of holy or ecclesiastical order, is nothing else but that power which is specially given to men sanctified and set apart from others, to perform certain sacred supernatural and eminent actions, which others of another rank may not at all, or, not ordinarily, meddle with: as, to preach the word, administer the sacraments, and the like."¹

Field does not say what this power is but it is the precondition to the proper ministration of Word and Sacraments. What the relation of this power is to Christ’s ministry and to the work of the Spirit is nowhere stated. There is a powerful suggestion in a passage where he argues that neither the apostles nor the bishops received their ecclesiastical power from Peter and his successor, but immediately from Christ Himself;² but he does not develop this at all in connection with the gift and work of the Holy Spirit. Field’s words about power of order leave him open to an interpretation which would treat that power of order as being a possession of the Church, or of a certain group within the Church (the ministry), a possession that is for all practical, purposes independent of Christ’s personal presence with, and sovereignty over, the Church. The Church’s ministry could in that sense be treated independently of Christ’s ministry.

There are other facets of Field’s thought related to this subject with which we shall deal in a moment; but for the time being we must note two things that illumine for us his understand-

understanding of the nature of the "power of order".

(1) This power can be taken away by the decision of the Church. Neither heresy nor schism in themselves destroy the power of order, but those who are deprived can no longer administer the holy ordinances of the Church with any benefit to others or themselves.

(2) Field's emphasis is more on the reality and power of that which is ministered than it is on the power in the minister. This can be seen especially in his discussion of the power of the keys. The door of the kingdom is, he says, shut against us by sin. The key to open this door is "in the divine Trinity principally". In men there is a "ministerial power to remove the impediment of sin", that is the "power of the keys". But Field says that the key of ministry is only the power of teaching, instructing, admonishing, comforting, governing, and "yielding" sacramental assurances of God's mercy and grace, by dispensing the sacraments Christ has instituted. Man has fully entangled himself in sin and brought himself under the condemnation of God. From these bonds none but God alone can free man by His favor and the work of His grace.

"The ministers of the Church, by the ministry of the word and sacraments, may convert men to God instrumentally, making them partakers of his graces, and bringing them into such an estate, wherein they shall be sure for Christ's sake to find mercy with God, for the remission and taking away of their sins. They may pray for them, and out of the knowledge of their estate assure them of remission; but other power to unloose and untie these direful and horrible bonds of sin and punishment, they have none . . . "

This gives us an insight into Field's concern with the power of the ordinances of the gospel rather than with the power of the
minister himself. Not that the minister has no power: the administration of the Gospel is a decisive exercise of power; it is not his own however. But the minister has power in another sense - or rather he has authority or jurisdiction which is related to the power of the keys: namely, the authority to excommunicate a person from the ordinances of the Church. This, says Field, is not to be esteemed lightly, for that person is "undoubtedly excluded from all access to the throne of grace in heaven, and all acceptation there". This is a formidable power indeed. But it is formidable because the minister has authority to exclude men from the fellowship in which is to be found salvation, not because his "power of order" gives him any special control over the door of the Kingdom of heaven.

George Downame, who was subsequently Bishop of Derry, preached and published in 1608 two sermons, one on the dignity and duty of the ministry, and the other on the function of bishops. In 1611 he published a defense of the latter which had come under attack. These three treatises are very informative for our present concern. Downame maintains that ministers are ordained

"to supply the office, and sustain the person of the Sonne of God . . . When Christ was to ascend into heaven, hee ordained the ministers of the Gospel, as the Embassadours of God, in his stead: affirming, that as his father had sent him, so he did send them. For we (saith the Apostle) are the Embassadours of God in Christ's stead, even as though God did intruste you by us, we beseech you in Christ's stead, be reconciled unto God. The ministers therefore were ordained to supply the roome of Christ. Which the Lord did, not that hee would have the ministerie of the word least esteemed, than if he should speake from heaven himselfe; but that hee might by this meanes teach us after a more familiar manner, and might make the better triall of our obedience . . . Our dutie therefore is, when God doth speake unto us by his ministers to set our selves, with Cornelius

(Acts 10:33) and his company, in the presence of God; and to hear .. The word preached, not as a word of man, but as it indeeds the word of God.¹

Downman's words might be construed to mean that since Christ has ascended He has left men to perform His ministry for Him. But other parts of the sermon show that he never conceived of it quite in that way. We can see his meaning more clearly in another place where he is speaking of the necessity of the ministry of the Word. He says that those whom God elects He also calls, and no one is saved unless he is called. For this reason the Church, which is the company of the elect, is .SubItems, a company of men called. But how are men called? By the ministry of the Gospel, which must be "seconded and made powerfull, by the Spirit of God".² God is not absent: therefore His ministers are not alone. However, there is not sufficient evidence to permit us to say outright that Downman definitely believes that the ministers exercise their ministry only in the context of Christ's present ministry in the Church.

Downman was actually more concerned to make clear something else. In dealing with the duties of the ministry he spends many pages demonstrating that its chief work is the preaching of the Word.³ By it men's minds are enlightened to see their own misery

¹. Of the Dignitie and Dutie of the Ministrie, pp. 20ff; Of., Calvin, Institutes, IV,1,5. Cf. also the quotations from Luther's sermons in Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, I, Pt.1, pp. 107f.
². Ibid, p. 27. ³. Ibid, p. 17. It is surprising and alarming the way Downman develops this part of the ministry's task at the expense of the administration of the sacraments and the ministry of prayer. On prayer and the sacraments he writes less than a page each; on the preaching of the word he writes 18 pages! See pp. 17-37.
and the infinite mercies of God, and by it, as by the arm of God, they are drawn unto Christ that they may turn and believe in Him. There is no means so effective to convert a sinner and bring him to faith in Christ as the ministry of the Word. It is the power of God unto salvation. Downmane even calls the preaching of the Gospel, the Kingdom of heaven, because it is the principal means of bringing us to God's kingdom. But the reason this issue has been referred to here is because Downmane rests all the honor and dignity which are due to ministers upon this work of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments (primarily the Word). Because ministers have been given to minister God’s Word, which Word is salvation itself, they are deserving of the very highest honor and dignity. To no other men ought we to give such glory and titles of honor. (Downmane is quick to explain that this does not imply that the Church should lord it over Princes as the Pope does, for Christ’s Kingdom is not of this world.) It is important to notice that in this sermon particularly Downmane always keeps his eye on that which is ministered, not on the powers and capacities of the ministers. When he does look to the ministers themselves, he requires that in them two qualities ought to be inseparably united: "integritie of life, and light of doctrine".

In this sermon Downmane does not concern himself with ordination, and there is no mention of any power or powers that the minister may or may not have by virtue of his ministerial office, other than what is exercised in the breaking open of the Gospel in

the midst of the Church. Because he is here looking at the itself, rather than at the one who performs it, we shall not at this point give any further time to what he might consider to be the nature of ministerial power.

Another man in this period to deal significantly with ministerial orders is Francis Mason. In his Vindication of the Church of England he speaks of ministerial power as a definite entity in itself, and is willing to call the giving of it a sacrament if it is remembered that the grace given is not so much for the good of the receiver, as for the "flock for whose sake he receiveth it". The priesthood is a spiritual power to minister the Word and Sacraments, and is conveyed successively by ordination. It is an indelible character in the sense that a spiritual power is given (as in baptism) which cannot be given twice. Mason insists that Christ is the chief ordainer, but then explains by saying that He is the "fountain" from which all the orders of the Church come, flowing first to the Apostles and then "ran down to the bishops as its conduit pipes". Later the metal of these "pipes" became debased and corrupted and the orders became "thick and muddy"; but with Cranmer the form of ordination was purged and "more pure orders" were conferred. Mason states explicitly that the peculiar functions of a priest are the preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments. He is commenting on the word of ordination, "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou dost forgive, etc.", and he says, "Whomsoever ... Christ hath entrusted with the power of forgiving

2. Ibid, p. 46.  
3. Ibid, p. 153  
4. Ibid, pp. 165f.
sins, the same hath he honoured and vested with the authority to minister the Word and Sacraments. Whence it appears that those words do comprehend the whole and complete ordination of a priest, though implicitly and woverty".1

Richard Montague, in dealing with the question of ministerial power, reveals a point of view similar to that held by Field. In the conferring of Holy Orders internal grace, that is the Holy Ghost Himself, is given. Because of this, priests have the power not only to pronounce, but to give, remission of sins to all who are penitent. Greater power than this has no man received from God.2 But he goes on to qualify what he means, by saying that none can forgive sins absolutely, authoritatively, by prime and original power, except God alone; priests have a delegated power from God to reconcile men to Him by leading them to repentance through Word and Sacraments to become capable of being forgiven.3 So, "sins are forgiven in two ways: by power original, and authority: by derived power and delegation."4

Bishop Davenant believes that, in Colossians 1:25, Paul means by the words "the dispensation of God" "a lawful and defined power given to him by God for dispensing and administering the spiritual things pertaining to the Church".5 What is this power? It is not so much a "power", a "capacity" to administer these realities, but an authorization, a "calling" to do so. Since the Church is God's household, no one ought to exercise any function in it unless he is called to it by God Himself. There are two kinds of legitimate calling: (1) Extraordinary, like that of the Apostles;

or (2) Ordinary, like that of bishops and ministers now. The ordinary calling ought to be given under some visible sign, by those who have rightful ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Those who receive orders in this way have been made ministers "according to the disposition of God". But since ministers are appointed in the Church according to God's dispensation we must see that what they teach and do is valid only by the delegated authority and approbation of God Himself. A minister is bound to dispense "the spiritual things pertaining to the Church" in such a manner as the Lord has directed. But a legitimate call is not in itself sufficient: a minister must be judged by that which he is called to minister, by the Christian Faith itself. Legitimate pastors are _ministri_ (μισθωτος) of the Gospel, not lords; lords neither of the Church, nor of the Faith.

Thus far in this section we have been speaking of the ministry as though there was only one, namely the ministry of the Word and Sacraments. But now we must go on to discuss the position of the early Carolines in reference to the ministry of the Church of England as it is ordered into bishops, priests, and deacons. Naturally their beliefs about episcopacy, its nature and its necessity, will be fully considered. But careful attention will also be given to the question: Did they believe that there was more than one order of ministry in the Church?

Let us first look at the writings of Lancelot Andrewes. He believes in the three-fold division of teachers (presbyters), helpers (deacons), and governors (bishops); but he does not say

1. Ibid., 1:25 (p.295)  2. Ibid., 1:23 (p.368).
that they are three different ministries. In fact, in a sermon on Psalm 68:18 he reminds his hearers that Paul, in commenting on this text, says that Christ gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists (Eph. 4:8-11). Andrewes goes on:

"These three now are gone, their date is out. But in the same period, he puts pastors and doctors too; and then we have still, and they are all the remains that are now left of the dona dedit of this day. A point I wish to be well thought on; that for these gifts this feast (Whitsunday) is holden, that for these we keep this high holy-day." 1

This is a very significant statement, for it virtually excludes the thought of any more than one kind of ministry. 2 Certainly it is impossible, if we take this passage at all seriously, to suggest that Andrewes believes in a three-fold ministry. There is only one ministry, though the Church has ordered herself and her ministry into a "threefold division". This division refers to the ordering and governing of the Church. In one place Andrewes actually refers not to three, but only to two degrees in the government of the Church, that of bishops and presbyters. There were the Twelve Apostles and the Seventy Disciples (Luke 9:1-10:1), both of which groups were "over the people in the things pertaining to God." But they were not equal; "among the persons ecclesiastical the Apostles had a higher seat". In the later ordering of the Church bishops succeeded the Twelve and Presbyters the Seventy. 3 This particular division of offices can be traced to the work of Christ Himself.

In spite of this Andrewes looks upon the order of the Church

---

1. Ibid, p. 236; Italics mine. 2. Obviously Andrewes is not suggesting that the pastors and doctors represent two different kinds or "grades" of ministry. 3. Sermons, Vol. V, pp. 64f
in terms of the three-fold division already mentioned: deacons, presbyters and bishops. Actually all three could be subsumed under one of the names. Which name? Diaconus, which is the proper name for the lowest of the three.

"We turn it 'administration' - it is indeed ministry or service, and that on foot, and through the dust; for so is the nature of the word. An ill word for pride, who had rather hear of words sounding of dominion than of service, specially this service; for it is but the order of Deaconship, and pride would be at least more than a Deacon... The Angels of Heaven are but 'ministering spirits'; nay Christ Himself is styled no otherwise, but that 'He was a minister of the circumcision'. He that is Lord of all, and gives all the offices, calls His own but so."1

Andrewes does not, unfortunately, develop this further here or elsewhere, but it is nevertheless an extremely important point. As we shall soon see, most of the Carolines disclaim a lordly ministry of the Church, but they fail to say why it cannot be lordly, if it is to be the true ministry of the Church. It is to be regretted that Andrewes does not say more about it, but at least he makes it clear that all the orders of the Church, even the praelati of it, come under the office of servants, because that is the office Christ Himself held. There can be no question that the acceptance of this doctrine of the ministry and government of the Church, and its ramifications, involves the uprooting of prelacy.

Joseph Mode, however, in one of his references to the ministry insists that it is improper to speak of the ministry of the Church. Ministers are servants, but they are the servants of God, not of men.

"They are the Peoples Magistri to teach, instruct, and oversee them: were it not absurd to call the Shepheard, the sheeps minister? If he be their minister, they surely are his masters. And so indeed the People by occasion of this misappelation, think they are ours, and use us accordingly. Indeed we are called ministers, but never their ministers, but as you see here. (1 Cor. 7:1) God’s ministers, Christ’s ministers, who employeth us to dispense his mysteries unto his Church."

Andrewes believes that the distinction between ministers or priests, and bishops was a distinction made by Christ Himself. Episcopacy is in that sense de jure divino. And in spite of the above-mentioned evidence indicating that he believes in only one ministry, he does believe that bishops are a separate order, and he demonstrates easily that the use of the word "consecration" instead of "ordination" has no significance in this regard. Bishops have entered into the apostolic functions of oversight, the power of commanding, correcting, and ordaining. Andrewes’ position in regard to ordination is manifested in his reaction to the proposed consecration of bishops for Scotland in 1610. None of them had received episcopal ordination, but had been ordained by presbyters. Andrewes suggested that a bishop ought to ordain them before they were consecrated. According to Spotswood, Archbishop Bancroft told Andrewes that "where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the reformed churches." Heylyn says, however, that Bancroft’s words were that "there was no such necessity of receiving the order of priesthood, but that episcopal consecration

might be given without it". At any rate Andrewes consented.

Mason says that Andrewes nowhere expresses his opinion on consecration per saltum.

"We know that he (Andrewes) did not reject presbyterian orders as wholly invalid where others were not to be had. He may well have felt that consecration to the episcopate might cover any deficiency in them. The one thing certain in the matter is that he would have preferred to ordain Spotswood and his companions priests before consecrating them, and that he would not have considered such a proceeding to be a sacrilegious reordination."

It is evident, then, that if one tries to keep in mind all the important references to ministry and order, Andrewes' position is not very clear. But about episcopacy we can draw two conclusions at least: (1) Episcopacy is not, for Andrewes, absolutely indispensable; the ministry of the Church can be, and can be propagated, without bishops; (2) Episcopacy is nevertheless the only proper government of the Church.

No inference at all is necessary when we examine Dean Field's writings in reference to the question of the order of the Church. He deals with it explicitly and, in reference to one or two facets of the problem, fairly completely. The most convenient way of approaching his treatment of it is by following his polemic against Rome on the issue of whether any other than bishops may ordain. Field begins by asking whether the power of ordination is essentially annexed to the order of bishops. To get at the truth he says it is necessary to observe that the whole of ecclesiastical power is divided into (1) the power of order, and (2) the power of jurisdiction. The power of order is that which is given to those who are set apart to "preach the word, administer the

1. Aerius Redivivus, p. 387; quoted in Mason, Op cit, p. 72
2. Mason, Ibid, pp. 72f
sacraments, and the like". This power is not limited to any one part of the Church; it is authoritative for the whole Church. However, each man is to be given a certain portion of God's people for which he is responsible. "This particular assignation giveth to them, that had only the power of order before, the power of jurisdiction also, over the persons of men".

The Apostles of Christ and their successors divided the people of God into particular churches that each city and its surrounding district made one Church. Now the unity and peace of a particular church required that there should be only one pastor; but the duties in these churches grew to such an extent that many presbyters were required. However, one was particularly pastor of the Church, who was, for the sake of distinction, called a bishop. To him and "eminent and peerless" was given for the sake of unity, and the others acted as his assistants. When he was present he performed the acts of "ecclesiastical ministry"; when absent they did nothing without his approval and consent. For the sake of order some things were specially reserved to him, such as ordaining, reconciling of penitents, and confirming.

"These being the divers sorts and kinds of ecclesiastical power, it will easily appear to all that enter into the due consideration thereof, that the power and authority to intermeddle with things pertaining to the service of God, and to perform eminent acts of gracious efficacy tending to the procuring of the eternal good of the sons of men, is equal and the same in all those whom we call presbyters, that is, fatherly guides of God's Church and people; and that, only for order's sake, and the preservation of peace, there is limitation of the use and exercise of the same. Hereunto agree all the best learned amongst the Romanists themselves, freely confessing that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter, is not a distinct and higher order, or power of
"order, but a kind of dignity and office or employment only ... Hence it followeth, that many things which in some cases presbyters may lawfully do are peculiarly reserved unto bishops ... And therefore we read, that presbyters in some places and at some times, did impose hands, and confirm such as were baptized: which when Gregory, Bishop of Rome, would wholly have forbidden, there was so great exception taken to him for it, that he left it free again. And who knoweth not, that all presbyters in cases of necessity may absolve and reconcile penitents; a thing in ordinary course appropriated unto bishops? And why not, by the same reason, ordain presbyters and deacons in cases of like necessity? ... If they (bishops) become enemies to God and true religion, in case of such necessity as the care and government of the Church is devolved to the presbyters remaining Catholic and being of a better spirit, so the duty of ordaining such as are to assist or succeed them in the work of the ministry pertains to them likewise ... Who, then, dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God that were ordained by presbyters, in sundry Churches of the world, at such times as bishops, in those parts where they lived, opposed themselves against the truth of God, and persecuted such as professed it?"1

There is for Field, then, only one ministry; or at least the distinction between bishops and presbyters is not a distinction of essential ministry, or power of order. Both are ministers of the Gospel, of the Word and Sacraments, than which ministry there can be no higher. Other distinctions between them have nothing to do with power of order. But what of the distinction between presbyters and deacons? Field is not really explicit at this point, but it appears as though his position could be stated thus: presbyters have the power to administer all the ordinances of the Church, though under ordinary circumstances they have the authority of the Church to minister only the Word and Sacraments, the other ordinances being reserved for bishops; deacons, however, only receive the power and authority to read and preach the Word. Field says that the Apostles authorized and ordained men to continue their ministry of Word and Sacraments, of binding and

loosing, and of other pastoral duties. These were the presbyters. But, "knowing the weight of the burden they laid on their shoulders, (the Apostles) added unto them as assistants others of an inferior degree and rank, whom they name deacons, or ministers." Thus Field seems to believe in a two-fold ministry; but in a three-fold ministry he does not believe. He would have agreed with Whitgift in saying that quaed ministeriam bishops are not different or higher than presbyters.

It is only for the sake of the order, peace, and well-being of the Church that administration of such things as ordination and confirmation are reserved to bishops; they have no special power of order for the performance of these rites. Because Field holds this position he obviously does not believe that the necessary power to ordain is continued in the Church by episcopal succession, nor does he believe that episcopacy is the essential ministry without which the Church could not be.

However, he does appear to hold a conception of the succession of the power of ordination. A bishop administers ordination not strictly in the power of his episcopal office but in the power of his presbyteral office. That is, a part of the power of order, which every presbyter is given, is the power to ordain. Thus the power of ordination continues in the Church in the total college of presbyters and bishops.

Both presbyters and bishops are therefore the successors to the Apostles. It would, however, be going too far to suggest

3. We shall concentrate on ordination because it is the chief bone of contention.  4. Op. cit, Vol. III, pp. 201 & 203.
that Field holds a conception of *corporate* succession. He simply believes that the full power of order, which was in the Apostles, is annexed to the presbyteral office. Historical continuity and, in that sense, personal succession, are very important to him, because by that means the power of order is passed down from generation to generation. There is no question that Field does allow his conception of ministerial power to become too much an autonomous entity in the hands of the Church, or rather in the hands of the clergy; consequently personal succession threatens to become just as autonomous. However, Field himself is saved from a too arbitrary doctrine of personal succession by his recognition of the necessity of true doctrine. Not personal succession alone, but the succession of the true faith as well, is necessary to preserve the ministry of the Church.1

Because the power of order is annexed to the presbyteral office Field severely criticizes those churches which allow lay-elders to "meddle" with ordination. He insists that neither Scripture nor the tradition of the Church shows us any trace of lay-elders.

"The government of the Church is in respect of two sorts of men the clergy and the laity. Touching the former, they are to be tried and approved for their life and learning; they are to be ordained with solemn imposition of hands; and if they deserve it, they are to be suspended from the execution of their office, or utterly deprived, and degraded. Shall lay-elders have as much to do in all these actions as they to whom the ministry of the word and sacraments is committed? Are they competent judges of men's learning and aptness to teach, that neither are teachers nor learned? Can they give the sacred power of holy ministry that have it not themselves?"

Furthermore, Field insists that the discipline of the Church generally cannot possibly be undertaken except by those to whom

is committed the work of dispensing the Word and Sacraments. In other words, the ministry of the Word and Sacraments is decisive. Field seems to believe that because the power of order for the ministration of the Gospel ordinances is annexed to the presbyters and bishops of the Church, the power of authority for government and discipline is strictly theirs as well.

It is quite natural that Field should look upon a hierarchical government as the best means of preserving order in the Church. In the same way that one bishop is necessary for the unity and peace of many presbyters, so one chief or arch-bishop is necessary for the unity of many bishops; and even the archbishops must have "one before and after another". Some of the Puritan groups were challenging this idea of government, but practically all the Established-Church leaders shared in the common conception inherited from the Medievalists that the order of the cosmos was maintained by hierarchical authority, and that the government of the Church and State ought to correspond to it in form.

In spite of his convictions about episcopacy, Field did not make it a mark of a church's catholicity. Catholicity has reference to the Faith of the Church, not, as far as he is concerned, to the form of church government. A church demonstrates that she is catholic by proving that she holds the catholic faith. He therefore concludes that the Reformed churches are the Catholic Churches of God.

Bishop Overall's Convocation Book sets out the principle of a hierarchical church government corresponding to the government of

Christ over the whole world.\(^1\) The ecclesiastical government that Christ set over the Jews was continued under the new covenant when there were a sufficient number of churches to warrant it.\(^2\)

In the Apostles' time the three essential parts of the ministry, the power to preach, to administer the Sacraments, and authority of government rested entirely in the Apostles. They ordained "a second degree of ministers" for local work, but the latter did not have the power and authority to ordain or the apostolic keys to excommunicate.\(^3\) No other bishops besides the Apostles were necessary at first; in the process of time, however, the Apostles did commit these two prerogatives, "containing in them all episcopal power and authority", to men whom they judged "meet", to men such as Timothy and Titus. This was not to be a temporary form of government; the same order and form of ecclesiastical government was to continue in the Church for ever.\(^4\) In reference to ordination, the Church for fifteen hundred years thought it "altogether unlawful" for any but a bishop to ordain a minister of the Word.

It is true that it was decreed that priests should lay their hands with the bishop's upon the one who was to be made a priest; "but they had not thereby any power of ordination, but only did it to testify their consent thereunto, and likewise to concur in the blessing of him; neither might they ever in that sort impose their hands upon any without their bishops."\(^5\)

This, taken at its face value (and there is no reason why it

---

2. Convocation Book, p. 132  
4. Ibid, pp. 147ff.  
5. Ibid, p. 150.
should not be taken in this way), casts a very serious reflection upon the Reformed churches that have only presbyteral ordination. However, Mason quotes a letter from Birch's Life of Tillotson which is important. The letter is by John Cosin, who for some time was secretary to Overall, and it refers to an incident in which a Dr. de Laune, who had been ordained by the presbytery at Leyden, was collated to a living in Overall's diocese. The question was this: was it lawful for him to be inducted to a benefice? And if not, would Bishop Overall be willing to re-ordain him? The bishop says,

"Reordination we must not admit, no more than rebaptization: but in case you find it doubtful, whether you be a presbyte capable to receive a benefice among us or no, I will do the same office for you, if you desire it, that I should do for one who doubts of his baptism ... If thou beest not already etc. Yet for my own part, if you will adventure the orders that you have, I will admit your presentation, and give you institution unto the living howsoever."

We shall leave for a moment the question of whether or not Overall thinks that the order of bishops constitutes a different or higher "ministry" than that of presbyters, and refer to it when we treat Francis Mason.

Near the beginning of his famous, and controversial, sermon on the function of bishops, Downane tells us what he intends to prove: (1) that there were no lay governing elders in the primitive Church; (2) that in the first two hundred years the visible churches endued with power of ecclesiastical government were dioceses, not parishes; (3) that the "Angels" of the churches (Rev. 21:1-3:22) were consequently not parishional but diocesan bishops; (4) that the bishop "being advanced to a higher degree of the ministerie, was set above the other presbyters, not only

in prioritie of order, but also in majoritie of rule": and that not temporarily, but for life, unless for "unworthinesse he were displaced"; (5) that the calling of such bishops is of apostolical and divine institution. The first three propositions are quite straightforward in meaning and in method, so I shall leave them and go on to examine the last two in detail.

The fourth proposition definitely suggests that Downman believes there is a higher "ministry" than that of presbyters; this implies that there is at least a "two-fold ministry". He says that bishops are superior in power to presbyters, and that this power is two-fold: the power of ordination, and the power of jurisdiction. In reference to the former he says that since the Apostles' time the Church has been of the opinion that the right of ordination is such a peculiar prerogative of bishops, as that "ordinarily, regularly, there could bee no lawful ordination but by a Bishop". The authority for this did not come from presbyters, but from the Apostles. The Council of Carthage said that presbyters were to place their hands beside the bishop's hand on the head of an ordinee at ordination. But Downman says that this was not for necessity, but merely for the greater solemnity of the action. He points out that early Church Councils forbade presbyters to ordain, and says that whenever they presumed to do it (when an orthodox bishop was available) the ordination was repealed and "judged of non effect". He refers to Jerome's words that touching the power of order bishops are superior in power to ordain. They are, of course, also superior in power of

1. Sermon Defending the Honourable Function of Bishops, London, 1608, pp.6f. 2. He speaks of there being three degrees of ministers but since he does not discuss the deacon's power I shall not deal with it either. 3. Ibid, p. 37 4. Ibid, pp. 40f.
jurisdiction, in which jurisdiction they succeed the Apostles themselves. In spite of all this, Downme refuses to annex this power and authority of ordination strictly to bishops, in the same way that he refuses to annex the power and authority of Baptism to ministers. He says the ancient Fathers would, in case of necessity, have allowed ordination without a bishop; the papist teaching that it is absolutely null when not done by a bishop is mistaken.

Downme then goes on to demonstrate that government by bishops is an apostolic institution and is therefore a divine ordinance. He spends many pages citing all the authorities he can find in the New Testament and the early Fathers to prove his point; but after he has done so he asks: "May not wee also inferre, that all Churches are so necessarie and perpetually tied unto it, as that no other forme of government is warrantable in the Church of God? ... We doubt not, but where this may not bee had, others may bee admitted; neither doe we denie, but that silver is good, though gould be better".

What Downme is obviously attempting to do is to prove to the English Puritans first, that there is no warrant for their proposed church government in Scripture or in the early Church (see the first three propositions), and secondly, that the episcopal form of government which they are criticizing is actually of apostolic institution; and at the same time to qualify his statements in such a way that no reflections are cast upon the orders and order of government held by some of the Protestant

1. Ibid, p. 42.  2. Ibid, p. 45.  3. Ibid, p. 44.  4. Ibid, p. 43  5. Ibid, p. 95. See also Defence of Sermon 1.4, cap.6, p.139
churches abroad. This is perfectly evident when he refers to the churches who, because of the obstinacy and tyranny of popish prelates, were forced to lose episcopal government in order to redeem "the most precious jewel of the Gospel; which is to be redeemed (if need be) with the loss of all outward things". Finally, then, it is the substance of the Faith of the Church that is of utmost importance, and the form of order of the Church must take a secondary place to it.

This is also, in effect, Francis Mason's position. He declares very decidedly that Scripture sets down that there ought to be three degrees of ministers, and that only bishops are to ordain. In the consecration of a bishop "such ghostly and spiritual power or graces of the Holy Spirit" are given as is necessary to advise a presbyter to the office of a bishop. By means of consecration the ministerial function in general is conferred, but "in particular the ministration of discipline also, that is to say, the power of jurisdiction". This certainly suggests that there is more than one ministry in the Church, and that the bishop's is the highest, from which the others are derived. In the light of that portion of his thought to which we have already referred we might naturally expect him to articulate a full-blown doctrine of Apostolic and Episcopal Succession in which the episcopate is made the essential ministry without which there can be no Church. However, he does not in this respect live up to expectations.

Several years before his Vindication he had made it clear

that where there is unity of faith diversity of rites do no harm. ¹
But it is in the pamphlet The Validity of the Ordination of the
Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, Published in
1641 under Mason's name by John Dury, that we have the most de-
vastating argument against a superior "ministry" to that of presby-
ters. A. J. Mason points out that though Lindsay, the translator
and editor of Mason's Vindication, repudiates the attribution of
the pamphlet to Mason, good authority places it at the doorstep
either of Mason or of - Overall!

"George Davenport, writing to Sancroft in 1655 and the year
following, ascribed it on Cosin's authority to Overall, and
said that Overall had had a hand also in the composition of
Mason's greater work. Mason was a dignitary of Overall's
diocese of Norwich, and the two men were likely to work
together in such matters." ²

At any rate, whether it was Overall or Mason the argument is
important. The author sets out to discover whether the episcopal
order is an order at all, and the investigation is conducted only
among the schoolmen and later divines of the Roman Church. The
conclusion is this: consecration to the episcopal office is not
the conferring of new powers upon the man who is consecrated, but
the liberation of powers which he had before, which had been
hitherto restrained. The "restraint" itself, he says, is jure
divino, but only in the sense that it is according to Scripture
and apostolic ordinance, not in the sense that no other form of
regiment may be admitted. ³

"Wherefore seeing a bishop and a presbyter do not differ
in order, but only in preeminence and jurisdiction, as your-
selves acknowledge; and seeing Calvin and Beza had the order
of priesthood, which is the highest order in the church of God;

see A. J. Mason, Op cit, pp. 92f.
and were lawfully chosen, the one after the other, to a place of eminency and endued with jurisdiction derived unto them from the whole church wherein they lived: you cannot with reason deny them the substance of the episcopal office. And where insomuch their discipline is defective, we wish them even in the bowels of Christ Jesus by all possible means to redress and reform it, and to conform themselves to the ancient custom of the church of Christ, which hath continued from the apostles' time, that so they may remove all opinion of singularity and stop the mouth of malice itself."

Since Cosin was so close to Overall there can be little doubt that this book was written by the latter, or else was written by Mason and received Overall's approbation. It is a clear testimony to their belief in the one ministry of the Church.

Laud has not a great deal to say about the present question, but it is important that his position be made known. We can sum it up by noting that he believes that (1) the distinction between bishops and priests is of divine origin, (2) the Church must be governed by an hierarchical form of government, (presbyterianism is not agreeable with a monarchy), and (3) the ecclesiastical authority which some have over others ought not to be a domineering authority.

John Davenant, writing against the Puritans, denies that ministers are endued with equal authority. The bishops of the Church are in particular the successors of that ordinary superiority of the Apostles which is required for the perpetual conservation and extension of the Church. The power of ordaining belongs to the office of bishops only and does not belong to inferior presbyters. In a well constituted church, if presbyters confer holy orders, it is not only unlawful, but null and void. But in a disturbed church,
where all the bishops have fallen into heresy and idolatry, and orthodox presbyters are compelled to ordain other presbyters, these ordinations Davenant says he cannot call vain and invalid. Here necessity compels, as it does in certain baptisms. Therefore the Continental Protestant churches have not injured episcopal dignity.

Since Davenant goes on to speak of the power of jurisdiction as though it were something different, we can conclude that he does in some sense believe bishops to have a distinct power of ordination from presbyters, and that there is in that sense at least a two-fold ministry in the Church. With reference to the power of jurisdiction he maintains that the power that bishops have over the clergy is not a regal or lordly power, but pastoral or paternal.

Next to Andrewes in importance and stature as thinker, preacher and churchman, among the early Carolines stands Bishop Joseph Hall. As early as 1610 he wrote against the separatist Puritans in a careful little treatise called Against The Brownists. But it was not until 1637 that he published his very notable book Episcopacy By Divine Right. It was specifically prompted by the renunciation of his episcopal function on the part of Graham, Bishop of Orkney. Hall repudiates the idea of taking the foreign Protestant churches as examples for church government. They were forced to discard the episcopal office because the popish bishops would not be reformed. But in Britain the bishops preach and write for the Reformed Faith, and are, if necessary, ready to die for it.

Not only that, episcopal government was raised by the hands of the Apostles and is therefore of divine institution. But this government which they erected was intended not only for their own time and place; it was to continue for ever. Though the "bounty of gracious princes" has added to the outward dignity of the Church in England, her government is in substance the same as that originally established in the Church. And this is necessary. Though there may be varieties of circumstantial fashions in particular churches, yet the substance of the government must always be the same.

"The Holy Ghost led them into it; and therefore we, unless we will oppose the ordinance of the Holy Ghost, must not detract to continue it."

But exactly what is episcopacy? "Episcopacy is no other than a holy order of church-governors, appointed for the administration of the church, or more fully thus: Episcopacy is an eminent order of sacred function, appointed by the Holy Ghost in the evangelical church for the governing and overseeing thereof; and for that purpose, besides the administration of the word and sacraments, endued with power of imposition of hands and perpetuity of jurisdiction."

But is the episcopate a separate order? "For ourselves, taking order in that sense in which our oracle of learning, Bishop Andrewes, cites it out of the School, qua potestas est ad actum specialia, there can be no reason to deny episcopacy to be a distinct order. In the church of England, every bishop receives a new ordination, by way of eminence commonly called his consecration, which cannot be a void act, I trow, and must needs give more than a degree. And why should that great and sacred council (Chalcedon) define it to be no less than sacrifice to put down a bishop into the place of a presbyter, if it were only an abatement of a degree? I demand, what is it that is stood upon, but these two particulars, the especial power of ordination, and power of the ruling and censoring of presbyters? if these two be not clear in the charge of the apostles to those two bishops, one of Crete (Titus), the other of Ephesus (Timothy) I shall yield the cause, and confess to want my senses."

The power of ordination in itself implies a manifest superiority, and antiquity indicates that strict laws were set up to prevent

presbyters from usurping the privilege of laying on of hands.

Hall is here merely expressing with greater clarity and penetration what has been said by some of the afore-mentioned divines. Because of what he says about the uniqueness of the episcopal order, it is not surprising that he insists upon its retention in the Church with such fervor. However, he too refuses to make it indispensable to the life of the Church. In his *Humble Remonstrance for Liturgy and Episcopacy* (1640-1) he says,

"When we speak of divine right, we mean not an express law of God, requiring it upon the absolute necessity of the being of a church, what hindrances soever may interpose, but a divine institution, warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had... Those particular churches to which this power and faculty is denied lose nothing of the true essence of a church, though they miss something of their glory and perfection..."

To the Puritan criticism that the policy of the Church of England (under Charles and Laud) was to give full recognition to the order of the Roman Church but not to the orders of the reformed churches, Hall replies:

"That what fault soever may be in the easy admittance of those who have received Romish orders, the sticking at the admission of our brethren returning from the reformed churches was not in case of ordination, but of institution: they had been acknowledge ministers of Christ, without any other hands, laid upon them; but according to the laws of our land, they were not perhaps capable of institution to a benefice, unless they were so qualified as the statutes of this realm do require. And secondly, I know those, more than one, that by virtue only of that ordination which they have brought with them from other Reformed churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings, without any exception against the lawfulness of their calling."

It must be further noted that Hall shows no explicit concern with strict Apostolic-episcopal succession. His treatise on *Episcopacy By Divine Right* deals entirely with the rightfulness of episcopal government; the necessity of Succession as the means b; 1. *Ibid.*, p. 391. 2. *Ibid.*, p. 356
which ministerial power is preserved in the Church is not referred to. In his little work against the Brownists he never employs the argument that they have separated from the Apostolic Succession. But the decisive indication that his thought does not run on such lines is the attack he uses when he is defending his assertion that Rome is a true visible church. Not once does he try to substantiate his case by resorting to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

Before we leave Hall let us observe the following characteristics of his conception of episcopacy.

1. The bishop's rule is not lordly, but brotherly or paternal. Hall does not however, develop this sufficiently for us to be able to say how clearly he conceived of it. The Puritans for years had been claiming that Lord bishops were unscriptural, and the Churchmen had always replied that, though the prelates of the Church of England were called lord bishops, it did not imply that they claimed a lordly rule. Exactly what this means was not always easily determined. And so it is with Hall. However, if we look at a sermon that he preached in 1622 in which he expresses so well the fact that the true Church is visible in the world only under the shadow and reproach of the Cross, and interpret it in relation to his own conduct as a bishop, it is possible to say with some certainty that he knew that neither the Church, nor the bishops of the Church, could exercise a lordly and glorious rule.

2. Church government is not monarchical; it is "aristocratical". A bishop is not only subject to the judgment of a synod, but it is also determined by law that in many matters he take the advice and assistance of his ecclesiastical presbytery.

(3) The ancient form of election to episcopal office was by the vote of the presbyters. Hall points out that this is not now the method in England but "Were it pleasing to his majesty and the state to decree it, we should be well content to submit to this ancient form of election ..."

Moving from the 16th century to the Early Caroline Period we are able to discern certain modifications in the thought of the "Anglicans" in reference to the order and ministry of the Church. The peculiar turn that their arguments take is brought about to a large extent by the particular historical situation. First of all, the Puritans were still writing and preaching against episcopacy, advocating its overthrow and the establishment of some kind of presbyterian or congregational form of Church order; they were making a powerful impact upon many. The Churchmen had not only to show the untruthfulness of the arguments in favor of Presbyterianism, but to give a convincing defence of episcopacy as such. This they did by ransacking Scripture and the writings of the Fathers for every conceivable straw of supporting evidence.

Secondly, the authority of bishops was being ignored by many: sects were growing up which openly rejected episcopal jurisdiction and were ordaining their own ministers; some left-wing non-separatists, in order to avoid episcopal ordination, were going abroad to be ordained by a presbytery in some continental reformed church, and returning to look for benefices or lectureships; many non-separatist Puritan ministers were forming their own presbyteries among themselves for the sake of discipline in an attempt to avoid episcopal jurisdiction. The bishops, and those who were loyal

1. Ibid., p. 831. 2. This is not an attempt to "explain away" the arguments of the early Carolinians but simply to recall the setting.
to the established Church, marshalling the arguments in defence of episcopacy already recounted, made a desperate attempt to convince the wandering sheep and bring them back into the fold of the true shepherds of the Church. Thirdly, all these arguments had to be put forth in such a way that they would not constitute an attack on the Protestant brethren on the Continent who had not embraced episcopacy.

The early Carolines thought the Church of England was a Protestant Church (the term did not mean non-Catholic) and that it was therefore at one with the Protestant churches elsewhere. But as they laid ever increasing stress on the necessity of episcopacy, they cast increasingly serious reflections on their fellow Protestants—a situation to which they were not insensitive. Thus, recognizing the reformed churches as truly Catholic, since they held the pure Catholic faith, they had to qualify their statements about episcopacy in such a way as to prevent the validity of these churches from being called into question.
Section III - The Later Caroline Period

"Religion cannot be at all in communities of men, without some to guide, to minister, to preserve, and to prescribe, the offices and ministeries: - what can profane holy things but that which makes them common? and what can make them common more than when common persons handle them, when there is no distinction of persons in their ministration? ... A holy place is something; a separate time is something; a prescript form of words is more; and separate and solemn actions is more yet; but all these are made common by a common person ..."

So writes Jeremy Taylor in his Divine Institution of the Office Ministerial. 1 From a reading even of this brief passage, we might assume that we have come a long way from the Reformers. Instead of a mighty gospel to be preached through which the Lord Jesus Himself encounters men, instead of the Sacraments of the gospel to be administered by which Christ unites His own people with Himself, instead of prayers to be spoken to a living Lord who answers His people according to His promise - instead of this, we have "religion", a giving and receiving of "holy things" which must be in the hands of men who are "holy", or else the whole transaction becomes "common". The very "natural design" of religion necessitates distinct persons whose calling is holy and whose persons are taught to be holy. These, "being made higher than the people by their calling and religion, and yet our brethren in nature", may then be "intermedial" between God and the people. 2 Taylor says that since this is the way with all religions, if the Christian religion were to be otherwise it would suggest either that Christian rites are of "no mystery and secret dispensation, but common actions of an ordinary address, and cheap devotion", or that

2. Ibid, p. 683.
Christians undervalue all religion. 1

But how are ministers made fit or holy for their task? Taylor refers to the breathing of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles, which gave them the power for their mission; it was part of their commission or ordinary apostleship (the extraordinary part was to come at Pentecost) "to which the ministers of religion were, in all ages, to succeed." 2 This power is absolutely essential to the ministration of the Church ordinances. Taylor grants that a lay person in extreme necessity may preach the gospel to a dying heathen, but only then. But Baptism performed by a layman has no efficacy, for he cannot be a minister of sacramental grace. 3 Furthermore, in Baptism the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are used and they must not be usurped by hands to which they were not consigned. 4 In reference to the Lord's Supper Taylor says "if it be a holy, separate, or Divine and mysterious thing, who can make it, (ministerially, I mean) and consecrate or sublime it from common and ordinary bread, but a consecrate, separate, and sublimed person?" 5 And so is the Church a "royal priesthood", the denomination being given to the whole church from "the most excellent part (i.e. the clergy); because they altogether make one body under Christ, the head, the medium of the union being the priests." 6

It was, then, Christ's breathing of the Holy Ghost that first consecrated, separated, and "sublimed" the persons of the Apostles that they might perform the ministry above mentioned, a ministry into which the ministers of all ages were to succeed. But how

does this succession take place? According to Taylor, only through ordination by the Apostles, or by those who succeed into their full, ordinary, apostolic offices and powers, the bishops. These full, ordinary, apostolic offices and powers are preaching, baptizing, consecrating (elements), ordaining, and governing. Thus in a sense there are two successions: the one is that of the ministry of presbyters who have the power to perform the first three of these offices; the other is that of bishops who have the power to perform all five. It is the second order or succession that is primary; the other is secondary. "... Episcopacy is not only a divine institution, but the only order that derives immediately from Christ."¹ The presbyteral order as such is derivative not from Christ but from the episcopal order. Taylor completely rejects the notion that bishops and presbyters are of the same ministry or ministerial order and differ only in degree or power of jurisdiction. He says that in all orders there is the impress of a distinct character; the person is qualified with a new capacity to do certain offices which before his ordination he had no power to do. When a presbyter is made a bishop he is ordained afresh, and a fresh character is impressed.

Since this is what Taylor believes about the nature and character of the ministerial office we can well imagine what his comments will be about the problem of episcopal versus presbyteral ordination. After his statements about the new "character" that is given to a presbyter when he is episcopally consecrated, Taylor goes on to say:

"If to this be added that in antiquity it was dogmatically resolved that by nature and institution of the order of bishops ordination was appropriate to them, then it will also from hence be evident that the nullity of ordination without a bishop is not dependent upon positive constitution but on the exigence of the institution ... Ordination is the proper and peculiar function of a bishop, and therefore not given him by positive constitution of the canon."¹

This is why ordinations by presbyters were, in antiquity, judged to be null; Taylor insists that they were judged null because they were not valid, not because they were uncanonical.

Thus bishops are the only persons who can give the Holy Spirit that is necessary for ordination; they are also the only persons who can give the Spirit in confirmation. Taylor points out that in Acts we see that preaching and baptizing were carried on by many, other than the Apostles themselves. But the giving of the Holy Ghost could be performed only by them. However, this is a function which is perpetually necessary for the life of the Church, that Baptism should be confirmed by the gift of the Spirit. Therefore the power of performing this work was inherited by the bishops alone.² If any inferior ministers dare to usurp this function they "do hurt indeed to themselves, but no benefit to others, to whom they minister shadows instead of substances".³

The subordination of presbyters to bishops is made complete when we see that the former have no jurisdiction essential to their order, but only that which is derivative from apostolic preeminence.⁴ It is therefore obvious that the regiment of the Church now must be so ordered that full scope is given to that preeminence.

Everything that belonged to the regiment of the Church in the

Apostles' time need not be preserved in the Church of England; but she must have no government other than that of the apostolic Church. Taylor quotes Cyprian with approval:

"When our blessed Saviour was ordering his church, and instituting episcopal dignity, he said to Peter: 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church'. Hence comes the order of bishops, and the constitution or being of the church, that the church be founded upon bishops."2

All legislative power and jurisdiction resides in the episcopal order. In each diocese it is the bishop who has in his own charge "a legislative or power of command". Over the Church at large it is the whole council of bishops that orders and directs her. Taylor does not believe in an ascending hierarchy of order and jurisdiction above bishops. In the same way that all the Apostles were equal in honor and power with Peter, so the bishops are equal with one another. As the whole hierarchy ends in Jesus, so does every particular one end in its own bishop. "Beyond the bishop there is no step, till you rest in the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls."3

In the diocese the bishop's authority is supreme. Taylor maintains that whatever the bishop "commands us as from God, in that his power and legislation are properly exercised", is "absolutely to be obeyed without any other condition or reserve."4

In spite of this Taylor insists that the bishop's rule must be

1. Ibid, p. 159  
2. Ibid, p. 162  
3. Ibid, pp. 733f.  

We must remember, of course, that here Taylor is writing against Rome. We ought not to interpret him to mean that archbishops are either wrong or unnecessary. He is simply saying that there is no higher order of ministry than that of bishops.
paternal. As Christ was Lord of all and yet Servant of all, so must the Apostles be. The rule of bishops is a government, but it is neither a "power to constrain" nor a "commission to get wealth." It is a rule "as of him that minister." Nevertheless the bishop's authority is final. But what if the bishop himself is a heretic or a schismatic? Is it then permissible to separate from him? Only if he is judged to be guilty by a synod of bishops. But then separation will not be necessary for he will be deprived.

"But let the case be what it will be, no separation from a bishop, 'ut sic', can be lawful; and yet if there were a thousand cases, in which it were lawful to separate from a bishop, yet in no case is it lawful to separate from episcopacy; that is the quintessence and spirit of schism, and a direct overthrow to Christianity, and a confronting of the Divine institution."2

Finally, what does Taylor think of the reformed churches of the Continent? He confesses he does not know what to think. He recognizes that his immediate forbears did not condemn then, but now he feels that episcopacy is beginning to be thought of lightly because of it. He suggests that the question ought more to be, "What we think of the primitive church, then what we think of the reformed churches?". If antiquity was right in condemning ordination by presbyters then surely it can be no sin for the Church of England to do the same. The argument that it is by necessity they have no bishops, Taylor shrugs off. He says if God intended to build a church in any place, He would see that those things were available for the constitution of a church.

"The work of Christianity could not be completed, nor a church founded, without the ministry of bishops. Thus the case is evident, that the want of a bishop will not excuse us from our endeavors of acquiring one; and where God means to

2. Ibid, p. 235
"found a church, there he will supply them with those means and ministers, which himself hath made of ordinary and absolute necessity ...

"But shall we then condemn those few of the reformed churches, whose ordinations always have been without bishops? No indeed; that must not be: they stand or fall to their own master. And though I cannot justify their ordinations, yet what degree their necessity is of, what their desire of episcopal ordinations may do for their personal excuse, and how far a good life and a catholic belief may lead a man in the way of heaven, although the forms of external communion be not observed, I cannot determine."

We have given Taylor a fairly detailed treatment because he is rather unique in the 17th century. He is the only divine of outstanding ability in the century who so thoroughly annexed all the powers of the Church to the order of bishops. In spite of the fact that he refuses to condemn outright the reformed churches abroad, it is obvious where the axe falls. His doctrine of the Holy Spirit is so fully conceived of in the context of episcopal succession — that is, he sees the Spirit almost completely in terms of the gift of the historic Christ which is passed on from hand to hand in the successive generations of the Church — that he is able to discuss the work of the ministry entirely in terms of the "power of order", without significant reference to Christ's immediate relation to, and sovereignty over, the Church.

Taylor also does what the Anglican Fathers in the previous century would never have done: he explicated his doctrine of the ministry and order of the Church with little or no reference at all to what those same Fathers spoke of as "the Gospel", "the Word of God", "pure doctrine", or "the true Catholic Faith". They were convinced that it was impossible to consider the true ministry of the Church apart from the pure Biblical doctrine.
This is no problem at all for Taylor. The exercise of ministry in the Church is entirely dependent upon the power of order. This power is simply given at ordination and nowhere else. His language would suggest that the having or not having of this power is dependent only upon the person who performs the ordination. It follows that the use of the power of order may be suspended on account of heresy, but that the power itself is an autonomous reality not affected in any way by the substance of the doctrine ministered by a man. If this is true then it is natural that the ministry and order of the Church is discussed by Taylor without constant reference to the gospel that is to be ministered.

Henry Hammond speaks of the apostolic office and of succession in much the same way as Taylor. The Apostles only (not the seventy disciples) succeed Christ in His office, as Joshua succeeded Moses in his office and power. He goes on to say that no man ought to assume to himself any office in any society, but only he who is designated for it by the one who has the supreme power over it. So it is in the Church: only he who is called by God, as Aaron was, must bear office. But now no one receives such a call immediately from heaven, so there is only one way to claim it: namely, by receiving it from those who have received it immediately from heaven. Hammond means, of course, from the bishops who have, derivatively, received it from heaven. In the same way the Apostles succeeded Jesus, so the bishops succeeded to

Apostles. The ordination of presbyters does not give them the power to ordain. The words "Receive the Holy Ghost" do not contain under them all that is there when they are used in the consecration of bishops, but only those particular things mentioned immediately afterwards. The power of ordaining is not mentioned and it therefore remains with the bishop. He goes on to say that the lack of bishops in the reformed churches is not only a defect but a corruption among them, though the fault lies not with them but with their superiors in the state who will not permit them to have bishops. Certainly their situation is not comparable with those people at home who want to cast out all bishops.

The bishops hold their offices by the right and establishment of the Lord Himself. This must be kept in mind for the whole well-being of the Church (which consists in unity), yes, and even the very being of the Church (which consists in the truth of the doctrine and obedience to the Institution of Christ) depends upon the qualifications of those who hold the office of teaching in the Church. And if the Governors of the Church have not the power to decide who shall be entrusted with that office, and to exclude those whom they judge unfit, and to prescribe forms of "wholesome" doctrine within which all are obliged "to contain themselves", it will be impossible to maintain truth or peace, or even Christianity itself.

The distinction between doctrinal and personal succession Hammond acknowledges to be reasonable, but he objects when it is interpreted to mean that "unless the assertors of the necessity of succession, can prove that their Bishops succeed the Apostles in

purity of doctrine they do nothing". He believes that those who do not do everything may yet do something: "he that said, half was more than all, was not so grossly out, as he that made it equal with nothing".¹

At the request of Charles I, Robert Sanderson wrote a treatise entitled *Episcopacy (as established by Law in England) not Prejudicial to Regal Power*. The work was produced in 1647 but not published until 1661. It is prefaced with a quotation from a royal proclamation made on August 18, 1637, which declared that processes could issue out of the ecclesiastical courts in the name of the bishops, that a patent under the Great Seal was not necessary for the keeping of ecclesiastical courts or for citations, suspensions, excommunications, and other Church censures. Summons, citations, and other processes of these courts, inductions to benefices, correction of ecclesiastical offences by these courts no longer had to be in the king's name or under his seal. It was this proclamation that had prompted some Puritans to make the charge that the bishops were undermining the royal authority.² Bishop Sanderson, in attempting to answer this charge, says that though it is claimed that bishops govern the Church by divine right, we must keep in mind that the words *jus divinum* are not always used in the same "latitude". There is a primary and a secondary signification. The primary sense refers to things that are of divine positive

¹. Ibid, p. 381. ². Laud himself was accused by the Puritans of attempting to wrest part of the King's rightful power out of his hands by his exaltation of the divine right of bishops. The Archbishop replied that he had never denied that the exercise of his jurisdiction was derived from the Crown of England. 

right under the New Testament: Under this sense comes the preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments. The secondary sense refers to those things which have no express command in the Word, but have authority and warrant from the institution, example, or approbation of Christ or His Apostles, and have been held by the common judgment of all the churches in the primitive and succeeding ages needful to be continued; under this sense comes the observation of the Lord's Day, the ordering of the keys, and the distinction between presbyters and deacons.

And what of the government of the Church by Bishops? In what sense is it *ius divinum*? Sanderson believes that it is most probable that it is an institution *ius divinum* in the former sense, and that this can more easily be defended than confuted. However, since it is expedient to avoid a dispute and since the lesser sense is sufficient, most of the divines of the Church of England have chosen to rest episcopacy upon *apostolica designatione*.

In a brief appendix to the book Sanderson gives his own opinion as being that episcopal government is not to be derived merely from apostolic practice or institution, but that it was originally founded in the Person and Office of Christ Himself, who sent the Apostles as His Father had sent Him, "to execute the same Apostolical and Pastoral office for the ordering and governing of His Church until his coming again."

In reference to the main purpose of the book, which was to show that episcopacy was not "prejudicial" to the King's power, Sanderson acknowledges that the external power of jurisdiction of bishops is, in the very substance of the power itself wholly and

entirely derived from the King, and therefore not of divine right. Other power such as preaching, ordaining, and absolving, though the substance of the power is from God, are so regulated in the outward exercise of them by the laws and customs of the land that the execution of them still depends upon the regal authority.  

Henry Ferne follows the general concensus of opinion held by his colleagues in reference to ministerial orders. He confesses that he does not know whether the episcopal function is a distinct order from that of presbyters, though he does believe that bishops have a faculty or power to ordain which presbyters have not. And bishops do not receive and exercise this power by a "moral designation" only (such as civil offices do for their time in office), but by a "Real Consecration" which, though it does not imprint a Sacramental character on the soul, yet it gives to the person "so ordained and devoted such a faculty or habitude to that action or work, as cannot be taken from him." The question is this: Is this power superadded to make bishops have a distinct power from that which they had as priests? Or is it communicated as part of the priestly order and in the exercise of it simply restrained to certain select persons? Ferne says the latter alternative is more "easie and expedient" for peaceful agreement, and yet "safe enough for Episcopal Ordination".

At any rate the holy orders of the Church come down through the ages by virtue of successive ordinations. But if this is true the Church of England must have received her orders from Rome. Is it possible that this should be so, since Rome is in

hersay? Ferae maintains that there is a distinction between "Lawful or valid orders" and "Orders Lawfully given or received". The power to give valid orders remains in heretics or schismatics, though they cannot give them lawfully. They retain the power itself, the "Character that is indelible." It is on account of this that the Church of England was able to receive her orders from Rome.

In connection with the non-episcopal churches of France and Switzerland Fena says that we must remember that there are two things which are necessary (though not equally) to the "constitution and continuance" of the Church. The first is the "Doctrine of Faith and Life", and the second is the order of ministry and government of the Church. To have pastors properly sent and lawfully ordained is extremely important to the life of the Church, but it is the doctrine of faith and life that is of first importance, while the ministry is "to serve unto it". That means that though some churches lack the properly appointed order of the Church we cannot judge them to be

"no Churches or Congregations of Christians; but we look upon them as Churches not completed or regularly formed, and excuse their defects so far as they are enforced on them by necessity, and conclude them bound to seek their Completion, and a supply of their defects from those that have Bishops, and hold the ancient Apostolike way of the Church".

Ferna is perfectly ready to accept the plea of necessity from the Reformed churches, but ho is adamant in his insistence that the true order of the Church (bishops, priests and deacons) is to be strictly observed where it can possibly be had and kept.

1. Ibid, pp. 143f; see also pp. 172f. 2. Ibid, p.148; Cf.,p.97. 3. Ibid, pp. 99ff.
Deliberate rejection of this order is a sin against the commandment of Christ and His Apostles, and, in effect, an open act of schism.\(^1\)

Another later Caroline, rather unique in his thinking (and certainly unique in his literary style, which is one of the most difficult I have ever encountered) is Herbert Thorndike. Many of the assumptions of the ecclesiastical group to which he belongs he quite naturally accepts: he asserts that bishops are of apostolic institution, that the Apostles were bishops, and that bishops are the successors of the Apostles.\(^2\) But - and this is where he differs from most of his Anglican contemporaries - not only the bishops, but the bishops and presbyters together are the full successors of the Apostles. He insists that the early bishops were heads of presbyteries: the government of the Church passed to the bishop and his presbytery.\(^3\) Further, the power of ordination rests in the bishop and presbytery together. He admits that in antiquity this practice changed so that the bishop alone became the ordainer. However, in the beginning not only did presbyters participate in the ordination services,\(^4\) but the people themselves had a share in giving consent to those who were to be ordained as their presbyters. And if this is true surely it was "due and right" that presbyters and people played their part in designating who should be consecrated their bishops. But this alone was not sufficient for the consecration of bishop. The imposition of the hands of neighbor bishops was not formality, but part of the very substance of the thing.\(^5\) We see, then, that Thorndike is not sticking entirely to the well-worn path.

---

1. Ibid, pp. 102ff, 110f, and 128.  
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But he certainly is not capitulating to presbyterianism: "He that aimeth at the primitive form, and that which cometh nearest the institution of our Lord and His Apostles, must not think of destroying Bishops, but of restoring their presbyteries." ¹

That Thorndike consistently maintains his position that presbyters stand with bishops as the successors to the ordinary apostolic authority and power is evident when we examine part of his work The Right of the Church In a Christian State (1649). He there maintains that the power of the keys, which is the root of all ecclesiastical power, was entrusted to the Apostles and the Church. He goes on to say that either the Church must "challenge it against the apostles" (Thorndike seems to mean that the Church must claim to have the ecclesiastical power in herself independently of the Apostles), or else recognize that it was in the Church because it was in the Apostles, who had it before the Church was founded. "... Whereupon the office of the Apostles is called ἐπισκοπή, a Bishopric, before the Church was thereof they were Bishops..." ²

We might assume from this that only the bishops have the power of the keys and therefore the root of ecclesiastical power. But a little later, when he is discussing the question of lay-elders, he asserts that only to presbyters belongs the right of the celebration and consecration of the Eucharist because it is convertible with the power of the keys. Preaching and baptizing can be performed by inferiors, but not the celebration of the Eucharist. Therefore only presbyters (and, of course, bishops too) have the power of the keys, and since the power of the keys is the root of all ecclesiastical power, presbyters

¹. Ibid., p. 91; see also pp. 95f.  ². Ibid., p. 450
have a full share with bishops in the government of the Church.

It is interesting to note that Thorndike does not always identify the ministry of the keys with the "celebration and consecration of the Eucharist". He admits, for one thing, that Cyprian places the power of the keys in the Sacrament of Baptism, though he (Thorndike) has elsewhere said that it may be administered by some one who is himself only baptized and not ordained. In reference to the commission in ordination "whose sins ye remit, etc., " Thorndike says there can be no doubt but they are here authorized to declare forgiveness of sins to whoever is disposed by "serious contrition and true faith to receive it at God's hands". This is called the ministry of the keys. However, he points out that formerly the ministry of the keys was seen to be in bringing men to the place where they were capable of forgiveness, in bringing them to see their own sin and in directing them in the course by which they might come to reconciliation with God. It is undoubtedly for this reason that he is prepared to give precedence to preaching over prayer in the task of the ministry. But it is significant also, the place he gives to the congregation in this work. Discussing Matthew 18:13-20, he says that the Church is given by Christ the power of binding and loosing, and is then told how this power can become effectual: namely, by the intercession of the congregation of God's people. In drawing this conclusion Thorndike is consistent with what he has said about the power of the keys being entrusted to the Apostles and the Church. He is also consistent when he protects himself from

---

1. Ibid, p. 367.  
2. Ibid, p. 474.  
misunderstanding by saying that "This maketh the interest of the congregation in the work of discipline to be considerable, but entailleth it not to the keys of God's house", for he did after all say that the keys were in the Church only because they were first in the Apostles.1

The existence of bishops in the Church is by virtue of apostolic institution and there can, according to Thorndike, be no justification for not retaining them. He is prepared to pardon the brethren of the reformed churches abroad because they could not discern the succession of the apostles amongst the bishops on account of the "abundance of accessories", though there can be no excuse for the disobedient sons in England.2 He believes that the continental Reformers could not retain the historic office of the bishop without sacrificing something that was more important.

"Seeing that edification is the end for which the society of the church subsisteth, and all pastors and officers ordained as a means to procure it, as it is sacrilege to seek the end without the means when both are possible, so I conceive it would be sacrilege not to seek the end without the means when both are not. Now it is manifestly possible that the edification of the church may be procured effectively by those that receive not their power or their office from persons endowed with it themselves afore".

But he goes on to point out that, according to the resolution of Guilielmus Antiasiodorensis, presbyters, in case of necessity, can propagate the order of bishops. If this is true Thorndike says Christian people may in necessity appoint bishops, priests, and deacons, and they ought to be acknowledged by the rest of the Church provided they submit to the general laws of the Church. Instead of solemn ordination by imposition of the hands of persons endowed

1. Ibid, pp. 59f.  2. Ibid, pp. 92f.
with lawful ecclesiastical power, this acknowledgement itself is effectual. He denies that this invalidates God's precept concerning the necessity of personal succession; if it were not necessary then schism would be no sin. But it is commanded for the sake of the edification of the society of the Church and it is "not binding, when both are not possible, but the chief is". The reformed churches can be excused on the grounds of necessity for not having retained the personal succession of bishops, but no necessity can be alleged for not erecting bishops, presbyters, and deacons, over themselves with such limits of power as was determined by the Apostles.

It is obvious that Thorndike has a more flexible conception of ecclesiastical power and authority than many of his contemporaries. The possession of this power is not made a strict prerequisite to the validity of the administration of the Sacraments or of Ordination. It is the peaceful and proper ordering of the Church for the sake of her edification that is important. Rulers for the sake of the Church have been provided to this end and their rule continues through the ages of the Church as they propagate the succession of their own office. Thorndike maintains that it is only within the unity of this rule that the ordinances of the Church are effective. Thus he says that the Eucharist is only sound and effective "under the Bishop, that is, in the unity of the Church." He also says that ordinations done in schism are nullities, even though they are performed by persons rightly ordained, because they are against the

1. Ibid, p. 605  
2. Ibid, p. 606  
3. Ibid, p. 221
unity of the Church. But when the schism is healed the ordination is made valid without further ordination by the mere consent of the Church.\(^1\) However, Thorndike does not make this the only standard of judgment. He is not prepared to pronounce the sentence of schism upon the Reformed churches a broad because there is something even more important to be considered. They profess all that is necessary to the salvation of all Christians, "either in point of faith or manners" and can therefore not be condemned as having "forfeited the being of a church".\(^2\)

Before we pass on to other figures in this period there are two further points in Thorndike's thought to which we must refer.

1. He asserts that in the early church "always and everywhere, all congregations of Christians, remaining in the country adjoining to any city, made one church with the Christians of that city."\(^3\) This practice was followed everywhere because it was recognized that it was of apostolic institution that particular congregations ought to be dependent upon the episcopal churches of the city. However, the dependence of a cathedral church upon a metropolitan church is entirely a human arrangement.\(^4\)

2. Thorndike is obviously not satisfied to leave open the question concerning church government. Thus far we have seen that he gives the edification of the Church, in terms of the profession of saving doctrine, precedence over the form of church government. If the former is threatened it must be defended even at the cost of forsaking episcopacy. But the intolerable situation in England made it imperative that he should not leave

any loopholes. He asks: If the power of bishops and presbyters is of divine right, and if the state of the Church becomes corrupt, how can reformation be brought about without a "breach of Divine right" if the church governors oppose it? His answer is as follows:

"... Seeing that all religion, excepting true Christianity, is a most powerful means of disturbing the public peace... it follows by consequence, that all powers that are trusted with the preservation of the public peace, are enabled to forbid that which is not true Christianity... God hath given secular powers such right to restrain pretended Christianity, that when it is used against the true, it cannot be said to be usurped, but abused." 1

However, if this is indeed the only means by which corrupt Christianity can be dealt with when it is held by the lawful rulers of the Church then the Continental Reformation at least was not fully legitimate in its proceedings; there was there a "breach of Divine right". There is, then, a certain discrepancy between what he says here and the justification he has elsewhere made for the reformed churches. The same discrepancy can be found in the writings of most the later Carolines.

John Bramhall, who succeeded James Ussher as Archbishop of Armagh, is a vigorous defender of the Church of England from the attacks of both Romans and Puritans. However, since he is not at all original in his thought, we shall deal with him very briefly. He believes that the government of the Church by bishops was an apostolic institution approved by Christ, and that it was established as a guard against schism; he is therefore convinced that the inundation of sects in England (during the Long Parliament) is the

1. Ibid, pp. 562f; see also pp. 573 and 591.
natural consequence of the abolition of episcopal authority. 1
The historic continuity of the Church rests to a large degree upon
the orderly personal uninterrupted succession of pastors, in which
succession ordination is performed only by bishops. This is impor-
tant, for where we are not sure that there is right ordination we
have not full assurance that there is a church at all. 2 Bramhall
in the usual manner qualifies his statements to show that the
neighbor reformed churches are not judged to be "no churches".
He insists that we must not limit the extraordinary work of God's
Spirit. It is necessary to distinguish between valid and regular
ordination, as it is also necessary to remember that in the consti-
tution of ecclesiastical regiment great latitude is left to parti-
cular churches in relation to times, places, and persons. The
validity of the ordinations of the non-episcopal churches is not
questioned; nor is it denied that they have amongst them the true
nature and essence of a church. Bramhall only refuses to grant
that they have the integrity and perfection of the Church. 3
Episcopacy ought to be held in high honor because it is
obviously of apostolic institution. But for Englishmen there is a
further reason why it ought to be accepted as authoritative: it is
woven and riveted into the body of law of the commonwealth. 4
After the Restoration, when Bramhall was examining the letters of
orders of the men in his diocese, some came who had only presbyteryal
ordination. He informed them that they did not qualify for prefer-
ment in the Church.

"I dispute not the value of your ordination, nor those acts you have exercised by virtue of it: what you are, or might be, here when there was no law, or in other churches abroad. But we are now to consider ourselves as a national church limited by law, which among other things takes chief care to prescribe about ordination ... "

This may be all Bramhall said to them, but there is no doubt that he believed episcopal ordination was the proper and the "safest" way to ensure proper "catholic" orders for the Church.

John Cosin is the next important 17th century figure that must come under our consideration. Being at one time secretary to Bishop Overall it is understandable that he should manifest in his thought the influence of that great man. It is also understandable that he should have felt the impact of Overall's contemporary, Bishop Andrewes.

Cosin's conception of Holy Orders is set forth with rather startling bluntness in the first sentences of a sermon preached at the consecration, in 1626, of Francis White as Bishop of Carlisle. Here, preaching on the usual text (John 20:21,22) ministerial power is described as a definite gift that passes over, once for all, from Christ to the Apostles. The present ceremony of consecration is a work like Christ's work described in the text:

"Which work is the solemn deriving of a sacred and ghostly power upon the persons of the holy Apostles, for the use and benefit of Christ's Church ever after. We call it the Power of the Keys, and those keys, which, over and besides them that are committed to the custody of a priest in his ordination, to bind a sinful and to loose a penitent soul, are here given over, once for all, into the hands of bishops; the key of order to send as Christ sent, and the key of jurisdiction to govern as He governed. A power that till this time Christ had kept, it seems, in His own hands, never parted with it till now ... "

This is what occurred when Christ gave to the Apostles the Holy Ghost, and it happens now in this consecration with the giving of the Holy Ghost. Cosin indicates later in the sermon, as he does in another place, that it is not the essence or the Person of the Holy Ghost that is given (heaven and earth, he says, cannot receive that), but "certain impressions of the Holy Ghost, gifts and graces which the Spirit of God doth bestow", whereby the recipient is warranted to have the Spirit with him forever to enable him to perform his office. But it is important to notice in the above quotation that this power of the keys is "given over, once for all, into the hands of the bishops". It is not surprising, then, to find Cosin insisting shortly afterwards that the Church of England has ever held firm to a "continued line of succession from former known bishops, and so from this very mission of the Apostles". The bishops received the gift; only they can pass it on. Cosin has, to this extent, detached the key of order and jurisdiction from Christ and demonstrated it to be strictly annexed to the episcopal college. He does however confess that it is God who gives the grace though the bishop imposes his hands. Because this is true a man holds his Holy Orders from Christ Himself, and though the bishop may suspend the execution of the power of order, the thing itself, when once given, can never be removed. But what is this power of order? To what functions of the ministerial office does Cosin relate it? He relates it to the administration of the Sacraments, to the celebration of the rite

of matrimony, to preaching, and to prayer in the Church. For our purposes, what he has to say about it in relation to the Eucharist is the most important. The power of order is that which gives a man the ability to consecrate the elements. It is a power to bless common bread and wine to make them become the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, and a power to offer the sacrifice of the Eucharist,

"which is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, made in the name of the Church, for the Sacrifice that Christ made of Himself, and offered upon the Altar of His Cross once for all."

Cosin definitely repudiates the doctrine of transubstantiation and the real sacrificing of Christ. The power of order is also related to the absolving of penitent sinners, which is not to be separated from the right dispensing of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; the latter, Cosin maintains, was expressly instituted for the remission of sins. It is thus a very definite kind of power that Cosin believes is given to the ministers of Christ, a power "both over His mystical Body, which is the society of souls, and over the natural Body, which is Himself, for the uniting both in one."

Because of his "High" concept of church orders, and because he believed the power of giving them had been annexed to the college of bishops, it was natural that he should have grave doubts about the Orders of the non-episcopal reformed churches. However, he was forced by the developments in England in the 1640's to go in exile to the Continent, and for seventeen years he lived in France. The Roman Catholics, claiming the Church of England to be outside the Holy Catholic Church, treated the Anglican exiles

3. Ibid, p. 277; see following.  
5. Ibid, p. 254
as heathens. The Reformed churches welcomed them as brethren and acknowledged that the Englishmen were at one with them in the Faith. Cosin thought that the Anglicans ought to treat the Huguenots in the same fashion, without necessarily approving everything they did. In 1658 he replied to a statement that Fuller placed in his history commending Cosin for not communicating with either the Papists or the Protestants at Charenton: Cosin asserts outright that he would have all the world know that he never refused to join with the Protestants anywhere in all the things in which they join with the Church of England. He declares that he has baptized their children, administered communion to them according to the Anglican rite, married some of them, presented some to be ordained by certain Anglican bishops, and preached at their ordination.

Earlier (1650) Cosin wrote to a Mr. Cordell, "who scrupled to communicate with the French Protestants", urging him not to refuse. Cordell was alleging (1) that they have no priests, and (2) that they have no consecration of the elements. Cosin acknowledges that they have not been rightly ordained by those who, since the Apostles' time, have had the ordinary power and authority to do so, but he refuses to admit that this defect implies this a nullity in their ordinations. He affirms the position held by most Anglican divines earlier in the century: that the power of ordination was restricted to bishops by apostolic practice and the customs and canons of the Church, rather than by "any absolute present that either Christ or his Apostles gave about it. Nor

can I yet meet with any convincing argument to set it upon a more high and divine institution". He goes on to say that whenever a minister ordained in the French Church sought a benefice in the Church of England, he was not required by the bishops to be re-ordained, as they would have done if they judged his original ordination void. Cosin gives a list of authors, Roman and Protestant, who believe that presbyters have the intrinsic power of ordination in actu primo, though for the avoiding of schism the power has been "restrained" to some. He does not say he fully agrees with this position though he refuses to dispute it. Cosin will say only this against the Reformed Church of France: (1) because they have not regular episcopacy among them their ordinations are "inorderly" (2) they are to be severely criticised because they want subordination among their ministers. Wherever the clergy are in great numbers, the maintenance of order makes it necessary that they be distinguished by degrees. "I think they will have more to do to defend themselves for want of subordination than of ordination itself."

Cosin's final and outright declaration of the unity he felt to be among the Protestant churches is to be found in his will. There he affirms that in mind and affection he joins with all who bear the name of Christ and profess the true Catholic faith,

"which I desire to be chiefly understood of protestants, and best Reformed Churches; for where the foundations are safe, we may allow, and therefore most friendly, quietly, and peace fully suffer, in those Churches where we have not authority a diversity, as of opinion, so of ceremonies, about things which do but adhere to the foundations, and are neither necessary or repugnant to the practice of the universal Chur

1. The letter to Mr. Cordell is to be found in Ibid, pp. 401-409.
2. Ibid, p. 527
In the preceding chapters it has been contested that John Pearson adhered to true Anglican doctrine more closely than any of his contemporaries except Beveridge. On the question of the ministry and order of the Church, however, he stands squarely with the "High" Churchmen of his period. In his Exposition of the Creed, strangely enough, he hardly mentions the issue at all, but in a letter written about ten years later (1668) he delineates the position that has come to be generally accepted among the "High" Churchmen.

Some one wrote to him asking if he (Pearson) could give his approval to a pastor who had received ordination after a "classical or congregational way". In his reply Pearson says bluntly that he could not approve. The order of the ministry which is necessary to the continuation of the gospel is derived by a "successive and constant propagation". The peace and unity of the Church depend upon legitimate ordination. Pearson even suggests that the manner in which the continental Reformation took place, in introducing different ordinations, has precluded "all ways of reconciliation"!

At any rate the Church of England must not lose her prized possession,

"If we once admit a diversity in our ordinations, we have lost the honour of succession, we have cast away our weapons of defence; we have betrayed our own cause, and laid ourselves open to the common enemy of all protestants, and we shall at last inevitably fall into the Socinian doctrine, to deny all necessity or use of any mission or ordination."

Pearson goes on to point out to his correspondent that since the validity of ministerial acts depends upon the legitimacy of the ministry, what comfort can any one have in participating in the ordinances of the Church when they are administered by a man whose

1. [218], p. 583f.
orders are not above question? If he is not a priest or presbyter he has no power to consecrate the elements of the Supper, nor has he the ability to effect absolution.¹

Isaac Barrow, like every other God-fearing Anglican of this period, was very concerned with the question of bishops. His concern, however, was not with the succession of Holy Orders, but with the structure of Church government and with the derivation of authority in relation to historical continuity. This is borne out if we look at one of his sermons on the subject of the governors of the Church. He there gives a passionate apologia for the government of bishops on the grounds that the Church is "a well marshalled army". An army has of necessity degrees of authority to preserve order and discipline. And it is discipline that Barrow believes to be so supremely important; without discipline the Church can only be a heap of rubbish.² But God has established a definite government for the Church by which this discipline is to be maintained. In its substantial parts this government which God appointed must be upheld. In lesser matters of ceremony or discipline it is expedient that there should be differences among churches; but the main form of discipline constituted by divine appointment ought not to be abrogated.³

It is with order, peace, and unity, with the defence of the Faith and the institutions of Christ, that Barrow is concerned chiefly; if he also has regard for personal episcopal succession for the sake of maintaining in the Church men who stand in the unbroken line running back to the indispensable source of the power

of order, it does not show itself seriously in his writings. Barrow looks rather to the problem of succession in relation to the derivation of authority. When, for instance, he sets out to give the characteristics of the true guides of the Church no reference to "ordination grace" or "power of order" can be found. The true guides of the Church are those (1) who constantly profess and teach sound apostolic doctrine; (2) who gravely and decently administer the "holy mysteries of our religion"; (3) who derive their authority by a continued succession from the apostles; who are called unto and constituted in their office in a regular and peaceable way, agreeable to the institution of God and the constant practice of his church, according to rules approved in the best and purest ages... who also in a pious, grave, solemn manner, with invocation of God's blessing, by laying on the hands of the presbytery, are admitted thereunto; (4) who do not in an arbitrary, uncertain and fickle manner govern God's people, but rather govern by standing laws; (5) who are sober, orderly, and peaceable in disposition and demeanor, submitting to the government, and maintaining the communion of the saints; (6) who are acknowledged by the laws of the kingdom, "an obligation to obey whom is part of that human constitution, unto which we are in all things (not evidently repugnant to God's law) indispensably bound to submit". It is perfectly clear that in Barrow's eyes the problem facing the English Church is the maintenance of the historic Faith, and proper discipline and order through the work of lawfully constituted governors whose authority is unimpeachable by virtue of its derivation from the tradition of the Holy Catholic Church and the laws

of the English commonwealth. These governors are, and must be, the bishops.

Because of his keen sense of the necessity of discipline and order, it is not surprising to find Barrow giving careful consideration to Rome's assertion that since the Church is one, it therefore ought to be under one external government. He declares Rome's position to be false for quite a number of reasons, the most important of which are worth noting. The New Testament and the early Church, he suggests, nowhere express or provide for such a political union. Such a constitution would necessitate the vesting of some persons or person with sovereign authority, and not only does the New Testament not prescribe any such authority, there are "diverse reasonable presumptions against it." In the primitive times each church (Barrow means each diocese) had perfect liberty and full authority to govern its own members and decide its own affairs. This autonoma continued for some time, though it became tempered according to circumstances of place and time. Once in a while, out of "fraternal solicitude" only, some churches had to advise or reprove a wavering church. As well as that, the bishops of adjacent churches used to meet to consult about the maintenance of the truth, order, and peace of the Church. This was at first done freely, and without rule, but later confederations were formed which were regulated by certain orders established by the consent of all. In spite of this, every church, touching its own particular state, retained liberty and authority. "The peace of the Church was preserved by communion of all parts together, not by the subjection of the rest to one part". A political unity, Barrow
maintains, is not in accord with the nature and genius of the evangelical dispensation, and a union of the whole Church under one sovereign authority would be prejudicial to the main designs of Christianity. He does however believe that it is "convenient" for all those who live under one temporal sovereignty to live similarly within a "spiritual uniformity".  

There is, then, no warrant from Scripture or the primitive Church of an ecclesiastical authority higher than a bishop. Even the councils of the bishops appear to have a very limited authority (Barrow believes compulsive force is not proper to ecclesiastical authority as such2), and what they have is exercised only by the consent of the individual bishops. But it is surely a marvellous example of caution when Barrow refers to the question of ecclesiastical unity within one political commonwealth - a question about which he felt very strongly, as we have already seen - and says simply that it is "convenient" that there should be a "spiritual uniformity"!

Edward Stillingfleet's book Ironicum3 comes as somewhat of a shock if one has for some time been reading only mid-17th century Anglican and Puritan literature.

"I assert any particular form of Government agreed on by the Governours of the Church, consonant to the general rules of Scripture, to be by Divine right, i.e. God by his own laws hath given men a power and liberty to determine the particular form of Church government among them. And hence it may appear that though one form of Government be agreeable to the word, it doth not follow that another is not; or because one

"is lawful another is unlawful; but one form may be more agreeable to some parts, places, people, and time than others are ... So the same reason of Church-Government may call for an equality in the persons, acting as Governors of the Church in one place, which may call for superiority and subordination in another."¹

This is, obviously, a re-assertion of the position of John Whitgift.

The influence of Whitgift, Hooker, and Field can be seen throughout the book.

Stillingfleet maintains that apostolic example is no deciding factor, one way or the other. Example is only authoritative when it is accompanied by some command or rule.² He also concludes that the Jewish pattern is no standing law for Church government; this is another step against the stream, for Taylor,³ and Cosin,⁴ to name only two, had taken the position that the orders of the Church followed that of the priestly orders of Israel, while Thorndike⁵ compared the clergy of the Church with the consistency of the synagogue. Stillingfleet finally demolishes (to his own satisfaction at least) the arguments put forth by presbyterians and episcopallians for only one lawful Church government by saying that (1) no particular form of government is instituted by Christ, and (2) the example of the Apostles is not final because the same form of Church government would not serve a church in its first constitution that is necessary for it when it is actually formed.⁶

In the same way we have seen done by Field and others, Stillingfleet distinguishes between power of order and power of jurisdiction. He shows how by means of the consent of the

---
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pastors of the Church or by the appointment of the Christian magistrate (or both) the power of jurisdiction is delegated in different degrees of completeness, thereby limiting the exercise of the power which all presbyters possess equally. He therefore repudiates those who say that since the power of order is equal, in all Church officers, the exercise of episcopal power is unlawful. He goes on then to demonstrate that those who use distinction of order between the Apostles and seventy Disciples to prove a similar difference of order between bishops and presbyters have confused the issue. The Apostles are a unique college of men who are not succeeded.

But what of the ministerial office itself? What is conferred at ordination? Those who are ordained are given

"a right, authority, and power ... for the dispensing of the Word and Sacraments. Which right and power must not be conceived to be an indelible character, as the Papists groundlessly conceive, but a moral legal right, according to Laws of Christ, because the persons ordained do not act in it in a natural, but a moral capacity, and so the effect must be moral and not Physical, which they must suppose it to be, who make it a Character, and that indelible."

He therefore interprets the ordination words "Whose soever sins ye remit, etc.," not as a sheer gift of power to absolve, but as the gift of authoritative power to preach the gospel, through which men might come and yield themselves to the offer of grace and have their former "rebellions" pardoned. It is therefore a mistake "to think that the ministers of the Gospel succeed by way of correspondence and analogy to the Priests under the Law."

1. Ibid, pp. 261f; see also pp. 362ff.
2. Ibid, pp. 261ff; see also pp. 362ff and 407ff.
5. Ibid, p. 351
The contemporary conceptions of Apostolic Succession, and the attempts to "bring down so large a Catalogue of single Bishops from the first and purest times of the Church", ¹ are scorned by Stillingfleet. He almost repeats Francis White's words verbatim, insisting that the succession the primitive writers were concerned about was not a succession of persons in apostolic power, but a succession in apostolic doctrine. He declares that the retention of bishops at the Reformation had nothing to do with the succession of apostolic power. In the same way that the ecclesiastical government of the early Catholic Church was largely planned on the basis of civil government, ² episcopacy was retained in the Church of England at the Reformation partly because of its amenability to the form of civil government.³ The question that the Reformers were faced with was whether it was more convenient to lay fully aside that form of government which had been so much abused by the Roman Church, or to purge the abuses of the papacy and retain it as it was before its corruption by Rome. While some reformed churches chose the former course, the Church of England chose the latter. But whatever the choice, it was done on the basis of prudence.⁴

Prudence or not, Stillingfleet believes that episcopacy is the proper government for the Church of England. He is unconvinced by the arguments of the Puritans against it. Further than that he asserts that the bringing of full power of discipline into every parochial church is contrary to the practice of antiquity and of the Reformed churches abroad.⁵ Lay-elders had no place in the primitive

2. Irenicum, pp. 495 and 503.  3. Ibid, p. 512; see also pp. 523f.
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Church for there were no presbyters who did not teach. However, Stillingfleet admits that there is a real place for lay persons chosen by the people to represent them in the affairs of the Church. He says also that on the diocesan level bishops should not act alone: the presbyters of each diocese ought to act as a Senate to the Bishop.\(^2\)

William Sherlock, though he undertakes to defeat Stillingfleet's work against the Separatists, advocates the general party line that Stillingfleet had been at pains to contradict. In a rather revealing statement in an earlier book, *The Knowledge of Christ*, he describes the ministry as that which Christ left to govern the Church in His place when He ascended into Heaven. Christ still by "a vigilant Providence" superintends the affairs of the Church, but the external conduct and government has been left to bishops and pastors. Therefore union of Christians to Christ is by their union with the Christian Church; this consists "in their regular subjection to their spiritual Guides and Rulers, and in concord and unity among themselves."\(^3\) Their office, which was first held by the Apostles, remains in the Church by virtue of the apostolic succession, or rather by "successive ordinations". This is the position Sherlock upholds in his defence of Stillingfleet.\(^4\) Those who hold this office, which is the episcopal office, constitute a different and superior order to presbyters. This, he suggests, is illustrated by the fact that bishops act by the

1. *Irenicum*, pp. 450f.  
authority of their office while presbyters act only by the authority of their bishop. The implications of this are three.

The first is that church authority is not derived from the people; it comes wholly from Christ and is individually received by bishops and pastors from someone who stands in the Succession. Secondly, parochial congregations have not the complete essence of a church, because they have not full power of discipline and government within themselves, but are rather parts of a diocesan church. And finally, bishops are the highest governors of the Church.

No synod of bishops can impose anything on a bishop without his consent. Nevertheless, bishops ought to govern their churches by the mutual advice and counsel of their fellow bishops, and those who do not are schismatic, not Catholic, bishops.

The most outstanding figure in the Later Caroline Period is William Beveridge. In spite of the fact that on the question of the ministry and order of the Church he deviates considerably from the original Anglican tradition, his greatness shines through even, or perhaps especially, there.

In his treatment of the ministry he follows the normal pattern of biblical texts. Preaching on "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world", he says that this promise was given only to the Governors of the Church, the fulfilment of which is the pre-requisite for the proper execution of their ecclesiastical functions. All bishops, having the same office as the Apostles, if rightly ordained, enter into that promise. During His life

1. Ibid., p. 426. 2. Ibid., pp. 305f. 3. Ibid., p. 928
Jesus did not confer on the Apostles any Sacerdotal power, for it was yet in the hands of the Levitical Priesthood. But after His Resurrection, when the Levitical Priesthood had expired, He breathed on them the Holy Ghost which was their consecration. The first and principal part of the apostolic or episcopal office is the ordaining of others into it, and giving them power to ordain others, and so successively to the end of the world. For the inferior offices of presbyters and deacons the Apostles transferred "so much of the Spirit upon them as was necessary for that office." The gift of ordination cannot be bestowed by the presbyters or the deacons; that work is entirely in the hands of bishops. It is quite right that presbyters should, at any ordination, lay their hands on with those of the bishop, but it is only by the imposition of the bishop's hands that the ordinee is made a Priest.

And so it is with Confirmation. It too must only be performed by a bishop; only he can give the Holy Ghost, since only he has it to give. Beveridge exalts the necessity of Succession tremendously, calling it the "root of all Christian communion." The means of grace must be rightly administered, and nothing is more necessary than that they who minister them are rightly ordained according to Christ's institution.

"And certainly there neither is, nor ever was, any provincial or national Church upon earth, wherein the institution of Christ and His holy Apostles in this particular hath been more punctually observed, than it is in ours. For as the Bishops and Pastors of our Church have, by a successive imposition of hands, continued all along from the Apostles, received the

same Spirit which Christ by anointed into them for the effectual administration of the Word and Sacraments; so do they after the same manner confer the same Spirit upon others, even by 'laying their hands' upon them, according to the institution of Christ, made known and confirmed to us by the practice of His Apostles and Catholic Church in all ages since. And herein it is that the essence of 'ordination' doth properly consist."

The English schismatics have not respected this succession, and have been willing to separate themselves from it. Because of this they have no ground to pretend to succeed the Apostles and consequently have no right to the Spirit promised in Matthew 28:20. By cutting themselves off from the Church of England they have been severed from the Catholic Church and thereby from the means of grace.

Here, set out in bald terms, is Beveridge's position with regard to the Church's ministry, looked at from the point of view of episcopacy in relation to Apostolic Succession. It is not unfamiliar to us: it has been articulated in its general outlines by many of the men whose works we have examined. Beveridge, like Taylor, simply heightens the argument, and states it in crystal clear, absolute terms.

But we should have a very false understanding of Beveridge if we saw only this in his doctrine of the ministry. There can be no question that his understanding of the ministry as outlined above implies a definite annexation of the Holy Spirit to the episcopal office: all who succeed to the office automatically have the Spirit as their accompaniment. In so far as he asserts this position, in this way, he has bound the Holy Spirit and made Him the possession of the Church. In so far as he asserts that a man's position at

the foot of a list of bishops which goes back without a break to Christ is the test of the regularity of his office, he has set historical succession above the sovereignty of the Spirit. For this he must be severely criticised. But if we examine all his writings it must be confessed that he is his own severest critic, even if unaware of the fact. For instance, it is perfectly obvious that he knew an unbroken succession did not guarantee the possession of the Spirit. He admits that the papists have retained the apostolic succession, but he asserts outright that because they have abused it, clogged it with superstitious ceremonies, and performed the offices of the Church so imperfectly and irregularly, they are "not capable of having this promise (Matt. 28) fulfilled to them".  

Other things, then, must be taken into consideration as well as the Succession. When we examine certain other of his sermons we do not see the same emphasis on Succession at all. In a sermon entitled "Steadfastness to the Established Church Recommended" in which we might well expect a great deal to be said about it, there are only two brief references to proper ordination and lawful calling. He defends the Church of England on the grounds that she professes the full doctrine which was taught by Christ and His Apostles, "the foundation of our whole religion", and that she administers the Sacraments according to Christ's own institution. When, therefore, he is making such radical claims for episcopacy, and particularly for the episcopate of the Church of England, we

1. Ibid, p. 21  
must remember that he knew, even if he did not always say so, that it only stood firm when joined to the true Faith and the pure administration of the Sacraments.

If we go on to look carefully at the passages where he is discussing the Holy Spirit in His relation to the ministerial office we can notice another extremely important fact. The "annexation" of the Spirit to the apostolic office, to which we have referred, was a peculiarly uneasy one. Beveridge knows only too well that the Holy Spirit cannot be bound. The Spirit is God; by Him Christ Himself is present as the apostolic ministry is carried on. It is this latter fact that disturbs the rather factual declaration of the inevitable presence of the Holy Ghost with the Apostles and Governors of the Church. When we read these declarations¹ the fact that it deals with a promise, and that the promise involves the presence of Christ Himself, throws the whole thing into a new dimension. We are then prepared for the words that follow.

"... How great soever the power be, which our Lord committed to His Apostles and their successors, for the government of His Church in all ages, it is but ministerial; ... Yea, whatsoever power they have of this nature, it is still His power in their hands; they derive it continually from Him, who is always present with them. And therefore, as they themselves need to have a care how they exert this power, or neglect the exerting of it; so others had need to take care too, that they neither resist nor despise it."²

Quite clearly Beveridge knows that Christ remains Lord of His Church, and not an absentee-lord either! His attempt to domesticate the Holy Spirit fails because he knows the Spirit cannot be detached from Jesus Christ. That he was not successful in this

attempt is made perfectly obvious by the following:

"But while His Church is here militant upon earth, He exerciseth His regal power, not only in subduing His enemies, but likewise in appointing and commissioning officers, to administer His Word and Sacraments, and the discipline that He hath settled in it, for the increasing, strengthening, and well-governing of the whole, and also of every part of it ... It is He who still appoints and empowereth officers in His Church, for the edifying and well-governing of His people; they are His ministers, His ambassadors, acting only in His name; and it is He alone who makes their ministry effectual, to the ends for which He hath ordained it; for which purpose He also is always present with them, in the execution of their respective offices under Him ... He takes particular care of His Church, as His own proper kingdom and people ... He defends it all along by His Almighty Power; He directs and governs it by His Holy Spirit; He disposes of all things both in it, and out of it, for the benefit and advantage of it; and so will continue to do, till that which is militant here on earth, be made a most glorious Church triumphant in Heaven; and all because, as the Apostle here adds, 'The Church is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all'."

With this understanding of the relation of the Body to the Head, and of the relation of Christ's ministers to Christ Himself, it is impossible consistently to make ministerial validity and efficacy depend upon "something" that is added to the minister's personal existence at his ordination, even if, or rather especially if, this "something" is said to be the Holy Spirit. The gift of the Holy Spirit is not an illusion; He is given. And without that gift no ministry can be carried out. But it is obvious, from Beveridge's remarks, that He is ours because He is still Christ's. Beveridge is perfectly confident that the Spirit is present because Christ promised that He would send Him, and by sending Him performs His own ministry in and through the Church.

CHAPTER V

THE WORD AND SACRAMENTS IN THE CHURCH

Section I - The Sixteenth Century

We must begin with a word about procedure. The Anglican-Roman debate during the 16th century centred upon the Eucharist, and discussion of this question takes a large place in the writings of the Carolines. This chapter would be easier to write - and read - if it were confined to the theme of the Eucharist, or perhaps to both Sacraments, leaving the Word to be dealt with separately. However, it is my conviction, substantiated I think in this chapter, that to do this would be in the end to misrepresent Anglican theology. Anglican doctrine of the Word and of the Sacraments must be understood together; therefore in what follows both will be discussed in relation to the being of the Church.

The Reformers first approach the question of the being of the Church from the angle of the Roman accusation that they are outside the Body of Christ. The Romanists charge that because the Anglicans have severed themselves from the historic institution they are therefore cut off from the Holy Catholic Church. To this charge the Anglicans reply that they are not severed from the Church, for the true Church exists where the Word of God is proclaimed. For example, when Bishop Bonner urges the reformer, Archdeacon Philpot, to "come and be of the church; for there is but one church", Philpot immediately exclaims:

"God forbid I should be out of the Church! I am sure I am
within the same; for I know, as I am taught by the scripture, that there is but one catholic church, one dove, one spouse, one beloved congregation, out of the which there is no salvation.  

Bonner: "How chanceth it then, that you go out of the same, and walk not with us?"  

Philpot: "My lord, I am sure I am within the bounds of the church, whereupon she is builded, which is the word of God."  

We ought to note at the outset that when the Reformers and Elizabethans use the phrase "Word of God" they always mean the Scriptures, unless the context indicates otherwise. When they speak of preaching the "Word of God" they mean preaching scriptural truth. In their minds the movement of reform is an effort to reassert scriptural authority over all matters in the church. Some of the Reformers, such as Hooper, approach the question of the authority of scripture in much the same way as the Puritans of a later day, that is, without a proper regard for the authority of tradition, especially the Patriotic tradition. This is not true of Cranmer and the men closest to him, nor is it true of the Elizabethan divines who succeed them, for they revere the Fathers and quote copiously from them. The early Anglicans are convinced that the faith and order of the early Church, if properly understood, will in themselves condemn the Roman errors. Nevertheless, the authority of the Fathers, and of tradition as a whole, in relation to biblical authority is a dominating issue in the debate between the Papists and the Anglicans. The latter insist that these two authorities must not be regarded as of equal status. They are concerned that the pattern of the early Church's thought and practice be understood afresh, but their work is never primarily...  

1. Philpot, Works, (P.S.) p. 16; also 23, 37f, 212, et c.
directed to that purpose. One concern overrides all others: that they should in all their work be faithful to the Word of God. Jewel says, when forced to deal with this issue:

"But what say we of the fathers? ... We despise them not, we read them, we reverence them, and give thanks unto God for them. They were witnesses unto the truth, they were worthy pillars and ornaments in the church of God. Yet may they not be compared with the word of God. We may not build on them: we may not make them the foundations and warrant of our conscience: we may not put our trust in them. Our trust is in the name of the Lord".1

And when, for another example, we listen to Ridley's "Pious Lamentation" over the reversal that has taken place in Church affairs with Mary's accession to the throne, we hear him bewailing that whereas the Word of God has been preached, read, and heard in every town, church and village, "yea, and almost in every honest man's house; alas! now it is exiled and banished out of the whole realm? It is impossible to understand the Reformers in any part of their work if we forget that for them the Word is primary. New life has been given to the Church in England because the biblical gospel has, after many years of suppression, been released. The Church lives by the gospel. We must take Archbishop Cranmer seriously when he says that if the Church "wanders abroad" and does not contain itself within "the compass and limits of the word written" it is not a true but a false church.

"That church, as it is without the compass of God's promises made in truth, not only may, but also doth commonly, yea continually err and go astray; for they are not coupled to

2. Works, (P.S.) p. 49; notice also his persistent references to the "truth of the gospel", especially in his letters.
"the head Christ, which is the life, the way, and truth."\(^1\)

The question of preaching does not present itself to the Reformers apart from the necessity for the biblical faith to be continually heard in the church. Preaching is simply the written Word become oral Word. "Prophecy is the preaching and expounding of the Word of God."\(^2\) If the early Anglicans write little about the place and status of preaching as such in the life and worship of the Church, it is because this much is taken for granted. They are concerned with what is to be preached, with the nature and character of the gospel. Moreover, the English Papists offer no serious theological challenge to the importance of preaching, whereas from the very beginning the reformed doctrine of the Eucharist is under fire, and it is chiefly for a "heretical" understanding of the Eucharist that the Reformers are tried and condemned under Mary. As long as we keep in mind that the Anglican doctrine is that the Church is grounded in the Gospel, we shall understand clearly why in the Thirty-Nine Articles they define the visible Church of Christ as "a congregation of faithful men in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance". (Article XIX)

Does this mean, then, that the Anglican doctrine of the Church is "lower" than the Roman? Do the early Anglicans conceive of the Church only as a fellowship of believers? Do they lack an adequate doctrine of union with Christ? We must answer no to all three questions. Christ is not absent from the preaching of the Word.

\(^1\) P.S., Remains & Letters, p. 11; see also the letters of Philpot.
\(^2\) Jewel, II (P.S.) On I Thessalonians 5:20; p.880.
That is the whole point; it is Christ who is preached, and it is Christ Himself who touches the hearts of men. It is Christ who draws men to Himself by the Word. It is Christ's own voice that is heard by His people.

"This is the end whereunto the gospel is given, that the people should be saved ... Therefore our Saviour appointed his apostles to this office of preaching his word, saying 'Go and preach the gospel unto all nations' ... By it we hear the sweet voice of our Saviour: ... By it we hear the merciful calling of God: ... By it we are taught to believe, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; that his name is Jesus, because he shall save his people from their sins; and that there is not salvation in any other beside him. For faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." 1

Small wonder, then, that in the liturgies of 1549 and 1552 preaching is not optional but obligatory. The service of Mass on the other hand is complete without preaching. Its fulness is not diminished by the absence of the sermon, which is not difficult to understand when we see that in Catholic theology preaching is merely apologetic instruction and moral exhortation. Preaching is, therefore, not a constitutive element in the Roman priesthood. Except in case of special dispensation, every priest must celebrate his Mass daily, while according to Trid. Sess. XXIII De Sacr. ordinis, can. 1, one may quite well be a priest without ever preaching. 2 Not so those ordained to the ministry of the Church of England. The encounter between Christ and His people takes place in the preaching of the Word as it does also in the celebration of the Sacraments. And it is this personal presence of Christ in both Word and Sacraments, insisted upon by the Reformers, that the Papists could not understand. Cranmer accuses Gardiner of unjustly interpreting what he says to mean that Christ is absent from the Sacrament.

2. See Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, I, i, p. 74.
"For I say (according to God's word and the doctrine of the old writers) that Christ is present in his sacraments, as they teach also that he is present in his word, when he worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers. By which manner of speech it is not meant that Christ is corporally present in the voice or sound of the speaker (which sound perisheth as soon as the words be spoken), but this speech meaneth that he worketh with his word, using the voice of the speaker, as his instrument to work by; as he useth also his sacraments, whereby he worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them." I

We shall return presently to the problem of Transubstantiation that is referred to here. At present we must notice how the archbishop sets the Word and Sacraments in relation to each other. Both are instruments of the living Lord Jesus Christ.

In Roman theology preaching and sacraments could never be spoken about in the same breath as Cranmer has done here. But it is not because he has a "lower" doctrine of the relation between Christ and His people that Cranmer is able thus to set them together. It is because he has a different conception of the nature of salvation and of Christ's relationship to the Church. One of the most important differences between Reformation and Roman theology is that the former has broken away from the all-embracing category of being that dominates the latter. Salvation no longer means the infusion of grace (considered as a divine substance) which raises us to a higher level of being. Grace is now seen to be God Himself being gracious in Christ. To receive grace is to receive Christ.

G. W. Bromiley, in his book on Cranmer, though speaking at this point on a different theme, brings out this contrast. There is in Cranmer's theology, he says, a "personalizing of Christianity". By that he means that Cranmer understands God's gift to us, not as

1. *Lord's Supper* (p. 11).
"a nebulous or quantitative grace, but Jesus Christ Himself with all His benefits". For this reason his doctrine of the Church is not "lower" but "higher" than Rome's. Roman doctrine has it that in the Mass, by means of sacerdotal power, the priest consecrates the bread and sets before the people the "very flesh of Christ". In that sense no doctrine of the real presence of the living Christ is taught. But Anglican doctrine is that with the reading and preaching of the Word, and with the celebration of the Sacrament, Christ Himself comes to His Church and draws her to Himself. As J. C. McLelland puts it, discussing the eucharistic theology of Peter Martyr, the intimate friend of Cranmer and Jewel, "Christ Himself is the real Actor in the Church, in her beginning and her continuance, her justification and her sanctification. It is His Holy Spirit that establishes the Church in being, but also bestows this afresh by the dynamic communication of Christ's properties to His members". Cranmer will therefore not countenance Gardiner's endeavor to distinguish between a "presence" of the spirit of Christ in Baptism and a "presence" of His body and blood in the Lord's Supper. Cranmer maintains that this "is no small derogation to baptism, wherein we receive not only the spirit of Christ, but also Christ himself, whole body and soul, manhood and Godhead, unto everlasting life, as in the holy communion". He saw both Sacraments in terms of union with Christ; in Baptism not less than Communion we put on Christ, Baptism for regeneration, and the Eucharist for "nourishment and augmentation".

1. Ibid, pp. 37f.  
3. Lord's Supper, p. 22.  
We cannot but misunderstand the writings of 16th-century Anglicans on the Sacraments if we do not set their sacramental doctrine in conjunction with their doctrine of the Person and Word of Christ, their doctrine of union with Christ, and their doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Certainly none of them (not even Hooker) deals with the Sacraments in the full, positive theological context that characterizes Peter Martyr's exposition, and I think Dr. McLelland is right when he says that Cranmer's "often negative and one sided statements must be interpreted in the light of Martyr's more positive doctrine". But the early Anglicans are gripped by the living message of the New Testament and it is that, more than any other factor, that leads them to deny transubstantiation. Their eyes have been opened to the work of the living Lord Jesus Christ and nothing can force them to look away, so to speak, to the elements of the Sacraments. This does not mean that for them the sacraments (and the elements) are unimportant. They testify repeatedly that it is God's gracious will to use these earthly means to accommodate, and communicate, Himself to us. Christ comes to us in His Word as He comes to us in the Sacraments. Unquestionably none of these divines can be completely exonerated.

1. This is the limitation, it seems to me, of C. W. Dugmore's otherwise excellent scholarly treatment of the Anglican Reformers' understanding of the Eucharist (The Mass and the Anglican Reformers) he isolates their eucharistic doctrine from what they said about the whole economy of salvation. It is this that enables him to apply the title "Reformed Catholics" to the English Reformers as though this distinguished them from the continental divines. The Rev. Basil Hall is certainly correct in pointing out that by his way of defining, Calvin, Butzer, Martyr, and Melancthon were all "Reformed Catholics". (Scottish Journal of Theology, March, 1960, p. 39)

2. Op cit, p. 39
from the charge of subjectivism in relation to the sacraments, especially in the way they pursue the argument of "worthy reception". A few of them in fact, such as Hooper, Philpot, and Becon, allow themselves to deny the objective presence of Christ in the Sacrament in a very alarming manner. But that is not because they have lost sight of God's objective work and His present lordship over the Church. On the contrary; when we look at their writings as a whole it is clear that they are actually endeavoring to take seriously God's sovereignty over the Church, a personal sovereignty which is exercised by the Holy Spirit. They are trying to let God be God in His Word and Sacraments; they testify that He will do what He has promised. They are not denying, but affirming in a fresh way, the presence of Christ in His Word and Sacrament, a presence that is absolutely real but which is according to the work of the Holy Spirit. Many passages from Ridley, Philpot, Becon, Cooper, Nowell, and Hooker could be quoted to illustrate this. But we can do no better than turn to Cranmer in a very remarkable passage at the end of his discussion with Gardiner.

"The minister of the church speaketh unto us God's own words, which we must take as spoken from God's own mouth, because that from his mouth it came, and his word it is, and not the minister's. Likewise, when he ministereth to our sights Christ's holy sacraments, we must think Christ crucified and presented before our eyes, because the sacraments so represent him, and be his sacraments, and not the priests:

1. It should not be forgotten, however, that whatever they say about faith is to be thought of in relation to election. When they say that Christ is present in the Sacrament only to faith they mean in part that only those who belong to Christ receive Christ.
as in baptism we must think, that as the priest putteth his hand to the child outwardly, and washeth him with water, so must we think that God putteth to his hand inwardly, and washeth the infant with his Holy Spirit; and moreover, that Christ himself cometh down upon the child, and appareleth him with his own self; and as at the Lord's holy table the priest distributeth wine and bread to feed the body, so we must think that inwardly by faith we see Christ feeding both body and soul to eternal life. What comfort can be devised any more in this world for a christian man?  

We treat them unjustly if we say that these Anglicans fail to take seriously the gift of Christ in the elements. Against all the arguments put up by the Roman party in favor of transubstantiation they answer in effect: the bread of the Sacrament is still bread, and the wine still wine. The natural substance of the bread and wine is not converted into the natural substance of Christ's body and blood. Christ's true body is in heaven and it remains there until His coming again. But by grace Christ's body and blood (i.e. Christ Himself) are given in the Sacrament. Bread, retaining its own natural qualities, "may be thus by grace, and in a sacramental signification, his body". The crucified and resurrected Christ is present, but He is present by grace in the Sacrament, not in glory. By means of the earthen vessel the treasure is actually given, though the vessel remains earthen.

It is Jewel who expresses most clearly and positively the position they were upholding.

"We affirm, that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the body and blood of Christ, and that by them Christ himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us, as that by faith

1. Lord's Supper, p. 366; Cf. Ridely, Works, p.13; Philpot, Works, pp. 274-84; Cooper, Against Private Mass, (P.3.) pp. 211ff; Nowell, Catechism; Hooker, Ecc. Polity, V, lvi, 9 & lxvii, 12
2. Cranmer, Lord's Supper, pp. 420ff; Ridley, Works, p. 228.
4. Ibid, p. 15.
"we verily receive his body and blood. Yet say we not this so, as though we thought that the nature and substance of the bread and wine is clearly changed, and goeth to nothing:... Galasius saith, the substance of the bread, or the nature of the wine, ceaseth not so to be:...' ... "And in speaking thus, we mean not to abase the Lord's supper, that it is but a cold ceremony only, and nothing to be wrought therein; (as many falsely slander us we teach.) For we affirm, that Christ doth truly and presently give his own self in his sacrament: in baptism, that we may put him on; and in his supper, that we may eat him by faith and spirit, and may have everlasting life by his cross and blood. And we say not, this is done slightly and coldly, but effectually and truly. For although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold him fast, and eat him by faith, by understanding, and by the spirit. And it is in no vain faith which doth comprehend Christ: and that is not received with cold devotion, that is received with understanding, with faith, and with spirit. For Christ himself altogether is so offered and given us in these mysteries, that we may certainly know we be flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone; and that Christ 'continueth in us, and we in him.' And therefore in celebrating these mysteries, the people are to good purpose exhorted before they come to receive the holy communion, to lift up their hearts, and to direct their minds to heaven-ward: because he is there, by whom we must be full fed, and live."  

If we are willing to accept this as a fairly accurate summary of the early Anglican doctrinal position with regard to the sacraments, then it is certainly impossible to say that they believe in the "Real Presence" or that they consider the elements of the Supper to be relatively unimportant. By them, Jewel says, Christ Himself is presently given to us. Christ Himself is offered and given us in these mysteries. At the same time it is necessary to rephrase what I have said above: that since their eyes have been opened to the work of the living Lord Jesus Christ nothing can force them to look upon the sacramental elements as possessing some divine quality that can be isolated from Christ's present activity.

For that reason Jewel says that it is to good purpose that during

1. III (P.3.), p. 63; see also Hooker, V, lxvii, 2.
the celebration of the Supper the people are exhorted to lift up their hearts and minds to heaven. Why? Because Christ is there by whom are are to be fed.

The Reformers, then, and their Eliza bethan successors, are evangelical in their theology. But unlike many modern "evangeli
cals" they do not have a low regard for the sacraments. On the contrary; as we have seen, because they are gripped by the New Testament gospel they have a much "higher" doctrine of both Word and Sacraments than their Roman opponents, and a much more profound understanding of the Church as the body of Christ. And this is the theology that is behind and in the Prayer Book. One further word: in Anglican theology the sacraments are for the Church, but they are also to be found only in the Church. They are not self-sufficient rites that are effective ex opere operato as they are in the Roman Catholic Church. Both Sacraments can quite naturally be administered privately under Roman doctrine. But in Anglican theology the sacraments belong in the Church, in the covenant community, in the community of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, the early Anglicans understand the sacraments evangelically. They take seriously Augustine's concept of the sacraments as "visible words" (which is given such prominence in Peter Martyr's writings), and look upon the sacraments as being God's special means to bring home the Word to us. It is not surprising, then, that the Prayer Book should refuse to countenance private baptism except for "great cause and necessity" (and even then if the child lives he is to be brought

1. Cranmer, I, p. 204; Becon, pp. 201, 232; Jewel, III (P.S.)365
to Church for the service to be completed) and order that it be administered on a Sunday or holy day in the presence of the Church, "that the Congregation there present may testify the receiving of them that be newly baptized into the number of Christ's Church; as also because in the Baptism of Infants every Man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to God in his Baptism". Nor is it surprising that the Prayer Book should direct that "there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper, except there be a convenient number to communicate with the Priest, according to his discretion".

Section II - The Early Carolines

The most serious mistake the student of the early Carolines can make is to miss the essential theological continuity between Lancelot Andrewes and the Reformers. Since many interpreters have missed that continuity, while some have definitely denied it, we ought perhaps to ask what it is that might lead one to think that he works with different theological principles than those of, say, Cranmer and Jewel. The answer is that there are certain notable divergencies; his reintroduction of "Catholic elements" into the liturgy; his re-placing of the table altar-wise; his concern for episcopacy; his opposition to Puritanism and his denial of the "Calvinistic" doctrine of predestination. These points, and perhaps a few others, have been sufficient to divert the attention of many students of this period from the basic theological agreement

between Andrewes and the Reformers. Andrewes is a Catholic in the way the Reformers are Catholics; i.e., he holds as his authorities first the Word and secondly the Fathers. And like the Reformers he does not interpret the Scriptures or the Fathers in the categories of scholasticism. If we fail to see this, and consider Andrewes' true theological niche to be in the tradition of Aquinas, we shall not only be doing Andrewes an injustice, but we shall also completely misunderstand 17th century Anglicanism.

Our present concern is with the relation of the Word and Sacraments to the life and being of the Church, and this is where Andrewes really comes into his own. Ever since 1648, when Richard Drake published in English a "Manual of Private Devotions" by Lancelot Andrewes, the latter has been widely known for his extraordinary prayers. But in his own time Andrewes was famous as a preacher, and it was his preaching, rather more than his other accomplishments, that gave him his special place in the Royal Court. "For 17 years it was he who every Christmas day expounded to the court of England the doctrine of the Incarnation, for 18 on Easter day that of the Resurrection, for 15 on Whitsunday that of the Holy Spirit, for 14 in Lent that of self-denial." This fact, that Andrewes was a great preacher, is naturally relevant for our study of his doctrine of the Word and Sacraments in the Church. But we understand the peculiar relevance of the fact only when we read Andrewes' sermons and see how often he uses them to exalt the Sacrament. Repeatedly, especially in the conclusion of his sermons, he refers to the Lord's Supper, relating it to the theme of the Sermon and exhorting his

congregation not to leave before communicating. On a number of occasions we find him depreciating the efficacy of preaching when compared with the Supper, i.e. he employs the sermon to set forth, almost at the expense of preaching, a high doctrine of the eucharist. It is possible for the interpreter to take this sacramental doctrine and forget where he found it. This, it seems to me, leads him into error concerning Andrewes' true position, liturgically and theologically. When we listen patiently to Andrewes the preacher, telling us of the great blessings which come to us through the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, we shall see that he works with essentially the same theological principles as Butzer, Peter Martyr, Cranmer, and Jewel.

But the early Carolines, as we have noted in preceding chapters are living in different times than the Reformers and the early Elizabethans. In the 17th century the Papist is not longer the sole enemy; there is now another: the Puritan. In the former section I pointed out that the status of preaching does not receive any detailed consideration in the discussions between Anglican and Roman. The Anglican is so concerned with what ought to be preached and the English Papist is troubled so much about heresy in sacramental doctrine, that the place of preaching as such remains in the background of all their debates. But by the latter part of the 16th century the Puritans have thrust the question to the foreground. They have exalted preaching to such an extent that Hooker has been led to claim that only the reading of Scripture during the service
deserves the appellation "Word of God". In the early days of the Reformation Anglicans are sometimes led to speak too negatively about the Eucharist because they are trying to counter the Roman arguments on Transubstantiation. By the time of the 17th century Anglicans sometimes fail to speak positively enough about the preaching of the Word because they are alarmed by the growth of Puritan ideas which stress preaching to the detriment of the Sacrament.

Andrewes is affected by this alarm, and there are many remarks in his sermons that are obviously directed against the Puritans, among them those questioning the sufficiency of preaching alone. It is important that these remarks be not taken out of context, but be seen in relation to the whole of his theology.

In the theology of Bishop Andrewes the foundation of the Church is the unity of God and man which is given in Jesus Christ. In Christ God has bound man to Himself. Christ is both the Atoner and the Atonement, and by His work we are now permitted to share even in the divine nature. Yet apart from the gift of the Holy Spirit the whole work of Christ is of no avail for us. Even though everything is done by Christ, nothing is done if the Spirit is not given. Andrewes expresses the reason for this in many ways, but perhaps his favorite form of expressing it was in terms of the "exchange" that is involved in our salvation.

"The exchange is not perfect, unless as He (Christ) taketh our flesh, so He giveth us His Spirit; as He carrieth up that to Heaven, so He sendeth down into earth." 4

That which bears Christ's benefits to man is the Spirit. In fact Christ in all His fulness is related to, and bound to, the Church only by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is in Himself the Spirit of union and unity. He is the "very essential unity, love, and love-knot" between the Father and the Son in the Holy Trinity; He is the "union, love, and love-knot" of the two natures united in Christ; and he is the "love-knot" between Christ and His Church.¹

Andrewes never loses sight of the fact that the Holy Spirit is the bond between Christ in heaven and His people on earth, and his treatment of the Word and Sacraments is accordingly governed by that. If we do not receive the Holy Spirit,

"receive what we will, nothing will do us good. Receive the word, it is but a killing letter; receive baptism, it is but John's baptism, but a barren element; receive His flesh, 'it profiteth nothing'; receive Christ, it will not do, for ... 'he that hath not His Spirit, is none of His'. So, Christ renounces him, He hath no part in him. To receive Christ, and not the Holy Ghost, is to no purpose". ²

The Church is, and the Church continues to live, by the work of Christ through the ministration of the Holy Spirit. But there are three earthly ordinances provided for the Church that act as "arteries" to convey the Spirit to us: Prayer, the Word, and the Sacraments. We should use them all, he says, and the Spirit will not fail to come to us.³

(a) The Word:

In the 20th century a radical adherence to biblical authority is apt to be identified with left-wing Protestantism, and in England the Puritans are considered to be the spiritual fathers of this sort

1. Ibid, pp. 113, 147 & 238. 2. Ibid, pp. 191f. 3. Ibid, p. 128
of Christianity. Perhaps we should, therefore, say a word or two at this point. Andrewes’ conception of biblical authority. In his *Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine* there is ample evidence of the primary place he thought the scriptures ought to have in the Church. "Our believing is grounded on the word of God"; this obviously is his working principle throughout. Beyond that, however, there is an interesting and instructive description of the different way in which the Roman Church and the Church of England handle the Bible. "The question between us" Andrewes says, "is of the means of interpretation". He then lists six means of interpretation that are used by "us": (1) Prayer (the papists also use this means); (2) "Conference of places" (by this he means comparing one part of the Bible with another, and he claims that "the less plain must be referred to the more plain"); (3) Looking to the original (i.e. Hebrew and Greek text); (4) "Acquaintance with the manner of dialect that we may know the Holy Ghost’s tongue"; (5) Having the eye intent upon the "scope" (i.e. the author’s total intention); (6) Looking to "antecedentia and consequentia". Against these the papists set the following means of interpretation: (1) Prayer; (2) the Fathers; (3) the Councils; (4) the Pope; (5) the Church. To all except the first Andrewes says, No. The Fathers do not always agree, councils have differed, some popes have been heretics, the Church is divided, and many bishops have been Arians. In spite of this, knowing how highly Andrewes regarded the writings of the Fathers and how heavily he drew upon them, and remembering

the sermon where he cautions against placing upon a passage of Scripture a "feigned" sense instead of one "given by our fathers and forerunners in the Christian faith", we do not have to wonder if Andrewes is in any way suggesting that the Bible should be isolated from the life and history of the Church. His "means" of interpretation are obviously designed to expose what the Bible is actually saying, or rather to discover what God is actually saying to the Church through the Bible. And when we set them over against the Roman "means" of interpretation, and his objections to these, we see clearly that he is here insisting that the Bible must remain absolutely free of any shackles that will imprison its message.

There is therefore no question in Andrewes' mind about what the Church is called to preach. He, like his anglican predecessors, believes that preaching should be simply the written word become oral word. The content of preaching should be the message of the Old and New Testaments because the Church must be grounded in the Word. In a sermon on the coming of the Wise Men Andrewes puts it this way:

1. Sermons, V, p. 57
2. A. J. Mason's claim that "The Holy English Church appeals always to Scripture interpreted by primitive antiquity" (Relation of Confirmation to Baptism, 1891, p. xi) is true to a point. But Andrewes saw that unless Scripture has authority even over primitive antiquity such a principle could be used to predispose what the Bible ought to say.
3. In his own preaching he carried this out with remarkable faithfulness. His sermons are extraordinary for the great seriousness with which the text is taken, examined and broken up, each part analysed minutely before being reassembled, all the while providing the basis for a positive, powerful declaration of God's great work in Christ. He was able to use with great effect the six "means of interpretation" we have just listed.
"When all is done, hither we must come for our morning-light; to this book, to the word of prophecy. All our *vidimus stellarum* is as good as nothing without it. That Star is past and gone, long since; 'Heaven and earth shall pass, but this word shall not pass'. Here on this, we to fix our eye and to ground our faith." 1

There are times of course when Andrewes speaks as if he equated the written words of the Bible with the Word of God itself. He asserts in one sermon that the apostles' tongue was simply "the pen" while the "Writer" was the Holy Spirit.2 But both the Continental and English Reformers before him speak in the same way about the Bible. His meaning (and theirs) cannot be seen in terms of modern fundamentalism. For Andrewes the Word is always fundamentally Christ Himself.3

Preaching the Word, then, is preaching Christ. Naturally there can be no identification between Christ and the content of preaching. Christ is in Himself the Word, the original Word of the Lord. Our word is but an "echo" (\(
\text{\(\hat{n}\)\(\kappa\)\(o\)\(s\)}\)) of that Word, a reflection by which the original is to be apprehended. Any word that comes directly from us is to be suspected. Only when it comes from God first and from us secondly will the Word be a forerunner of the Holy Spirit.4 And the whole aim and purpose of preaching is that the Spirit might be imparted and placed on the ear of the hearers.5 The Word and the Spirit belong together because the Holy Ghost is Christ's Spirit and Christ is the Word. And the One is received along with the other. Andrewes adduces in evidence of this the example of the Spirit falling upon Cornelius and his family when Peter was preaching the Word to them.6 In another

sermon on Acts 2, he claims that the union of “wind and tongue” here on earth expresses the unity of the Spirit and Word in heaven; “that as the wind or breath in us is to serve the tongue, so is the Spirit given to set forth the Word, and the Holy Ghost to spread abroad the knowledge of Christ.”

It is important to notice in this last comment that the Holy Spirit is not only something given but also the One who gives. We shall return to this point when we turn to Andrewes’ doctrine of the Eucharist; still we must remark now that the Spirit is never simply an “object” given. Even though Andrewes frequently speaks of the Spirit in the passive sense, he also makes it clear that the Spirit is the active God Himself at work. Preaching, for example, is only made effective by the action of the Spirit. If Andrewes calls preaching (along with the Sacraments and Prayer) an “artery” to convey the Spirit he means that it is a tool of the Spirit. Preaching is to “manifest” Christ, but it is finally the Spirit who does the “manifesting”. The Spirit comes and prompts in us the answer to Christ, the Word, that must be given. The Church is the body of Christ; but as a body it must have both head and heart: Christ is the head and the Holy Spirit the heart. Yes, and not only the heart; He is the breath of the body as well.

The Holy Spirit “cometh from Heaven, and it bloweth into the Church, and through and through it, to fill it with the breath of Heaven; and as it came from Heaven to the Church, so it shall return from the Church into Heaven again, per circuitos suos; even to ‘see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living’ there to live with Him and His Holy Spirit for ever”.

1. Ibid, p. 121. 2. Ibid, p. 128 3. Ibid, p. 378; see also 4. Ibid, p. 124 5. Ibid, p. 120
Andrewes handles the problem of the relation between preaching and Sacrament within the theological framework of the two natures of Christ. The Reformers and the early Elizabethans, we have already noted, do not have to treat this as a separate problem. Hooker, because of Puritan doctrine and practice, touches upon it but not with adequate theological discernment. Andrewes meets the question on its proper ground. Preaching and eucharist are both necessary ordinances in the Church because they correspond to the two natures united in Christ Jesus, Word and flesh. In the incarnation our nature has been "apprehended" by the Word; and our nature is thereby united to Him. But there must be a "mutual and reciprocal 'apprehension'" in which we are bound to Christ. This takes place first of all through the preaching of the Word wherein we receive Christ. But even more in the Sacrament we are "made partakers of this blessed union".¹ In his Christmas sermons especially Andrewes reminds us how the union of Word and flesh in Jesus demands a similar union of Word and flesh in the liturgy. On the day in which the Word was made flesh

"it is most kindly that a memorial be kept, as well of the flesh as the Word. On the feast of their union, they would be united; the day they were joined by Him they would not be sundered by any ... "²

It seems to me that more than just the Puritan threat led Andrewes to argue in his sermons in favor of not leaving the services before receiving the Sacrament. One cannot help but feel, as one reads his sermons, that many members of Court (and probably James himself?) must have been in the habit of leaving the service after

¹. Sermons, 1,p16. ². Ibid, p100; see also p. 116.
the sermon. What else can explain the urgency with which he continually exhorts his hearers not to "take the one and leave the other"?  

All the same it is the powerful Puritan emphasis upon preaching and prophecying, to the neglect of the Sacrament, that prompts him to lament what he calls the "circle of preaching".  

And he speaks out against the folly of asking which of the two, Word or Sacrament, is the better, and of "dashing one religious duty against another". Since we have both, he says, let us use both and thank God for them.  

He obviously thinks the natural result of the Puritan movement would ultimately be a service without a Sacrament. And since he considers the Sacrament to be the chief life-line of the Church (not, mind you, in the sense that the Holy Spirit is the life-line of the Church, but strictly in the sense of an instrument of the Spirit) the neglect of the Sacrament would mean the death of the Church. To divide the Word and Sacraments is to divide Christ. When we partake of both we have a "full and perfect communion with Christ".

Andrewes' opposition to Puritanism and his introduction of so-called "Catholic" elements into the liturgy have led some to think that he leans towards Catholicism in his liturgical theology. 

Surely, though, in the light of all that has been said above it

1. Ibid, p. 134. We know from Laud's diary that James did not come to the Chapel Royal at the beginning of the service and expected that as soon as he entered the officiating minister would break off the prayers and proceed directly to the sermon. Did he then leave after the sermon before the Sacrament? When Laud became Dean of the Chapel Royal in 1626 he asked Charles if he would please be present for prayers as well as sermon; Charles "not only assented to this request, but also gave me thanks". Laud, Vol. III, 139.  

2. Sermons, III, 318.  


must be clear that he is a true Anglican and not a Roman in this respect. Full and perfect communion with Christ is through both preaching and eucharist. Unlike the Mass, where "communion" with Christ has strictly to do with the reception of the host, the Anglican liturgy sees the true encounter between Christ and His people to take place in Word, Sacrament, and Prayer. And this precisely is Andrewes' theology. Communion is through the Holy Ghost and all three of these ordinances are "vehicles" of the Spirit. What more can be said? What higher gift can be given than the Holy Spirit? The Church should not try to live by a "circle of preaching" without the Sacrament, but preaching it must have. For by preaching the Church encounters Christ Himself who is our Comforter in Heaven through the Holy Spirit who is our Comforter on earth.

(b) The Sacraments:

"And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." This is always Andrewes starting point; the Word moving to the flesh. His sermons are designed this way, almost always ending with a reference to the Sacrament and its meaning, and exhorting all present to receive this great gift. The preaching of the Word by its very nature moves to the Sacrament because in Christ Word and flesh were brought together. In one of his nativity sermons Andrewes deals with this magnificently. In Christ are drawn into one, Creator and creature, Heaven and earth. For in Christ did dwell the fulness of the Godhead bodily. There is in Christ a "recapitulation" of God and man. By virtue of this "recapitulation" we are one with

1. Ibid, pp. 161f. 2. Ibid, p. 153
Christ, Christ as man; and God is one with Christ, Christ as God.
The Christmas celebration will properly be carried out if we gather
first to prayers and to God's Word; but then we must gather espe-
cially to the dispensation of the Sacrament. For in the Sacrament

"we do not gather to Christ or of Christ, but we gather Christ
Himself; and gathering Him we shall gather the tree and fruit
and all upon it. For as there is a recapitulation of all
in Heaven and earth in Christ, so there is a recapitulation
of all in Christ in the holy Sacrament. You may see it
clearly: there is in Christ the Word eternal for things in
Heaven; there is also flesh for things on earth. Semblably,
the Sacrament consisteth of a Heavenly and of a terrestrial part,
(it is Irenaeus' own words); the Heavenly - there the word took
the abstract of the other; the earthly - the element." 1

Of course Andrewes does not consider this in the way Romd does.
The earthly part does not change into the heavenly. In the same
sermon he goes on to point out that the two are joined by "a kind
of hypostatical union of the sign and the thing signified". This
was the way the Fathers thought about it, and that is why Theodoret
and Gelasius were able to illustrate the manner in which the two
natures of Christ are joined, using the Sacrament as their analogy.

"Even as in the Eucharist neither part is evacuate or turned
into the other, but abide each still in his former nature and
substance, no more is either of Christ's natures annulled,
or one of them converted into the other, as Eutyches held,
but each nature remaineth still full and whole in His own
kind." 2

He makes the same point in his debate with Cardinal Bellarmine.
He insists that to ask how the bread can be to us Christ's body
is an unnecessary question. We do not anxiously inquire about
this, he says, any more than we try to find out how the blood of
Christ washes us in our baptism, or how the human and divine natures

are united in one Person in Christ. Transubstantiation is a new doctrine. Andrewes does not deny a change (or trans) in the elements, but not a change of substance.

"At the coming of the almighty power of the Word, the nature is changed so that what before was the mere element now becomes a divine Sacrament, the substance nevertheless remaining what it was before ... There is that kind of union between the visible Sacrament and the invisible reality (rem) of the Sacrament which there is between the manhood and the Godhead of Christ, where unless you want to smack of Kytches, the manhood is not transubstantiated into the Godhead." 3

It is not necessary to advocate transubstantiation in order to guarantee that the body is "really" given. Andrewes maintains that when Christ breathed on the disciples and said "Receive the Holy Spirit" they actually received Him, though the substance of His breath was not transubstantiated into the Spirit. There is no more need to think of transubstantiation in the one situation than in the other. 4 But the reference here to the Spirit is important. Andrewes has said that the sign and the thing signified are joined together in a "kind of hypostatical union" comparable to the two natures united in Christ. By whom are the two natures joined in Christ? By the Holy Spirit. He is the love-knot between the Father and the Son, between the two natures of Christ, and between Christ and His Church. 5 Will He then not be the bond of unity in this other "hypostatical" union? Obviously. And it is in terms of the gift of the Spirit that Andrewes continually speaks of the

3. Op Cit., p. 265, as in Stone, Op Cit., p. 265
Sacrament. The flesh and the Spirit, he says, go together. Not all flesh, but this flesh that was originally conceived by the Holy Ghost. Therefore when we receive the one we receive both. ¹ We cannot see the Comforter but we can see the means by which He is given, by Christ the Word and Christ's body and blood. Through them we may taste of his goodness and drink of His Spirit.

"Not only by the letter we read, and the word we hear, but by the flesh we eat, and the blood we drink at His table, we be made partakers of His Spirit, and of the comfort of it. By no more kinder way passeth His Spirit than by His flesh and blood, which are vehicula Spiritus, 'the proper carriages to convey it'. Corpus aptavit Sibi, ut Spiritum aptaret tibi Christ fitted our body to His, that He might fit His Spirit to us. For so is the Spirit best fitted, made remissible, and best exhibited to us who consist of both. "This is sure: where His flesh and blood are, they are not exanesimae, 'spiritless' they are not or without life, His Spirit is with them".²

It is because we consist of both body and spirit, then, that we have these "bodily signs the means of conveying the graces of His Spirit into us". The Sacrament is to us spiritual food, though "not so much for that it is received spiritually, as for that being so received it make us, together with it, to receive the Spirit, even potare Spiritum - it is the Apostle's own word".³

It is not as though Christ could not have given the Spirit without these signs. He could have given the Spirit without breathing on the Apostles; but He is pleased to use these "outward ceremonies", though the "enthusiasts" seem to forget this.⁴ To both senses the Holy Spirit is presented: for the ear the Word, for the eye the Sacraments, the visible verbum.⁵

The great work of Christ flows to the Church through the two Sacraments. Christ's blood was shed for us and it ran in two streams, first to Baptism, "the laver of the new birth", and secondly to the Supper, "the Cup of the New Testament in His Blood". Baptism and the Supper are therefore not simply two of the Sacraments of the Church, but rather the twin-Sacraments of the Church.

Baptism was to do with generation, or rather re-generation. In the same way the world was created in the beginning by the Spirit moving over the waters of the deep so the new-made world, the Church is created by the same Spirit on the waters of baptism. Actually, though, only Christ is the new creation; He only is the second Adam; He is the "Only-begotten" and "hath never a brother". Yet Christ is to be the first-born among many brethren, and therefore He not only comes to share in our flesh and blood, but in His baptism "He puts us on". Now, in our baptism we put Him on. Christ has had placed upon Him the transgressions of us all, He has been made sin for us, He has been "baptized, as I may say, in so many millions of sins of so many millions of sinners". It is understandable then that He should come to the Jordan to be baptized. But the waters of the Jordan cannot wash away that "former foul baptism". This but points ahead to another baptism in Gethsemane, Babbatha, and Golgotha.

"This in the Jordan, here now, was but an undertaking of that, then; and in virtue of that, doth all our water-baptism work. And therefore are we baptized into it: not into His water-baptism, but into His cross-baptism; not into His baptism, but into His death."

Andrewes reminds us, however, that the baptism of the body is but the body of baptism; the soul of baptism is the baptism of the

1. Ibid, p. 102.  2. Ibid, p. 348.  3. Ibid, pp. 191, 197
soul. And this baptism of the soul is strictly "by the blood of Christ, by the hand of the Holy Ghost, as of the body with water, by the hand of the Baptist; without which it is but a naked, a poor and a dead element". It is appropriate that the Person by whom Christ was conceived should be the same by whom Christians are born. Or to go higher: it is meet that the Author of generation should also be the Author of regeneration.

"The same Person, and in the same element - the element whereof all were made, and wherewith all were destroyed after; that with the same all should be saved again, the water itself now becoming the Ark - the drowning water, the saving ark, as St. Peter noteth. That as then by His moving on the waters He put into them a life and heat to bring forth, so now by His coming down upon them, He should impregnate them to a better birth. That as His title is, the Lord and Giver of life, He might be the Giver of true life, that is, eternal life, whereto this life of ours is but a passage of entry, and not otherwise to be accounted of."

The Spirit descends upon Christ in the shape of a dove; the Dove comes upon the Lamb, and both are peace-loving, guileless, patient, and innocent. And the Holy Spirit that makes the Church to be Christ's Spouse also creates in her the qualities of the Dove. If she begins to show the qualities of a vulture (as Andrewes suggests the Jesuits do) it means the Holy Spirit has been banished.

But this baptism of Christ was not so much His as ours. The voice saying "Thou art my beloved Son" came not for Him but for us; and now it is spoken to us for we in our baptism have put Christ on. Before we were enemies, now we are members of the new "league" or "covenant"; before we were strangers, now we are members of the household of God; before we were servants in the household, but now are sons, beloved sons. And if sons, then heirs, joint heirs
of Heaven. Whitsunday is the feast day of our adoption. Christ is God's beloved Son in whom He is well pleased. Only when we are baptized by the Spirit are we made by adoption what Christ is. Our own baptism is, as Andrewes has already said, the occasion for the Holy Spirit to lay His hand on us and enable us to "put Christ on".

But all this we can "put in hazard". We can again fall into sin and God no longer will be pleased with us. Yet we cannot be baptized again. It has pleased the Holy Ghost

"as He applied Christ's blood to us in baptism one way, so out of it to apply it to us another way, as it were in supplement of baptism. In one verse they be both set down by the Apostle; 1. in uno Spiritu baptizati, 2. in uno Spiritu potati. And whom He receiveth so to His table to eat and to drink with Him, and every one that is well prepared He so receiveth, with them He is well-pleased again certainly. On this day of the Spirit, every benefit of the Spirit is set forth and offered us, and we shall please Him well in making benefit of all. Specially of this, the only means to renew His complacency, and to restore us thither, where our baptism left us". 1

It is for this reason that Andrewes calls baptism and the Supper the "twin-Sacraments" of the Church: the Supper is the "supplement", or better still, the "restorer" of Baptism. 2

What Baptism does for us once for all, the eucharist does repeatedly, only in the sense of renewing and nourishing. It nourishes the new man who grows faint and weak and it also cleanses him. 3 But if the Eucharist does repeatedly, in its way, what Baptism does once for all, this means that by it too we must "put Christ on"; which, of course, is precisely what Andrewes declares in so many of his sermons. Since we are made of flesh and blood Christ

has taken the same for Himself in order to become our brother. And we share in His treasure when He gives back to us what He has taken from us: His body and blood. He takes our flesh and we receive His Spirit. By taking flesh and blood He shares our humanity; by taking His flesh and blood we receive His Spirit and "partake of the Divine nature". This union is stronger than family, or even marriage, ties: it remains for ever. It is appropriate that, since we drew our death from the first Adam, "by partaking of his substance", we should

"partake the substance of the second Adam; that so we might draw our life from Him; should be ingrafted into Him, as the branches into the vine, that we might receive His sap — which is His similitude; should be flesh of His flesh, not He of ours as before (He has just mentioned Christ becoming flesh of our flesh in Virgin Birth), but we of His now; that we might be vegetate with His Spirit, even with His Divine Spirit. For now in Him the Spirits are so united, as partake one partake the other withal".2

In this way God is with us. It is true that, though Christ was once completely with us, He is with us in body no longer.

"We are not together; we are parted. He and we. He in Heaven, and we in earth. But it shall not alway so be. Beside this day Immanuel hath another day, and that day will come; and when it doth come, He will come and take us to Himself. That as He hath been our Immanuel upon earth, so He may be our Immanuel in Heaven; He with us, and we with Him, there for ever.

"This of the Sacrament is a preparative to that; will conceive and bring forth the other. For immediately after He had given them the Holy Eucharist, He prayed straight that they that had so been with Him in the blessed Sacrament — 'Father, My will is', My prayer, My last prayer, 'that where I am they may be also'" 3

Eschatology is never a tacked-on element in Andrewes' thought. We might even say, in fact, that Andrewes thought is stretched between the First and Second Parousia. In one sermon he tells

1. Sermons, I, pp. 15f. 2. Sermons, III, p. 58
the congregation that "pay-day" is past; the ransom has been paid and the sentence reversed. Yet the prisoner still has not been released; he will not come into possession of his freedom until another day, the day of Christ's second appearing. When that day comes then the prisoner can lift up his head, for his redemption draws nigh, and that will be his full, perfect, plenary redemption. Between these two redemption days there is provided a seal by which we are given a "mark of separation"; and there can be no final redemption without it. If we come without the seal it will be for us a day not of redemption but of utter desolation.

"This seal ... is in the dispensing and disposing of the Holy Ghost. We are therefore of necessity to pass His office also; that so all the Trinity may co-operate, and every Person have a hand in the work of our salvation. Remember I have told you heretofore, that Christ without the Holy Ghost is as a deed without a seal, as a testator without an executor. It is so. For all He hath done, redemption or no redemption goeth by this seal; all that Christ hath wrought for us, by that the Holy Spirit doth work in us ... For by and from Him we have it, and by from any other we have it not".1

It is evident, then, that the day of Pentecost was the day of sealing and the feast of Whitsunday is always to be considered the day of sealing. Andrewes therefore exhorts his congregation not to refuse the Holy Spirit "when He sits in His office, and offers to set His seal on us". But no matter how we consider it, we cannot find "in the office of the Church" what this seal should be, but the Sacrament. The outward seal should be visible and the Sacrament is the "only visible part of our religion". In fact Paul (Rom.4:11) calls baptism (circumcision?) the seal of righteousness. Both baptism and eucharist are of like nature, except that the seal of

1. Sermons, III, pp. 209ff; see also 169.
baptism can be imprinted only once whereas the eucharist is able to
sign it over and over again. In this way God has provided for us
to make sure we are sealed against the day of redemption. For by
and with the body and blood in the Supper grace is imparted to us,
and "grace is the very breath of the Holy Spirit, the true and
express character of His seal, to the renewing in us the image of
God whereunto we are created". We receive grace there, but we
must be careful not to receive it in vain; we ought to stand fast
in it, continue in it, stir it up, grow and increase in it "even
to the consummation of it, which is glory - glory being nothing else
but grace consummate, the figure of this stamp in His full perfec-
tion". 1

We are "at the very highest pitch ... we shall ever attain to
on earth" when we come from Holy Communion. For in it we are
gathered to Christ, and by Christ to God, and thus we wait for the
consummation of all things at His coming again. This gathering to
Christ now has its accomplishment at the last great gathering when
His elect are gathered from the four corners of the earth. "And
then, and never till then, shall be the fulness indeed, when God
shall be, not as He now is, somewhat in every one, but 'all in all'". 2

The reference here to gathering together raises the question of
the "gathering" or unity of the Church. In the first of his
Whitsunday sermons that has been preserved (preached before James
at Greenwich, June 8, 1606) Andrewes comes at the question of unity
from the point of view of a preparative for the Spirit's coming.

1. Ibid, pp. 218ff; see also these other important passages,
II, 268; III, 58f, 239f.
2. Sermons 1, p. 283
On the Day of Pentecost "they were all of one accord in one place". There was a unity of mind as well as of place and the Spirit therefore was willing to come. Can we imagine that He who is in Himself "essential Unity" would deign to come where there is no unity of spirit? Looking at it in this way Andrewes appears to see Church unity as being not the consequence, but the condition, of the coming of the Holy Spirit. Later in the sermon we see him carry the idea through in an interesting way. We have, he suggests, a special means whereby to invite the Spirit to us again and again: the Sacrament. For being of one accord is an "effectual disposition" towards receiving the Holy Spirit and the eucharist is the Sacrament of "accord". It represents unto us perfect unity in the many grains that are kneaded into one loaf and the many grapes pressed into one cup, and what it represents to us in such a living way, it also effectively works in us. In another sermon Andrewes also makes clear that it is the Spirit coming to us by the Sacrament that binds us into one. For by the Sacrament we drink of the one Spirit that there might be but one Spirit in us. Thus we are all made one bread and one body, "kneaded and pressed together into one", even as are the symbols of the Sacrament.

One would naturally expect something further than this from Andrewes on the unity of the Church in relation to the Sacrament, something taking his magnificent arguments with regard to our union with Christ in the Supper and carrying them on to the nature and meaning of the oneness of the Church, but nothing explicit can be found in his writings on this theme.

There is yet one aspect of Andrews' sacramental doctrine that is relevant to our inquiry, namely, his understanding of the eucharist as a sacrifice. The Reformers reject the late medieval conception of sacrifice in the Mass, but what they affirm in its place is not always easy to determine. They do, of course, insist that the sacrifice upon the Cross was unique, and that no doctrine of the Sacrament must trespass against it. In the way some of them articulate this they appear to be following Augustine's lead.

"There is in Augustine no thought of any repetition of the sacrifice once made on Calvary. What the Church offers in the Eucharist is a 'sacramentum memoriae'. In this supreme act the Church of the redeemed partakes in his sacrifice as members of the body of which He is the Head. In so doing it shows forth the Lord's death until he come. Thus he is able to say: 'this is the sacrifice of Christians - we who are many are one body in Christ'. (De civit. dei. x.6) Augustine speaks also of a sacrifice of praise (Enarr. in Psalm., cii, 4) and of thanksgiving (De spirit. et. lit. xviii; Sermo, ccxxvii), but all this is subsidiary to his conviction that reception of communion is part of the eucharistic sacrificial action ...

"The Eucharist is ... perfected by the use of the faithful rather than by the consecration of the matter as the later theory maintained." 1

Certainly both the 1549 and 1552 versions of the Book of Common Prayer explicitly show the Communion to be a sacrifice at three "levels"; as a commemorative sacrifice, pointing to our Lord's historical self-oblation on the Cross; as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; and as the offering of our souls and bodies as a "reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice" unto the Lord. But none of the Reformers has any explicit comments on the reception of the communion "as part of the eucharistic sacrificial action". This, however, is where Andrews elaborates very positively a doctrine of

1. Dugmore, Mass In The Anglican Reformers, pp. 8f.
eucharistic sacrifice. Whereas Ridley claimed that a table was more appropriate to the nature of the Eucharist because he conceived of it as being chiefly (if not entirely) a Supper where we are fed by Christ,¹ Andrewes is happy to have both a Table and an Altar in one because to him the Eucharist is both a Supper and a Sacrifice.² Perhaps we should at this point remind ourselves of the obvious that whatever is said about sacrifice is relevant strictly to the worship of the Church. That is, we are concerned with the service the Church is called to offer to God. Andrewes in his Answer to Cardinal Perron states that he considers the Eucharist to be both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice, and then comments that "A Sacrifice is proper and appliable only to divine worship".³ There is one sermon in which Andrewes treats this whole question with considerable fulness.⁴ Following the lead of his text (I Cor. 5:7,8) he approaches the matter of eucharistic sacrifice by comparing it with the sacrifice in the feast of the Passover. The latter was done in prefiguration of Christ, while the former is done in commemoration of Him.

"By the same rules that theirs was, by the same may ours be termed a sacrifice. In rigour of speech neither of them; for to speak after the exact manner of Divinity, there is but one only sacrifice, veri nominus, 'properly so called', that is Christ's death. And that sacrifice but once actually performed at His death, but ever before represented in figure, from the beginning; and ever since repeated in memory, to the world's end. That only absolute, all else relative to it, representative of it, operative by it. The Lamb, but once

3. This alludes to Augustine's words in contra Faustum, lib., xx, cap. xxii.
4. This is, incidentally, the most subtle and perceptive exposition of the subject that I have found anywhere in 16th and 17th century Anglican theology.
actually slain in the fullness of time, but virtually was from
the beginning, is and shall be to the end of the world. That
the centre, in which their lives and ours, their types and our
stitypes do meet. While yet this offering was not, the hope
of it was kept alive by the prefiguration of it in theirs.
And after it is past, the memory of it is still kept fresh in
mind by the commemoration of it in ours." 1

As usual Andrewes plays on the words found in the Vulgate version
of the text, 2 in this case on the words immolatus and epulemur.

"Will ye mark one thing more, that epulemur doth here refer to
immolatus? To Christ, not every way considered, but as when
He was offered. Christ's body that now is. True; but not
Christ's body as now it is, but as then it was, when it was
offered, rent and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not, as now
He is, glorified, for so He is not, so He cannot be immolatus,
for He is immortal and impassible. But as then He was when
He suffered death, that is, possible and mortal. Then, in
His possible estate did He institute this of ours, to be a
memorial of His possible and Passio both. And we are in
this action not only carried up to Christ, (Sursum corda) but
we are also carried back to Christ as He was at the very
instant, and in the very act of His offering. So, and no
otherwise, doth this text teach. So, and no otherwise, do
we represent Him. By the incomprehensible power of His
eternal Spirit, not He alone, but He, as at the very act of
His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into
His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an host
could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not
serve; Christ offered it is, thither we must look." 3

It is exceedingly important that we should not miss Andrewes'
point in all this regarding the meaning of the sacrifice in the
Eucharist. In the above statement he says that we are in this
action carried not only up to Christ but back to Christ on the Cross.
Whatever else he means by sacrifice we must first see that for him
the whole point of the celebration of the Eucharist is that we

1. Sermons, II, pp 300f.
2. Vulgate translation is; Expurgate vetus fermentum, ut sitis
nova conspersio, sicut estis azymi. Etenim Pascha nostrum
immolatus est Christus: Itaque epulemur, non in fermento veteri,
neque in fermento malitiae, et nequitiae: sed in azymis sinceritatis,
et veritatis.
3. Ibid, pp. 301f.
become involved in Christ's sacrifice. The celebration of Holy Communion represents Christ's sacrifice pro omnibus, but it also applies the sacrifice to "each several receiver, pro singulis". For that reason he insists that there can be no celebramus without epulemur. Whoever heard of the Passover Lamb not being eaten? Andrewes quite clearly understands as Augustine does, that the Eucharist is perfected by the use of the faithful. That is the whole point of it. We lose the fruit of Christ's offering if we fail to eat the "peace-offering." All the same we do offer Christ in the Sacrament. What else have we to offer to God that is worth anything? Andrewes sees clearly that our worship, our service of God, must have as its content Christ Himself. Therefore he tells us in another sermon that, since we had nothing worthy to offer to God, God has given us Christ who is worthy. Christ has already offered Himself, but we offer Him again and again, the one and only gift we can render to God. We give back to God what He has given us, and He, at the same time, gives back to us what we gave Him (the flesh and blood of Christ). Christ gave our flesh and blood in Sacrifice and now gives it to us that the Sacrifice might be applied to us.

Is it possible, then to say that here Andrewes has restored the true Catholic (meaning medieval Roman) understanding of sacrifice in the Eucharist? Undoubtedly there is in Andrewes a positive and salutary appreciation of the meaning of sacrifice that we cannot find in the earlier Anglicans. He calls the Eucharist a Sacrifice

1. Ibid, p. 301  
2. Ibid, pp. 298f  
3. Sermons, I, pp. 30f
and a Sacrament; but the important question is this: does he conceive of the eucharistic sacrifice in the sense that by consecration of the elements Christ is again held before God as a peace-offering? Or does he rather see in the Eucharist, sacrifice and sacrament together, in such a way that Christ, who made on the Cross "by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world", now gives Himself to the Church that she might share in His self-oblation? Does he not see in the Eucharist a total event in which the Church by receiving the Sacrament renders to God her proper duty or sacrifice? Andrews emphasis in all his sermons (and almost every sermon that he preached on the high festival days concludes with a reference to the Sacrament) is on the incredible treasure that we are given in the Sacrament. In his mind the importance of the Eucharist is that here God has provided a marvelous instrument for our union with Christ. We can find nothing in Andrews' writings discussing the moment of consecration in such a way as to suggest that here the Church has the means for sacrificing for sins. More than once he talks about the "peace-offering" with regard to the Sacrament but he does so in order to demonstrate to the congregation that they should not fail to communicate.

"For the law of a peace-offering is; he that offereth it must take his part of it, eat of it, or it doth him no good." 2

"It is of the nature of an Eucharist or peace-offering; which was never offered but it was eaten, that both there might be a representation of the memory of that sacrifice, and together an application to each person by partaking it." 3

When therefore Andrewes goes on to say that in the Sacrament there is a sacrifice which renews our covenant with God, we know he does not mean it as Romle does. He makes this quite clear in his debate with Bellarmine.

"Our men believe that the Eucharist was instituted by the Lord for a memorial of Himself, even of His sacrifice, and, if it be lawful so to speak, to be a comparative sacrifice, not only to be a Sacrament and for spiritual nourishment. Though they allow this, yet they deny that either of these uses (thus instituted by the Lord together) can be divided from the other by man either because of the negligence of the people or because of the avarice of the priests. The sacrifice which is there is Eucharistic, of which sacrifice the law is that he who offers it is to partake of it, and that he partake by receiving and eating, as the Saviour ordered. For 'to partake by sharing in the prayer', that indeed is a fresh and novel way of partaking, much more even than the Private Mass itself ... Do you take away from the Mass your transubstantiation; and there will not long be any strife with us about the sacrifice. Willingly we allow that a memory of the sacrifice is made there. That your Christ made of bread is sacrificed there we will never allow." 2

Transubstantiation is again the offensive doctrine. Of course we are no longer surprised to encounter yet another denial of the truth of this doctrine, for every Anglican since the Reformation has condemned it. But what is Andrewes' reason for referring to it at this juncture? He rejects it from the point of view of sacrifice. He thinks the doctrine of Transubstantiation corrupts the proper notion of eucharistic sacrifice. Why does it do this? Obviously the only answer is that it centres everything upon the moment of consecration when the actual body and blood of Christ are produced and re-offered to God on behalf of the living and the dead. Certainly the reception of the elements (or element) is a part of the action in the Mass, but the transubstantiation of the elements, and therefore the sacrifice, is an event to itself prior to and

1. Ibid., p. 67  
separate from the "communion". Andrewes' thought moves along different lines. The eucharistic sacrifice is the total event of prayers, consecration, reception of the elements, and thanksgiving, in which Christ Himself through the action of the Holy Spirit present His broken body and shed blood to His people, and they offer themselves in Christ unto the Father with thanksgiving and praise. Andrewes believes that in the Eucharist, taken as a whole, the sacrifice of Christ is made present in such a way that the Church is actually incorporated into that self-oblation.

Andrewes is an Anglican after the manner of the classical 16th century pattern. Though there are differences of emphasis in many places between him and his predecessors, (with regard, for example, to eucharistic sacrifice, where he is sounder than they) his basic theological outlook is the same. Now we must discover where the other early Carolines stand.

We can begin by noting that one does not find quite the same evangelical fervor in their writings that one finds in the works of the Reformers. This is important for us when we ask about their doctrine of the Word. The Reformers are never tired of affirming that the Church must live by the Gospel and they do everything they can to see that the Word is preached throughout the land. There is an obvious contrast between their ministry and that carried out by the contemporary papists. By the 17th century things are different; the Gospel is being preached. In fact there is often more preaching going on than the authorities of Church and State want, with Puritan preachers exercising great
influence in their afternoon preaching services. We have already remarked upon Andrewes' reaction to this and the same reaction is to be seen among his colleagues. If we find them emphasizing the preaching of the Word less than the Reformers, can we attribute it to their reaction to Puritan practice, or must we see it as a manifestation of a new theological outlook?

(a) The Word.

Our concern in this sub-section is not to examine and discuss everything the early Carolines say about the Word, but simply to see how they handle the theme of the Word in relation to the being of the Church. Because the Church is and must be grounded in Christ Himself, what place does the Word take with regard to the Church's relation to the Lord Jesus Christ?

We can do no better than turn again to Bishop Davenant's reply to Joseph Hall, when the latter asked him if he (Hall) were right in saying that the Roman Church was a "true, visible, church". Davenant said that Hall was right in the sense that the being of the Church stands upon the gracious calling of God. Wherever God continues His call to any people, calling them to participation in Christ by word and by sacraments, there is the true being of a Christian Church, even if they are false in their exposition of the Word and their treatment of God's ordinances. We shall take up the question of the Sacraments shortly; for the moment we must direct our attention to his comment on the Word. God's call comes to the Church by the Word. Does Davenant mean the

2. Ibid, p. 742
preaching of the Word? In his commentary on Colossians it is apparent in many places that he does mean this. Perhaps his most important comment is on chapter 2, verse 6, where he says that when we receive the Gospel we receive Christ Himself. That is why the Church is a multitude called out by the ministry of the Gospel, though Davenant cautions his students to remember that that call may be for many no more than an external call. What is necessary is an internal alliance with Christ. For no one can have the fruit of Christ's redemption unless he is in Christ, and we are ingrafted into Christ through faith by the Holy Spirit. It is the peculiar "province" of faith that it apprehends Christ the Mediator and Redeemer. But we must remember that for Davenant faith is called into being by, and rests upon, the free promises of God which are offered in the Gospel. God Himself, he says, is the Creator of faith and hope in the hearts of men; but the hearing of the Word of God is the instrumental cause. Preaching the Word is directly related to the being of the Church for Christ Himself is the content of preaching; the foundation of the Church, which is Christ, was laid by the preaching of the Gospel by the Apostles, and is continually established by the continuation of that preaching in all ages. Joseph Hall, who once claimed that he preached three times a week at Waltham and Halstead, and who on an earlier occasion asked what Church had ever produced as many preaching bishops as the reformed Church of England, sees in preaching the power of

1. On Colossians, 1:18  
2. Ibid, 1:14  
3. Ibid, 1:23  
4. Ibid, 1:5  
5. Exhortation to Restoring Brotherly Communion, p. 50  
God unto salvation;\textsuperscript{1} it is the word of reconciliation for it is directly related to the redemptive work of Christ.\textsuperscript{2} In his treatise "Against the Brownists" Hall tells them that if Christ has taken away His Word and Spirit from the Church (i.e. the Church of England) their (the Brownists') separation is justifiable. But if His Word and Spirit have not been removed (as Hall claims they have not) then the Brownists in separating themselves from the Church have separated themselves from Christ.\textsuperscript{3}

George Downame in his book On Justification speaks of the Word and Sacraments as God's instruments whereby the Holy Spirit begets and confirms us in Christ. The preaching of the Gospel is the ministry of reconciliation, for by it the Holy Spirit is able, not only to knock at the door of men's hearts, but also to open that door so that they receive Christ and their justification.

Thomas Bilson (who was actually writing just before the turn of the century) claims that without preaching there is no ordinary means for faith,\textsuperscript{4} and Francis White speaks in much the same way about it, calling preaching the outward means of bringing men to faith and salvation.\textsuperscript{5} Bilson warns his readers that the neglect or the abuse of either Word or Sacraments greatly endangers the state and welfare of the whole Church.\textsuperscript{6} For without word and sacraments the "saints" are not gathered, the Church is not edified, faith is not perfected, and heaven is not opened. Bilson goes on to comment that Paul considered that, of the two, preaching was the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Ibid, p. 152
\item \textsuperscript{2} Ibid, p. 607; see also Ussher, Vol. II, p. 436
\item \textsuperscript{3} Works, Vol. IX, p. 17.
\item \textsuperscript{4} Treatise of Justification, London, 1633, p. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Perpetual Government of Christ's Church, p. 15.
\item \textsuperscript{6} Op Cit. pp. 106f.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Op Cit.
\end{itemize}
greater and worthier part of his apostolic function. But they cannot be divided, for the truth of the Word is ratified by the seals of the Word, which are the sacraments.  

For these men Christ does approach the Church through preaching and therefore preaching is one of the saving ordinances in the Church. Speaking from the point of view of the liturgy they would all therefore have affirmed, as Bilson does, that if either preaching or the Sacrament is neglected the welfare of the Church is threatened. The true encounter between Christ and His Church does not take place only in the Sacrament; it takes place in the whole event where Word and Sacrament come together. Nevertheless there is to be seen in some of the men of this period a withdrawal from such a high doctrine of the Word, and it is Laud (appropriately?) who gives specific expression to it in his Conference with Fisher. The latter claims that "the lawfully sent preachers of the (Roman) Church, are assisted by God's Spirit to have in them divine and infallible authority, and to be worthy of divine and infallible credit, sufficient to breed in us divine and infallible faith."  

Laud replies that he has often heard it said that the Jesuits and the "precise party in the reformed churches" (i.e. the Puritans) agreed in many things though they seem most to differ, and that this is certainly one point of agreement between them.

"I ever took sermons, and so do still, to be most necessary expositions and applications of Holy Scripture, and a great ordinary means of saving knowledge, but I cannot think them, or the preachers of them, divinely infallible. The ancient fathers of the Church preached far beyond any of

1. Ibid, p. 278.  
2. Found in Laud, Works, Vol.II, p.113
"those of either faction; and yet no one of them durst think himself infallible, much less, that whatsoever he preached was the word of God". We are naturally reminded, by these words, of Hooker's reaction to the strong Puritan emphasis upon "preaching the Word of God". He questions the fact that preaching itself has any right to be called the "Word of God". It is true that the Word of God should be heard in the service of the Church, but it is heard only by the reading of Scripture.

"We therefore have no word of God but the Scripture. Apostolic sermons were unto such as heard them his word, even as properly as to us their writings are. Nowbeit not so our own sermons, the expositions which our discourse of wit doth gather and minister out of the word of God. For which cause in this present question, we are when we name the Word of God always to mean the Scripture only".

Hooker maintains that he has no desire to depreciate preaching. He esteems it as a blessed ordinance of God. Sermons are "Keys to the kingdom of heaven, as wings to the soul, as spurs to the good affections of men, unto the sound and healthy as food, as physic unto diseased minds".

He tells us that he does not mind how much the Puritans extol sermons. But what he does object to is the disgrace "which they offer unto our custom of bare reading of the word of God". For, he declares, when the Scripture is read or recited then the Word of God is properly delivered to the people. Sermons can only ambiguously be called God's word.

However much we sympathize with Hooker and Laud - Hooker because he wanted to resist what he considered to be a pernicious emphasis upon preaching at the expense of the reading of scripture, Laud because he thought the Puritans (and the Jesuits) were claiming infallibility for their preaching - we have to recognize that

1. Ibid, 113f. 2. V, xxii, 2. 3. V, xxii, 1. 4. V, xxii, 10.
they have departed from the original Anglican understanding of the meaning of preaching. The early Anglicans admitted — or rather they insisted — that preaching could be called the Word of God only in a "derivative" sense. That is, the word of the preacher must always be derived from Scripture (and if that is what Hooker means by saying that sermons are only "ambiguously" God's word then he is being faithful to the reformed Anglican position). Their real concern was that Scriptural truth be preached. But they never questioned the status of preaching. They always spoke of preaching as being the proclamation of the Word of God, because they believed that through preaching the voice of the God, who speaks in the Bible, would be audible in the whole Church.

This understanding of preaching is to be seen in Andrews, Bilson, and Davenant, and can be inferred from the writings of Field, White, Downname, and Hall, to name only four. But at the same time there is a certain hesitancy on this theme in the writings of the early Carolines, a hesitancy which is understandable in the light of the above-mentioned comments of Hooker and Laud. We must be cautious, however, about attributing this change of emphasis (in Laud for example) solely to hostility to Puritanism. For there is to be seen in Laud (as in Mountagu) certain manifestations of doctrinal deviations from the reformed Anglican position. Laud is able to say, when attacked by the Puritans for bowing towards the altar, that the altar is

"the greatest place of God's residence upon earth. (I say the greatest, yea, greater than the pulpit; for there 'tis Hoc est

"corpus meum, 'This is My body'; but in the pulpit 'tis at most but Hoc est verbum meum, 'This is My word'. Ad a greater reverence, no doubt, is due to the body than to the word of our Lord."1

This kind of distinction between "Word" and "body" is not to be found in the early Anglicans. Here perhaps is the one point where the Puritans have grounds, on strictly Anglican principles, for accusing Laud of "poperj — not, of course, for bowing towards the altar, but for the kind of distinction he draws between Word and body, pulpit and altar.

We cannot speak about the life and being of the Church in relation to the Word and leave untouched the matter of the written Word. We cannot properly discuss the preaching of the Word without at the same time asking about the content of the preaching, which in the minds of the early Carolines was supposed to be the message of Holy Scripture. Davenant cautions his students against the doctrines that Rome sets forth under the title of traditions.2 True catholicity is not to be found there, but in faithfulness to the apostolic preaching which is committed to us in writing. If, he says, "we can shew the doctrine of our Church to correspond with this, we are Catholics ... "3 In Davenant's mind this is a life and death question for the Church, for when this apostolic preaching is received Jesus Christ is received.4 If the Church becomes ignorant of fundamental doctrine, (i.e. of the central message of the New Testament) she can only be separated from her true foundation in Christ,5 separated from the foundation laid by the ministry

1. Works, Vol. IV, p. 284
2. Colossians 1:23.
3. Ibid, 1:23
4. Ibid, 2:5.
5. Restoring Brotherly Communion, pp. 58f.
of the Apostles.  

Francis White's words on the same theme sound like an echo of Davenant's. And Field points out that if our faith is to be the same as that of the Apostles it must have the same object; since their faith was built upon the immoveable rock of divine truth and authority, so must ours. Divine truth and authority are to be apprehended in one sure place, for every true Christian knows that it is God who speaks in the Scriptures.

Mountague, in his normal emphatic manner, affirms that though there are many obscure parts in the Bible, all the points dealing with "Faith and manners, Hope and Charity" are plain. The position of the Church of England is, he says, that the written word without unwritten traditions is perfect and absolute and sufficient to the purpose for which it was intended. The Church must therefore lay hold upon the true tradition, which tradition "is no other thing, but the rule of our faith, the holy Scripture: nothing unwritten, uncertain, beside much lesse against Scripture." "Particular and Topical" churches can err in fundamental doctrine, but the Catholic Church in all her parts cannot err or she would cease to be. Laud makes much the same point: all members of the militant Church cannot err in the whole faith or any article of it, for then there would be no union between Christ and the Church, and the Church would cease to be, which is impossible. And Laud affirms the Anglican position that the articles of the Church must

be grounded upon Scripture. If everything the Church defined were necessarily fundamental to the faith then the Church would be establishing its own foundation. No article of faith is fundamental because the Church defines it, but because it was already fundamental before the Church defined it. The task of the Church is not to define new articles of faith but to explicate the articles of faith that are by their nature the basic dogmas of the Church.

It is obvious, then, that there is almost complete agreement among the early Carolines in the conviction that the one visible foundation stone of the Church is Holy Scripture. In this they are reaffirming the position of their 16th century forbears. But the matter is complicated for them by the stand of the Puritan party. One of the planks in the Puritan platform is the sole authority of Scripture, and another plank is the proposal to reform the Establishment according to the Word of God. We shall understand at least part of the difference between the two parties if we go back again to the debate between Thomas Cartwright and John Whitgift. Cartwright in the *Admonitions to Parliament* had insisted upon a complete reform of the Establishment according to Scriptural precept. "Either must we have a right ministry of God, and a right government of his church, according to the scriptures set up (both which we lack); or else there can be no right religion." Whitgift had replied that the only essential notes of the Church are the true preaching of the Word and the right administration of the Sacrament. Other things, such as a certain kind of church govern-

1. Ibid, pp. 62f.  
2. Ibid, p. 42.  
3. Ibid, p. 34  
government, do not affect the essence or being of the Church, and therefore are not laid down definitely in Scripture. Every (national) church has liberty to establish such a form of government as is "apt and profitable for it". The Church of England maintains the same government that was used in the early church and for the succeeding 500 years. In that five hundred years or more there was no function or office in "which was not most meet for that time, and allowable by the word of God." Whitgift, then, believes that the Bible has no definite outline of church government; the Puritans believe it has. In fact the Puritans believe that only those things prescribed by Scripture in the areas of doctrine, discipline, church government, and church worship are permissible. The Anglicans maintain generally that only in the sphere of doctrine and life is the Bible the infallible rule and guide; in other areas the Church must order her affairs in accordance with her own needs and in conformity to what the Bible allows. But the early Carolines go further. They feel the Puritans are not interpreting the Bible properly, and they begin to compare them to the heretics in the various stages of the Church's life who pretended to base all their doctrines upon Scripture. Richard Field, for example, though acknowledging that the Bible is "full and sufficient to all purposes", nevertheless insists that the interpretation of the Scriptures ought to follow "the rule of ecclesiastical and catholic sense", which can prevent the

"manifold turning of heretics".¹ When we remember that Field has only ten pages earlier declared emphatically that the whole Church is "subject to the Scripture in all her parts and hath her infallibility from it; and, therefore, in her manner of having the truth is inferior to it",² we know he is not trying (not consciously anyway!) to imprison the biblical message within established ecclesiastical tradition. He is, though, profoundly disturbed by Puritan biblical interpretation with regard to church government and ceremonies and what he feels is the wrongful isolation of the Bible, on the part of the Puritans, from the tradition of the Church.

Francis White, because he is writing against Rome, handles this theme differently. He says first that in the Church of England the interpretation of holy Scripture is performed by the Pastors "respectively to their several degrees of government". Thus the truth of exposition is not placed in personal authority but individuals yield to the bishops and ecclesiastical governors, who in turn rely upon the advice and help of "the skilfull and worthy persons in the Church, whom God hath induced with gifts to search out and manifest his truth ... "³ The grounds and principles of interpretation must, however, be taken from Scripture itself.⁴ When there is a controversy the supreme and independent Judge is the Holy Spirit. Under him there are two subordinate judges: for the whole Church there is the expedient of a general council of the church fathers lawfully assembled; for a provincial or national church the heads and fathers of the church must decide together. But White adds that

¹ Vol. II, pp. 443f. ² p. 433. ³ 150; see also pp. 45 ⁴ 161; see also 391.
they are all bound in their considerations to the written word of
God only, and if it is apparent that the bishops and pastors have
abused their authority then the faithful are free to dissent. 1
In this treatise White makes no reference to tradition as having any
proper place in exposition of the Bible.

Laud in his Conference with Fisher makes some very significant
remarks upon the subject. He says "since it is apparent that
tradition is first in order of time, it must necessarily follow
that Scripture is first in order of nature; that is, the chief upon
which faith rests and resolves itself ... The key that lets men
into the Scripture, even to this knowledge of them, that they are
the word of God, is the tradition of the Church: but when they are
in, they hear Christ Himself immediately speaking in Scripture to
the faithful; and 'His Sheep' do not only 'hear'; but know 'His
voice'"2 Scripture is sufficient in and to itself. But because
it is "deep" and may be "drawn into different senses", a man who
presumes upon his own capacities and goes on his own interpretation
to the exclusion of the tradition of the Church can readily be
mistaken. 3 Yet the most illuminating of Laud's comments is what
we might call "his confession of faith" to Fisher.

"I admit no ordinary rule left now in the Church, of divine
and infallible verity, and so of faith, but the Scripture.
And I believe the entire Scripture, first by the tradition
of the Church; then, by all other credible motives, as is
before expressed; and last of all, by the light which shines
in the Scripture itself, kindled in believers by the Spirit
of God. Then, I believe the entire Scripture infallibly,
and by a divine infallibility an sure of my object ... And I believe both Scripture and Creed, in the same uncorrupted
sense which the primitive Church believed them; and am sure
that I do so believe them, because I cross not in my belief

"any thing delivered by the primitive Church. And this, again, I am sure of, because I take the belief of the primitive Church, as it is expressed and delivered by the Councils and ancient Fathers of those times."

It is evident that the Carolines, in precept and practice, insist that the Church must let the early Fathers of the Faith assist it to understand the biblical message. The Bible holds a unique place in the Church, but it need not, and it must not, stand apart from the Church's heritage. Perhaps we could sum up the early Carolinian stand in this way: the Bible must never be subsumed under the Church's tradition; but once the tradition of the Church takes its proper subordinate place it can and should act as an almost indispensable guide to the full meaning of the Scriptural message.

It is even more important for us to understand that the early Carolines see the Church's absolute dependence upon Scripture as a sign of her absolute dependence upon Christ. The Church must listen to the Bible in order to hear the voice of Christ (Andrewes, Davenant, White and Laud). By the way they handle this concept it is evident they mean that the living Lord Jesus Christ speaks to His Church through the Scriptures, and that the place and importance of preaching is bound up with the place and importance of the Bible. Christ addresses His Church in the Bible and in similar fashion addresses His people by means of preaching.

Laud's comment about Word and body, pulpit and altar notwithstanding, the early 17th century Anglicans did not abandon the Reformation understanding of the Word, and consequently they

2. IV, p. 284
continued to think of Word and Sacraments together. Liturgically, then, they remained faithful to the Prayer Book. It seems odd to have to emphasize this point when so much of Laud's career centres upon his efforts to make the English clergy conform to the Prayer Book. But it has not infrequently been forgotten by later interpreters that Laud and his colleagues themselves conformed to the Prayer Book in the sense that for them the Word read and preached, the bread broken and eaten, all set in the context of prayer, constituted the full liturgy.

(b) The Sacraments:

A paragraph from John Overall's *Praelectiones seu Disputationes de Patrum et Christi anima et de Antichristo* fairly indicates the general position of the early Carolinians on the subject of Holy Communion.

"In the sacrament of the Eucharist or the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ, and therefore the whole Christ, are indeed really present, and are really received by us, and are really united to the sacramental signs, as signs which not only signify but also convey, so that in the right use of the sacrament, and to those who receive worthily, when the bread is given and received, the body of Christ is given and received, the blood of Christ is given and received and therefore the whole Christ is communicated in the Communion of the sacrament. Yet this is not in a carnal, gross, earthly way by transubstantiation or consubstantiation, or any like fictions of human reason, but in a way mystical, heavenly, and spiritual, as is rightly laid down in our Articles."

Two things about this comment ought to be noted as being generally typical of early 17th century Anglicanism. First, as the thrice repeated "really" serves to emphasize, there is a high doctrine of Christ's presence, which is yet to be distinguished from the

---

Roman and Lutheran doctrines of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation. Second, there is a re-affirmation of the Anglican tradition as embodied in the 39 Articles.

The former debate between the Roman Catholics and the Anglicans is therefore still going on. The Romanists are still accusing the Anglicans of seeing in the Sacrament only a "naked figure", and the Anglicans are protesting that though they deny the "carnal" presence they nevertheless affirm the "real" presence. The following quotations from a few of the early Carolines may be taken as examples.

"How then can we be charged with the heresy of these men, seeing we neither deny the verity of Christ's human nature, nor make the sacrament to be a naked figure or similitude only, but acknowledge that it consisteth of two things, the one earthly, and the other heavenly; and that the body of Christ is truly present in the sacrament and communicated to us, though neither corporeally torn with the teeth, nor popishly to be swallowed and carried down into the stomach and belly?"

"Let the devout Christian call to mind that He that said of the wine, 'This is My blood', and of the bread, 'This is My body', said also of St. John the Baptist 'This is that Elias', and of Himself, 'I am the door', 'the true vine', etc. ... Antiquity therefore is silent in the plea or the defence of Transubstantiation. ... (But) we acknowledge that the dignity of this Sacrament is greater than words can express, yea, than the mind of man is able to conceive. If any will exact the efficacy of those five words, 'For this is My body', we answer It is a great mystery. Truly we give, and that justly, great respect and reverence to the Holy Eucharist; for whereas bread and wine are elements naturally ordained for the sustenance of the body, by the power of divine benediction they do receive a virtue that, being received of the faithful, they become nourishment of the soul, nay, they become means whereby we are sanctified both in body and soul, and are made the members of Christ."

Laud, replying to Fisher's charge that all Protestants deny or doubt

the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, says:

"The Calvinists, at least they which follow Calvin himself, do not only believe that the true and real Body of Christ is received in the Eucharist, but that it is there, and that we partake of it, vera et realiter, which are Calvin's own words; ... And for the Church of England, nothing is more plain, than that it believes and teaches the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; unless A.C. (Fisher) can make a Body no Body, and Blood no Blood, as perhaps he can by transubstantiation — as well as bread no bread, and wine no wine. And the Church of England is Protestant too. So Protestants of all sorts maintain a true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and then, where is any known or damnable heresy here? As for the learned of those zealous men that died in this cause in Queen Mary's days, they denied not the real presence simply taken, but as their opposites forced transubstantiation upon them, as if that and the real presence had been all one. Whereas, all the ancient Christians ever believed the one, and none but modern superstitions Christians believe the other." 1

"I must confess my error and simplicity: for I would have thought, that in the Sacrament everie man would have confessed a change; that the consecrated Elements had beene somewhat more than meere ordinary Bread and Wine. For I did conceive a sacramentall Basing of them, and not only a natural, in their use and desigament ... A change of the elements, that is, Transmutation and Transclementation, do no inferred, you must know, Transubstantiation. For in the other two the matter remaineth; but in this the matter is destroyed". 2

Bishop Morton violently objects to the "slanderous" charge that Protestants teach that in the Sacrament there is only a "crust of Bread and a pittance of wine". 3

"A Christian man consisting of two men, of Outward, or bodily; and the Inward, which is, Spirituall; this Sacrament, accordingly, consisteth of two parts, Earthly and Heavenly: ... Answerable to both these is the double nourishment and Union of a Christian; the one Sacramentall, by communicating of the outward Elements of Bread and Wine, united to man's body, in his Taking, Eating, digesting, till at length it be transubstantiated into him, by being substantially incorporated in his flesh. The other, which is the Spirituall, and Soules food, is the Body and Blood of the Lord (therefore called

2. Mountague, Appello Caesaram, pp. 293f
3. Of the Institution of the Sacrament, 1651, IV, i, 3.
"Spirituall, because it is the Object of Faith) by a Union
wrought by God's Spirit, and man's faith; which (as hath beene
professed by Protestants) is most Reall and Ineffable."

These examples demonstrate the rejection of Transubstantiation
and the affirmation of the real presence by at least some of the early
Carolines, though the men just quoted may not each understand the
matter in exactly the same way. When we turn to certain others,
who are living and writing in this period, we find that there is what
appears on the surface at any rate to be fundamental disagreement on
eucharistic doctrine.

Take, for instance, the Irishman, James Ussher, and the Scotsman,
William Forbes. Ussher maintains that Rome is guilty, not only of
building hay and stubble on the foundation of the common faith of
the Church, but even of disturbing the foundation itself. The
catholic faith, that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, is
threatened by the Roman doctrine that the priest, by the words of
consecration, produces or "generates" Christ upon the altar. Ussher
cites the words of a Jesuit named Cornelius a Lapide who claims that
this is actually done "in such a powerful and effectual manner that,
if Christ as yet had not been incarnate, by these words, Hoc est
corpus meum, he should be incarnate and assume an human body".
Ussher asks if this "new Divinity" does not threaten the ancient
catholic faith. But William Forbes claims that though Transub-
stantiation is not of faith, and is even contrary to the Scriptures,
and more ancient Fathers, it is yet by no means to be condemned as

1. Ibid, V, i, 1; see also III, i, 1.
2. Works, pp. 490f; see also Morton, Op Cit, IV, i, 1.
heretical. And he suggests that the "more rigid Protestants" who think they have proven both Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation to be "heretical, impious, and blasphemous", have actually had their arguments effectively refuted by the Romans and the Lutherans. Many Protestants, he asserts, are too rash in their denial that God is able to convert the elements into Christ's body and blood. God can do many things that transcend our understanding and we must not presume to prescribe limits to His omnipotence. Forbes' own position is that those Protestants who hold that the body and blood of Christ are "really and actually and substantially present and taken in the Eucharist", are closest to the truth. Christ is present in a fashion beyond human understanding; how is not revealed to us in the Scriptures. It is not a "bodily or oral reception", but neither is it only by way of the understanding, or "merely by faith"; how Christ is present is known to God alone, and must be left to Him. Forbes disapproves of Protestant criticism on the practice of reserving the sacrament. Certainly Rome is wrong in consecrating the host for processions and theatrical pomp, and in thinking that the host is the real and substantial body of Christ apart from Communion itself. But in the ancient Church reservation was common practice, and we must be careful lest we condemn that.

Forbes' book is a bold attempt to lead Protestants to a more properly considered estimate of the Roman position. This is the

2. Ibid. I,iv,12; as in Stone, Op Cit. pp. 306f.
3. Ibid. I,ii,1; Stone, p. 306
4. Ibid. I,1,7; Stone, p. 306
5. Ibid. II, ii, 6; Stone, p. 307.
first time since the Reformation that we have heard an Anglican say that Transubstantiation is not heretical, impious, or blasphemous! Few of his colleagues would have agreed with him on this point. Joseph Hall, certainly, would have rejected any softening in the Protestant attitude to Transubstantiation. He reaffirms the traditional Anglican stand that since Christ's body is in heaven it cannot be on earth. Hall's doctrine of Christ's presence in the Sacrament reminds one of Hooper's and Bacon's. In spite of a number of qualifications, his tendency is to make the presence of Christ in the Eucharist dependent upon man's faith, man's believing. Obviously his doctrine of the Sacrament is different from Forbes. But almost all the other early Carolines hold higher doctrines of the Eucharist than Hall, yet in one way or another they reject Transubstantiation as being a serious and dangerous error. Forbes alone does not condemn it, though he says it is contrary to Scripture and the Fathers! In spite of the seeming disagreement I do not believe that Forbes' doctrine of the Eucharist was really at variance with the reformed Anglican tradition. Nor was it at variance with the doctrine of his Anglican contemporaries. For what fundamental difference can be found between Davenant (who was a militant Protestant) and Forbes over the presence of Christ in the Sacrament? Forbes says:

1. It is not really legitimate to call Forbes an "Anglican" for he is a Scot - a native of Aberdeen. He is a Caroline, though; he was for some time Principal of Marischall College, Aberdeen, and was the first Bishop of Edinburgh after Charles I founded the see in February, 1634. He died not long after his consecration on April 12, 1634.
"The holy fathers ... most firmly believed that he who worthily receives these mysteries of the body and blood of Christ really and actually receives unto himself the body and blood of Christ, but in a certain spiritual, miraculous, and imperceptible way." 1

"In the Supper by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost we invisibly partake of the substance of the body and blood of Christ, of which we are made recipients no otherwise than if we visibly ate and drank His flesh and blood." 2

Davenant says:

"Christ being taken away, there remains nothing in the Sacraments but an empty shew, and a ceremony stripped of all salutary efficacy: for Christ is the substance of the sacraments; the virtue and operation of Christ is the very life of the sacraments ..."

"If, as an outward administration of the sacraments is made by the hands of men, so an inward operation is wrought by the sole power of Christ; then it is vain to seek grace as though it were hidden in the signs themselves, or attached to the performance of them, i.e. to the outward administration of the sacraments: for it is to Christ alone, not to those external rites."

"The external administration of the sacraments is not to be despised, although the quickening and saving effect is to be expected neither from the human ministry, nor from the external signs, but from the Spirit of Christ: because Christ concurs with his institution, nor wills us to seek that grace from him which he promised, if we despise the sacraments of grace which he has directed to be used by us." 3

Forbes has in mind the "more rigid Protestants" and their tendency to reduce the presence of Christ in the Sacrament to a "spiritual" presence; the Sacrament is in this sense but a memorial of Christ's death. Forbes therefore claims the substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist by the power of the Holy Ghost. Davenant has in mind the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation and also the doctrine of _ex opere operato_. He therefore emphasizes the sovereign work of the living Lord Jesus Christ which makes the Sacrament to be what it is designed to be, the Sacrament of grace. In spite of

1. I, I, 2; in Stone, p. 306.  
2. I, I, 27; in Stone, p. 306  
3. On Colossians, 2:11
the difference of language they both affirm the presence of the whole Christ in the Eucharist so that He is miraculously given to His people.\(^1\) At this point there is no difference between Forbes and Ussher either. Forbes says plainly that "we do not receive only the benefits that flow from Christ; but the very body and blood of Christ, that is, Christ Himself crucified."\(^2\)

Turning now to Thomas Jackson we meet another Caroline whose eucharistic doctrine departs in an important respect from the traditional Anglican stand. Jackson claims that both the modern Roman and modern Lutherans have fallen into error, concerning Christ's presence in the Sacrament, because they can only conceive of Christ's body and blood working effectively upon us as some kind of physical medicine. Though Christ is not there in the same sense in which they claim He is, He is nevertheless present in the Eucharist; in fact (and this is where he differs with his Anglican precursors) He is present to the unworthy as much as He is to the worthy, though He is present to the former "in a quite contrary manner". In the same way that the sun shines upon people irrespective of whether their eyes are healthy or diseased, giving illumination for the one and irritation for the other; in the same way that the sun shines upon clay and wax, hardening the one and softening the other; so does Christ's blood "by its invisible but real influence mollify the hearts of such as come to the Sacrament with due preparation, but harden such as unworthily receive the consecrated elements".\(^3\)

Morton, on the other hand, claims that the teaching of the fathers

---

1. See also Davenant's Restoring Brotherly Communion, p. 80
"Christians partake not of shadowy representation but savingly partake of the body of Christ".


and of Calvin is to the effect that only the faithful partake of the body of Christ.¹

On the theme of the eucharistic sacrifice there is in some of the divines a noticeable change of emphasis from the Reformers comparable to the change we have already noted in Andrewes. Others, however, speak of it in almost the same fashion as did the Reformers and Jewel. White, for instance, refuses to admit that the name sacrifice can be applied to the Eucharist in a proper or univocal sense. In establishing the Sacrament Jesus did not choose an altar, He did not ordain any priests, nor did He Himself use any sacrificial words or actions. The Church of England rightly calls the Eucha rist a sacrifice, but this is true only in the sense that it is a representation of the real sacrifice on the Cross.² Laud follows the same line of thought. He refuses to countenance the Roman idea that the priest offers up what Christ Himself did. There is in the Eucharist a commemoration and a representation of the one sacrifice; Rome ought to go no further than that.³ Laud maintains that there are really three sacrifices offered to God in the Eucharist: (1) by the priest only, a commemoration of Christ’s death by the bread broken and the wine poured out; (2) by the priest and people together, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; (3) by each particular man, the offering of his body and soul. “It is safest for a man to believe the commemorative, the praising, and the performing sacrifice, and to offer them duly to God, and leave the Church of Rome

in this particular to her superstitions ... ¹

It is difficult to determine whether Morton goes any further than this. He first reiterates the well-remembered, though not less important, theme that Christ's death is the only properly propitiatory sacrifice. But that Sacrifice is objectively perpetual in the Church as the object of our remembrance,

"representatively and commemoratively, both in our acts of celebration, and in our prayers and praises offered up to God in the true apprehension of the efficacy and virtue thereof".

If I understand Morton properly both here and as he carries the argument forward, he is saying that Christ's self-offering is a propitiatory sacrifice by its own inherent virtue, whereas our commemoration of that self-offering in the Eucharist is "a Sacrifice propitious, as other holy acts of devotion, only by God's complacency and acceptance".²

Jackson handles the theme somewhat differently. In the Sacrament there is a propitiation for our sins for the obvious reason that Christ, who is the propitiation for our sins, is really present there. But it does not follow, he maintains, that there is any propitiatory sacrifice for sin in the Sacrament. The elements cannot directly cleanse us from our sins "by any virtue communicated unto them or inherent in them, but only as they are pledges or assurances of Christ's peculiar presence in them, and our true investiture in Christ by them". We always do receive forgiveness of our sins when we receive the Sacrament worthily; but this comes not simply by remembering His death, but rather "by the present efficacy or

¹. Vol. II, 339f.  ². VI, xii, 2.
operation of His body which was given for us, and His blood which was shed for us".  

After rejecting the idea that the Eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead, Field goes on to distinguish two kinds of offering to God. The first is where a man gives to God something that he possesses, so that henceforth it is God's, and for His employment. The second is where a man offers something to God in the sense of bringing it into God's sight so that He will be moved to do something because of it. It is in this second sense that Christ offers Himself daily in heaven. He does not present Himself and His body as a gift because He did that once for all on the Cross. Now in His daily offering He makes intercession for us by setting His unique sacrifice before the eyes of God the Father, and thereby obtaining grace and mercy for us. Our sacrifice in the Eucharist corresponds to this second sense of offering, corresponds to the intercession Christ makes on our behalf, for we in the Eucharist

"offer Him daily on the altar in that, commemorating His death and lively representing His bitter passions endured in His body upon the cross, we offer Him that was once crucified and sacrificed for us on the cross, and all His sufferings, to the view and gracious consideration of the Almighty, earnestly desiring, and assuredly hoping, that He will incline to pity us and show mercy unto us for this His dearest Son's sake, who in our nature for us, to satisfy His displeasure, and to procure us acceptance, endured such and so grievous things. This kind of offering or sacrificing Christ commemoratively is twofold; inward and outward; outward, as the taking, breaking, and distributing the mystical bread, and pouring out the cup of blessing, which is the Communion of the blood of Christ; the inward consistseth in the faith and devotion of the Church and people of God so commemorating the death and passion of Christ their crucified Saviour, and representing and setting it before the eyes of the Almighty, that they fly unto it as their

1. Creed, X,lv,9; St. 294.  
2. Vol. II, p. 59
"only stay and refuge, and beseech Him to be merciful unto them for His sake that endured all these things, to satisfy His wrath, and work their peace and good".1

Forbes' doctrine of the sacramental sacrifice is not far different from that. He first speaks of the Fathers who often claim that the body of Christ is offered and sacrificed in the Eucharist, though not in such a way that all the characteristics of a sacrifice are preserved. Rather is it by way (1) of commemoration and representation of the one and only sacrifice in which Christ consummated all other sacrifices, and (2) of prayer, whereby the minister of the Church entreat God the Father

"on account of the abiding Victim of that one sacrifice, who is seated in heaven on the right hand of the Father and is present on the Holy Table in an ineffable manner, to grant that the virtue and grace of this perpetual Victim may be efficacious and healthful to His Church for all the necessities of body and soul".2

Forbes insists that the Eucharist can be called "hilastic or propitiatory" in a quite genuine sense, not as though in itself it effects the propitiation and forgiveness of sins, for only the sacrifice on the Cross effects that,

"but as impetrating the propitiation which has already been made, as prayer, of which this sacrifice is a kind, can be called propitiatory".3

Further, the eucharistic sacrifice can be profitable not only for the living but also for the departed.4

In the sermon he preached at Andrewes' funeral John Buckeridge deals comprehensively with the theme of sacrifice. Christ offered the one true sacrifice; all other sacrifices are relative to it. In the Cross and the Eucharist there is "the same sacrificed thing";

1. Vol. II, pp. 61f. 2. III, i,10; in Stone, p. 307
3. III,ii,3; Stone 308 4. III,ii,17; Stone, 308
Christ's body and blood offered to the Father, though it is impossible that there should be in the Eucharist the same sacrifice, properly so called. In the Eucharist there is a 

"representative, or commemorative, and participated sacrifice of the passions of Christ, the true sacrifice, that is past; and here is an eucharistical sacrifice; but for any external proper sacrifice, especially as sacrifice doth signify the action of sacrificing, here is not one word. And therefore this is a new conceit of latter men, since Thomas' time, unknown to him, and a mere novelism".

After citing Hebrews 13:15 and Romans 12:1, Buckeridge discusses the sacrifice of praise, and the offering of our bodies as a living sacrifice, which are made and accepted only in, by, and through Christ. In the Eucharist the Church offers not Christ's natural body but His mystical body: the Church offers itself to God.

Buckeridge quotes Augustine's words:

"The Church, being the body of our Head Himself, doth learn to offer itself, that is, the Church, by Him, that is, by Christ".

The Church of England in her reformed Liturgy has the important words concerning the offering of "ourselves, our souls, and bodies to be a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto Thee, which is our reasonable service" - words not contained in the canon of the Mass.

"We deny not then the daily sacrifice of the Church, that is, the Church itself, warranted by Scriptures and Fathers. We take not upon us to sacrifice the natural body of Christ otherwise than by commemoration, as Christ Himself and St. Paul doth prescribe. They rather that take a power never given them over the natural body of Christ, which once offered by Himself purchased eternal redemption all-sufficient for sin, to offer it again and often, never thinking of the offering of Christ's mystical body, the Church, that is ourselves, our souls and bodies - they I say do destroy the daily sacrifice of Christians, which is most acceptable to God.
"Now then that which went before in the Head, Christ, on the
cross, is daily performed in the members, in the Church.
Christ there offered Himself once for us; we daily offer
ourselves by Christ, that so the whole mystical body of Christ
in due time may be offered to God".

Bickeridge also points out how important the presentation of alms
is in the Liturgy as part of our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

No Anglican in this period can be found to defend private Mass.
The position of the Prayer Book is explicitly or implicitly upheld.

There is not the same controversy over the doctrine of
Baptism as over the Lord's Supper, and much less attention is
therefore paid to Baptism. It is interesting, however, to notice
that the early Carolines (except Andrews) are not inclined to make
comparisons between Baptism and the Supper as the Reformers do.
That latter assert their doctrine of the Eucharist against the papist
by claiming that it is like Baptism. If there is no Transubstantiation in Baptism neither is there Transubstantiation in the
Supper; if there is no propitiatory sacrifice in Baptism neither
is there that kind of sacrifice in the Supper. On the whole, the
Reformers understand the two sacraments together. The early
Carolines (we must always except Andrews) are rather more guilty
of treating the Eucharist by itself, and in the process their
doctrine both of Baptism and of the Supper suffers. Certainly
Baptism does not feature importantly in their writings.

However, Hall in his treatise Against the Brownists emphasizes
the role of Baptism. He first tells the Brownists that the only
2. White, 341; Morton I, 11,5; Andrewes Works Vol. VIII pp. 265ff
justifiable ground for separating from the visible Church is when it "razes the foundation" of the Church. Sometimes churches will build hay and stubble on the true foundation but that is not a sufficient reason for separation. On their part the Brownists must face the fact that unless Christ has taken away His Word and Spirit from the Church of England they have, in withdrawing from the Church, withdrawn themselves from Christ. After saying this Hall shifts his ground somewhat and claims that even in the time of Henry VIII England had a true visible Church and

"so by consequent their succeeding seed was, by true baptism, justly admitted into the bosom thereof; and there, that even of them without any further profession, God's Church was truly constituted."^3

Having established that point Hall then lays before the Brownists this alternative: if the Church of England is a true Church the Separatists must return; if it is a false Church they must rebaptize if its baptism is good its constitution is good. 4

Field, dealing with much the same question, says that if heretics are not "of the Church" then they cannot baptize. Though there is a real sense in which they are not "of the Church" still they do "in some sort pertain to the Church, and so consequently have that degree, order, office, ministry, and calling, which is holy; by

1. Vol. IX, p. 10. 2. Ibid, p. 17. 3. Ibid, p. 24. 4. Ibid, p. 25 As we pointed out in chapter II, Hall is able to apply this logic against the Brownists with no feeling that it could backfire upon the Church of England, only because of his unquestioned belief in the national Church. He admits that the Church in Henry VIIIs time had true baptism. This implies (on his own principles) that its fundamental constitution as a Church was good. How then does he justify the Reformation? In his mind, obviously, the Reformation was simply the national Church exercising its rightful prerogative over its own affairs and bringing about a reform in doctrine and worship. The fact that it withdrew from the jurisdiction of Rome does not mean it separated from the Church; it means only that foreign domination was brought to an end.
virtue whereof they do administer the holy sacraments". Laud makes a distinction between a *true* Church and a *right* Church. A Church can be exceedingly corrupt in manners and doctrine and yet be a true Church "in the verity of essence, as a Church is a company of men which profess the faith of Christ, and are baptized into His name". In that sense the Roman Church is a true Church but she is certainly neither "right" nor "orthodox".

Perhaps it is also worth mentioning that in the other place where Hall refers to Baptism, he calls it the "face" of the Catholic Church. In interpreting Paul's words "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" he paraphrases them to mean that the Church is one in its head, its heart and its face.

We will conclude this discussion of baptism with a reference from Davenant, who in his commentary on Colossians, sets out briefly a part of the biblical doctrine of Baptism. After preparing his ground by saying, as we have already quoted above, that Christ is the very substance of the sacraments, without whose personal presence there remains nothing but an empty show, he goes on to explain that in Baptism that which was actually "done in Christ by nature" is now done in us by "analogy and comparison". The body of sin is weakened, repressed, overwhelmed, and finally buried, so that it no longer exercises control over us. This is accomplished in Baptism in a "two-fold respect";

"1. In respect to Christ; in whom, when we are engrafted by baptism, the benefits of the death of Christ are conferred upon and sealed to us: but he being dead and buried, it is clear that our sins were also dead and buried with him...

"2. Not only in the person of our Head, but even in our own selves our sins are said to be buried in baptism: because that mortification and burial of sin is not only performed sacramentally in one moment in the act of baptism; but really also is carried on by the Spirit of grace received in baptism, through the whole life of a Christian." 1

The issue of Christian unity in relation to the Sacrament has been touched upon briefly in our treatment of Andrewes. The fact that Andrewes gives comparatively little attention to the question is a reliable indication of the part it plays in the writings of his contemporaries. There is only one other man in the early Caroline period who deals with it seriously and that is Egeon Askew. He published his book on Brotherly Reconcilement in 1605 and in it we find, for the first time in Anglican theology, the claim that genuine reconciliation ought to precede the reception of the Sacrament. Andrewes of course touches upon this matter as well, but rather differently. He suggests that the Holy Spirit, who is given in the Sacrament, since He is in Himself "essential Unity", will not come unless there is unity of Spirit. 2 Askew also has this in mind in his reference to Acts 2 when he says that God only sent the Holy Ghost when they were all of one accord. But then he turns to Matt. 5:24 and comments

"And if this sacrifice without precedent unity be not accepted much less maist thou hope for acceptance of thy selfe, if when thou receuest the bodie of the Lord thou be not first reconciled to thy brother. For if (like the factious Corinthians) when ye come together in the Church to receive, there be dissensions among you, the Apostle tells you, this is not to eate the Lord's body, but to eate of the bread and drinke of the cup unworthily to your owne damnation, 1 Cor. 11:23 Let a man therefore first examine himselfe of his brotherly loue and reconcilement; and till then not dare to eate of this bread and drinke of this cup".

1. Colossians 2:12; p. 441f. 
2. III, pp. 112f.
The Sacrament is the feast of love, and from us who are to receive it is required brotherly love. 1 Askew is of course dealing with the estrangement between the Puritans and the Anglicans and he endeavors to show how imperative it is that they labour for reconciliation. He wrote this book shortly after the Hampton Court Conference, and it is not unimportant to note that he believed they were in complete consent "in the center of religion, though not all in the circumference of opinion". He adds that "our gracious Soueraigne like a blessed peace-maker, hath decided the differente of ceremonies indifferent". 2

It is only in 1641 that we have another, John Davenant, writing on Brotherly Reconciliation. But since we have already referred to this in a previous chapter, and since he does not relate Reconciliation to the question of the Sacrament, we shall not touch upon it here.

To sum up the early Caroline doctrine of the sacraments the following points may be made: (1) Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the Sacraments of the Church; (2) the Sacraments are the instruments of God by which He gives His grace to the Church, not the instruments of the Church to win something from God; (3) the Church depends upon the sacraments and must on no account neglect them.

The first point can be left without further elucidation, but we must in concluding this section be quite clear about the meaning of the second and the third.

The early Carolines consider the sacraments to be the instruments

---

1 A. P. 30f.
2 A. P. 250
of God. They are of course the Church's too, but hers only as they are His. The sacraments are channels or arteries that convey God's grace and God's Spirit, yes that convey Christ Himself "truly and really". This is Andrewes' understanding, which is shared by most of his colleagues, even though they did not think as clearly or deeply about it as he did. There is a comment in G. W. Bromiley's book on Cranmer which exactly sums up the early Caroline position as well. The sacraments, he says, were given primarily not as a reminder to God, but as a guarantee to us. It is not that we hold out to God a ground of acceptance but that God holds out to us a ground of assurance.¹

In contrast to this there is the Roman point of view that the Church has had placed in her hands an effective instrument whereby she can bring grace upon herself. That is, God responds to something the Church does.

But the Anglican doctrine, upheld by the early Carolines, is that God uses the sacraments to pour His grace upon His people. That is, the Church is responding to what God does. From this view point the whole Eucharist is done in response to and in remembrance of, Christ. The Eucharist is celebrated because God has first condescended to us, it does not cause God to condescend. It is celebrated in the knowledge that God wills to bind the Church to Christ again and again.

The early 17th century Anglicans reassert the Reformation view that the Church's dependence upon both Word and Sacraments is a sign of her dependence upon God. The Church is not given

¹ Op.Cit, p. 86
control of the sacraments, rather they are God's instruments, and the Church's only as they are His. The Church does not have the power to propagate her own life. That is what Davenant has in mind when he insists that the virtue and operation of Christ is the very life of the sacraments. He is battling against a view that leads men to look away from Christ and His personal Lordship of the Church through the Sacraments, and that leads them to look only at the administration of the sacraments as though "grace were hidden in the signs themselves." Not all the early Carolines see these issues as clearly as do Andrewes, Davenant, Hall, and Ussher. As a whole, nevertheless, they uphold reformed Anglican doctrine.

The other point to be considered in this summing up is the early Caroline insistence that the sacraments must on no account be neglected. These are God's chosen means of binding His people to Himself, and so to neglect the sacraments is to threaten the life of the Church. The early Carolines react strongly against the tendency in some Puritan circles to deprecate the value of the Sacraments. In fact the Carolines never cease to fight the sacramental battle on two fronts, the one against the Roman who in their extopere operato doctrine blaspheme against God's personal sovereign over the Sacrament, and the other against those Puritans who question the presence of Christ's body and blood given in the Sacrament. The Eucharist is exalted in the hands of the early Carolines, not because it has independent efficacy, but because God by the wonderful power of His Holy Spirit makes us recipients of the body and blood of Christ "no otherwise than if we visibly ate and drank His flesh and blood".

1. Colossians 2:11
Section III - The Later Carolines

(a) The Word.

In the preface to the book Anglicanism, which he and Dr. Cross edited, P. E. More calls the 17th century the "age of adjustment after the first confusion of the Reformation." This, it seems to me, does not fit the facts. For sheer theological consistency, even when men like Hooper and Becon are included, the 16th century divines taken as a group tower above the Carolines. In fact, the Later Carolines period is a theological muddle compared with the Reformation period. Among the later Carolines there are many, for instance, who have come to embrace a theology that is far different from that of the Reformation, yet they retain certain strong emphases that have come from the Reformation. Others, who keep much closer ties with Reformation theology, manifest a number of deviations from Reformation practice.

John Cosin is an example of the latter. In Cosin's writings we can see the strong influence of Andrewes and Overall, and in many ways he is one of the most vigorous defenders of the true Anglican tradition. Yet in his younger years he differs considerably, on a number of issues, from classical Anglican doctrine. In the early days of his ministry the Puritans are gaining in strength chiefly through their preaching, and the bishops find themselves unable to control the preaching that is going on in their dioceses. When Cosin is chosen to preach at the consecration of Francis White as Bishop of Carlisle on December 3, 1636, he uses the occasion to remind his audience (if any present need to be reminded) that men

1. 1935, p. v.
can rightfully preach only by a bishop's license. In fact only the bishop is sent by Christ to preach. The priest by his orders is authorized to "offer up the prayers and sacrifices of the Church, to administer the Sacrament, to bind and to loose"; but Cosin interprets the words in the Ordinal, "Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments in the Congregation, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto" to mean that a priest cannot preach unless appointed to a specific place by a bishop. This, Cosin maintains, is what the old canons say, and stories from the ancient Church show that

"They thought priests had a deal to do besides, to say their hours, to sing the service, to visit the sick, to reconcile penitents, and not to preach so much, though they neglected not this neither: but then it was when the bishop set them a-work, when he was otherwise employed, and could not so often attend it; for there must be preaching howsoever. I would not be mistaken, I come not here to preach down preaching; but this I wonder at, that preaching now-a-days should be counted our only office, as if we had nothing else to do, and an office independent too, as if we were all bishops when we preach."¹

We can understand why Cosin is concerned, of course, because from his point of view the situation is almost out of hand. Yet it is interesting that he does not apply the words in the Ordinal in a similar way to the administration of the sacraments. Plainly he is here sharing in the general effort of the prelates and the King to bring the Puritans under established authority. But can we explain his comments on preaching as being prompted solely by his anxiety over the Puritan problem? Is there not evidence here that his conception of the ministry differs somewhat from original anglican doctrine? Certainly if he does see the ministry

¹. Vol. I, pp. 95f.
of a priest chiefly in terms of the saying of hours, the singing of services, the visiting of the sick, and the reconciling of penitents, with preaching annexed to the episcopal office, then we have to say that his doctrine of the ministry differs from that of his predecessors.

Edward Stillingfleet is an example of the other type: his general understanding of the Christian Faith certainly does not conform to that of the Reformers, yet he has a strong emphasis in his writings on the preaching of the Gospel. His thought moves to a certain extent within the categories of "the law of nature", "the moral law", "the dictates of right reason", and "religion". He gives partial justification for the existence of the Church on the grounds that nature dictates that there should be such a society for Divine Worship, and goes on to speak of the sociable nature of man's nature, of the improvement religion makes to man's sociable nature, and of how God is more greatly honored by a "sociable way of worship". Yet it is Stillingfleet who in this same book affirms the Reformation principle that Word and Sacraments must stand together. He deplores the fact that some seem to think ordination sends them forth to be "readers of publick prayers" and forget that they are supposed to be "dispensers of God's holy word". He asks if the apostles were commissioned by Christ to prayer or to preach. If we succeed them in their ministry is it not, then, to be preachers of the Gospel? "Preaching is the end

1. *Irenicum*, pp. 18f, 36ff, 40f, etc. 2. Ibid, p. 15
of praying, in as much as the blessings conveyed by preaching are the things which men pray for". 1 In fact when Christ breathed on the Apostles and said "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever ye retain, they are retained", he was giving them the authoritative power for preaching the Gospel. For Christ means by these words that whoever by the preaching of the Gospel comes and yields himself up to the "tenders of grace proclaimed therein" has his sins forgiven, and whoever continues obstinate binds himself by his guilt to punishment. 2

We have cited Cosin and Stillingfleet as convenient illustrations of how difficult it is to treat the later Carolines as a theological group. It is almost imperative that each man be treated separately. But we can include them all when we say that their comments on the preaching of the Word, and even on the place of Scripture in the Church, do not, taken by themselves, tell us where they stand with regard to the main stream of anglican theology. We cannot assume that, because they affirm the necessity for preaching, they are convinced of the absolute dependence of the Church upon the Gospel for her life. With the earlier Anglicans one could almost always assume this. Even reading an old moralist like Joseph Hall (to take an early Caroline who lived almost to the Restoration) you never doubt his perception of the depth of God's grace in Christ, and the Church's dependence on it for her life and being. For Hall, to preach the Word is to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ's grace. For many of the later Carolines to

1. Ibid, pp. 44ff.
2. Ibid, p. 506.
preach the Word normally means to preach Christ's law. The most obvious example of this is William Sherlock, but he is not an isolated instance. We shall take several selections from his Discourse Concerning the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, and see how far he deviates from the reformed anglican understanding of the Faith.

"To know Christ, is not to be thus acquainted with his Person, but to understand his Gospel in its full latitude and extent; it is not the Person, but the Gospel of Christ, which is the Way, the Truth, and the Life ... " 1

"All that the Gospel tells us is, that Christ loved sinners so as to die for them, and that he loves good men, who believe and obey his Gospel, so as to save them, and that he continues to love them, while they continue to be good; but hate a them when they return to their old vices ... " 2

"The unchangeableness of God's Love doth not consist in being always determined to the same object, but in that he always loves for the same reason, that is, that he always loves true virtue and goodness, wherever he sees it, and never ceases to love any person, till he ceases to be good, and then the immutability of his Love is the reason why he loves no longer; for should he love a wicked man, the reason and nature of his Love would change; ... He governs reasonable creatures by Principles of Reason, as he doth the material World by the necessary Laws of matter, and bruit creatures by the Instincts and Propensities of nature." 3

"The Righteousness of God, which is more than the Righteousness of all the men in the World, cannot make an unrighteous man righteous ... " 4

"The Scripture uses these phrases promiscuously, to be 'justified by faith', to be 'justified by the faith of Christ' and 'to be justified by Christ', and to be 'justified through faith in his Blood', and to be 'justified and saved by grace', nay 'By believing that Christ is the Son of God' John xix.31, and 'that God raised him from the dead', Rom. x.9. all which signify the same thing, that we are justified by believing and obeying the Gospel of Christ ... " 5

"Christ's Righteousness and our own are both necessary to our Salvation, the first as the foundation of the Covenant, the other as the condition of it." 6

1. P. 94; contrast this with Beveridge Vol. I, pp. 346f.  
2. Discourse Concerning the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, p. 147  
Even if Sherlock speaks highly of the necessity for preaching he is going to mean something very different from what Jewel or Andrewes means. This is also true of Henry Hammond, Edward Stillingfleet, Jeremy Taylor, Henry Ferne, Isaac Barrow, and even Herbert Thorndike, to name six of the later Carolines whom I consider to share Sherlock's theological viewpoint in part at least. It is true, of course, that these men differ too. Stillingfleet and Taylor are miles apart in their interpretation of episcopacy and succession. Taylor is a deeper thinker than most of the others, and Thorndike is more profound than any of them. Yet all of them are tied together by the fact that their thought is moralistic, and, surprisingly enough, individualistic. They all manifest confidence in the light of human reason, and they see God's grace as the power to enable men to keep the rules of the Gospel. They talk a different language than their predecessors, and it is because they are talking about a different kind of Gospel. Where would we find a reformed Anglican who would ever say this?

"Our pardon of sins, when it is granted after the breach of our covenant, is just so secure as our perseverance is: concerning which, because we must ascertain it as well as we

1. If it be objected that Thorndike could not possibly be included with the others as being individualistic, we need only refer to the first paragraph of his work "The Covenant of Grace". There he says: "The greatest difference that is to be discerned among those things that concern the duty of all Christians, consists in this; that some of them concern Christians as Christians; others as members of the Church. For though all Christians, as Christians, are bound to be members of the Church (inasmuch as it is a part of their profession to believe one Catholic Church); yet their obligation to be Christians, being in order of nature and reason before their obligation to be members of the Church (because the very being of the Church presupposes all that are members of it to be Christians), that obligation which is original and more ancient, must needs be presupposed to that which is grounded upon it. Works, Vol. III, p. 1."
"can, but ever with fear and trembling, so also is the estate of our pardon hazardous, conditional, revocable, and uncertain; and, therefore, the best of men do, all their lives, ask pardon, even of those sins for which they have wept bitterly, and done the sharpest and severest penance. And, if it be necessary, we pray that we may not enter into temptation, because temptation is full of danger, and the danger may bring a sin, and the sin may ruin us: it is also necessary that we understand the condition of our pardon to be, as is the condition of our person, variable as will, sudden as affections, alterable as our purposes, revocable as our own good intentions, and then made as ineffective as our inclinations to good actions and there is no way to secure our confidence and our hope, but by being perfect, and holy, and pure, as our heavenly Father is; that is, in the sense of human capacity, free from the habits of all sin, and active, and industrious, and continuing in the way of godliness. For upon this only the promise is built, and by our proportion to this state we must proportion our confidence; we have no other revelation."  

Taylor associates preaching with God's "legislative" activity. Though these men have not forgotten that the central doctrine of the Reformers was justification by faith, in their hands it receives a twist, and the result is a doctrine the Reformers would never have recognized - or perhaps would have recognized only too well as belonging to the Romans.

And so, although I have already pointed out how difficult it is to make any generalization s about the later Carolines, I am now about to make one. It is this: in the writings of the later Carolines the proclamation of the Word does not mean so much the preaching of grace as the preaching of law. Naturally qualifications of this are necessary in the light of specific parts of the works of some of these divines. Yet it is plain that they do not really see preaching as the declaration of God's great work of grace in Jesus Christ. In the preaching of the earlier Anglicans God's

2. Vol. III, p. 504
Law is the servant of His Grace; in the later Carolines God's Grace is the servant of the Law. Now that I have made the generalization I must make clear that it does not apply to Beveridge, Peason or Cosin.  

The next point to be considered is that of Scripture and reason and we should keep in mind that the early Carolines are trying to make their way between Romans on the one side and Puritans on the other. Taylor speaks of the Apostles as being the fountains of tradition, to which all parts of the Church are to conform. The Church must not make herself a judge of the truth, but only point to "the code" which she has received, and show that what is needed to be known is there. The difficulty is that when doubt arises concerning any matter of belief the Catholic Church has no court of judicature where a person may go to have the matter settled; and a more serious difficulty is that when the Church is divided there is no higher court to decide the disputes between the separate parts of the Church.  

If there can be any arbiter at all it must be reason.

"So that in this question, by reason I do not mean a distinct topic, but a transcendent that runs through all topics; for reason, like logic, is instrument of all things else; and when revelation, and philosophy, and public experience, and all other grounds of probability or demonstration, have supplied us with matter, then reason does but make use of them ... All these disputes concerning tradition, councils, fathers, etc., are not arguments against or besides reason, but contestations and pretences to the best arguments, and the most certain satisfaction of our reason. But then all

1. It is difficult to know where to place John Bramhall; he is concerned to preserve the tradition of the reformed anglicah Church, yet I find him a superficial thinker.
"these coming into question submit themselves to reason, that is, to be judged by human understanding, upon the best grounds and information it can receive. So the Scripture, tradition, councils, and fathers, are the evidence in a question, but reason is the judge." 

At the same time Taylor does not believe that reason settles all questions indubitably. In the interpretation of Scripture there are so many difficulties that the wisest man will have the least confidence in what he expounds. Everybody agrees that the Creed contains those things that are clearly set down in Scripture. But beyond that it is only right that every man be left at liberty to believe according to his own conscience; "a necessity derived from the consideration of the difficulty of Scripture in questions controverted, and the uncertainty of any internal medium of interpretation".

It is most interesting to note that with Taylor matters of Church order, and moral questions, are discussed with greater confidence than theological issues. Taylor apparently feels that, beyond the plain doctrine that is summed up in the Creed, Scripture is somewhat obscure on matters of Faith, whereas it is quite clear on questions of Order, and on the pattern of the holy life.

The issue of Scriptural interpretation bothers the Later Carolines considerably. From the beginning the Anglicans assumed that differences with the Romans were due to the fact that the latter did not take the Word of God as their primary authority; but now the Puritan party is accusing the Anglican prelates of failing to take the Word of God seriously enough. It appears to the Carolines then that the difficulty is in interpretation, and

whereas the Early Carolines emphasize the assistance the tradition of the Fathers gives in understanding the Scriptures, the Later Carolines lay a great deal of weight upon the role of reason as well. Thorndike maintains that the same common sense which assures us that the Scriptures are true must also "assure" us of what they mean. Everything else, knowledge of the original languages, comparison of various passages, the text itself, plus contemporary writers who help us to understand the nature of the times— all these are but helps to common sense. If that does not bring certainty then we can only rely upon the consent of the Church that tells us of the belief and practice of the early Christians.¹

Thorndike thinks that the expedient of turning to the early tradition of the Church will not happen only occasionally; for he is convinced that all those things that are necessary to salvation are by no means "clear in the Scriptures".² It is not enough, as Hobbes has suggested in "Leviathan", that we believe simply that the Lord Jesus is the Christ.³ What is required of us is sometimes obscure and difficult to understand.⁴ After a most carefully worked out argument Thorndike, refusing to accept either the position of the Puritans that the Scriptures are perfectly clear to all men, or the position of the papists that the authority of the Church is the basis for believing what the Scriptures contain, reaches this conclusion:

"We affirm whatsoever the whole Church, from the beginning, hath received and practised for the rule of faith and manners, all that to be evidently true by the same reason for which we believe the very Scriptures; and therefore that the meaning of them is necessarily to be confined within those bounds, so

4. Ibid, pp. 82ff
"that nothing must be admitted for the truth of them which
contradicteth the same". 1

This imposes a limitation upon Scriptural interpretation, or in
Thorndike's terms, imposes a limitation "to the fancies of all men
that take upon them to interpret the Scriptures". 2 Thorndike
finds himself in greater kinship with "the most learned of the
Church of Rome who are not willing to attribute infallibility to
the present pronunciations of the Church, than he does with the
Socinians who rest everything upon Scripture alone without the con-
sent of the Church. 3

Bramhall is suspicious of what he calls "unwritten fundamen-
tals" 4, and affirms the dependence of the Church upon Scripture;
though Scripture does not derive its authority from the fact that
it is written, but from the Holy Spirit by whom it came to be.
Scripture comprehends all "supernatural truths". But Bramhall
does not think that we should consider Scripture to be the judge,
so much as the rule, of supernatural truths. It is the law or
rule by which we judge what is right and wrong. 5 In order to be
capable of expounding Scripture properly we need first to know the
right analogy of faith, to which all interpretations of Scripture
must conform; secondly, to know the practice and tradition of the
Church, and "the received expositions of former interpreters in the
successive ages, which gives a great light to the finding out of
the right sense"; thirdly, to be able to compare one passage with
another; and lastly to know the "idiotisms" of the languages of
Scripture. 6

When we turn to Pearson and Beveridge on the Bible we again encounter the traditional anglican position, reasserted with vigor. If when we read many of the other later Carolines we are unsure whether the Bible deserves the authoritative place within, and also over, the tradition of the Church, when we read Pearson and Beveridge we are left in no doubt about this. According to Pearson, the Apostles delivered to the Church the same Word they heard from Christ. Their message is only theirs because it is delivered by their ministry: actually the source is God Himself who speaks by them. That is why the apostolic witness was, and must still be, the "foundation of Faith". The household of God is built upon this foundation of the apostles and prophets, and it is only by their writings that the "truths" which they received from God are conveyed to us. We therefore conclude that "the true nature of the Faith of a Christian, as the state of Christ's Church now stands, and shall continue to the end of the World, consists in this, that it is an assent unto truths credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto us in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets".

We scarcely need add, since these comments are taken from Pearson's work on the Creed, that he believes the witness of the early Church to be of great importance. He looks upon the Creed as a guide to lead us "to the Scriptures, from whence it was at first deduced."

We can discern in Pearson, and even more in the others, a tendency to speak of the Bible as a repository of divine truths, whereas the earlier Anglicans were more inclined to speak of it as

1. Creed, p. 16.  2. Ibid, pp. 18f  3. Ibid, p. xii
the witness to what God has said and done. There are even times where Beveridge refers to the Word of God as "the whole system of Divine Revelations" contained in the Old and New Testaments. That is, here Beveridge is affected by the attitude of his time, which regarded the Bible as though it were a depositum of that which is revealed and therefore separable from the Word and work of the Revealer. But of all the men in the Later Caroline period he is least affected by this attitude. For he tells us plainly that

"By 'the Word', therefore, we are to understand that which the Apostles preached, and which is now contained and delivered to us in the Books of the Old and New Testament wherein it hath pleased the Most High God to speak His mind, to make known Himself and His Will to us ... "

Not only has the Most High God spoken His mind in the preaching of the Apostles, He still speaks to us by their writings, the same Holy Spirit by whom they wrote and spoke now conveying His Word to us. And it is in the doctrine which they taught that we must be grounded. What is there written we are bound to believe and act upon; nothing else can we be obliged to believe and observe. The excellency of the Church of England consists in its refusal to require anything as an article of faith except what "the Apostles first taught, and what the Church of Christ in all ages hath believed to be consonant to the doctrine contained in their writings; "

We shall return shortly to further comments on Beveridge's treatment of the Church, Scripture, and tradition. At the moment we must note the peculiar urgency in all his writings that the Good News of the Bible be heard in the Church. The Word in the Bible

2. Vol. V, p. 146
must become the Word in and to the Church, and that only comes about by constant reading and preaching in the liturgy of the Church. For the normal way God conveys the Holy Spirit to the Church is by the Word. In the same way that God created the world by His Word, so He recreates it by the same, His Holy Spirit moving upon our heart while His Word is sounding in our ears. We read in the Scriptures that the Spirit of God fell upon people while they listened to God speaking to them by an apostle or prophet. It is the same Word that we are to hear now, for faith still comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. We must therefore not only search the Scriptures and read the Word ourselves, but also hear it often from

"some that are empowered and sent from Him to declare it to (us) and must accordingly receive it, 'not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the Word of God, which worketh effectually in them that believe'"  

Beveridge is perfectly serious when he says that the preached Word ought to be received not as a Word of man, but as the Word of God. The reason why the preaching of the Word makes so little impression upon men nowadays, he maintains, is because they will not look past the preacher. They see there in front of them a fellow creature, a man of like passions with themselves, and regard what he says as being no more than what might be spoken by any man.

"Whereas if they really believed and considered, that the Word they hear, is the Word of God Himself; and that he who preacheth it, preacheth not in his own name, but God's ... they would soon find it 'working effectually' also upon them"  

Ministers are commissioned to act in Christ's name and stead; they

2. Vol. I, pp. 196f; Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV, i.5.
are ambassadors for Christ. Those who are ordained within the apostolic succession receive the same Spirit that was conferred upon the apostles, and thus become ambassadors for Christ as they were. As ambassadors ministers speak strictly on behalf of God. In fact God speaks by them, for they speak only what is delivered to them by Christ, and act only in His name and by His authority. They are sent to represent Him, to stand in His place; that is why Jesus said, "He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me."

Beveridge is not foolish enough to believe that all preaching is good, and he tells his congregation that sermons are not necessarily God's word. If they contain things contrary to Scripture then obviously they are not; but we are sure, when in God's House we hear the Scriptures read by one of God's own properly commissioned ministers, that we are hearing God's Word from God Himself, for it is He who is speaking by His minister. When Beveridge uses the phrase "Word of God" he means the Scriptures, and when he talks about preaching the Word of God he means first and last the preaching of the message of the Scriptures.

Still, it is not always easy to know what this message is, and Beveridge maintains that the Bible seems to be the constant source of heresy and schism. But that is only because men are ignorant of the original languages, or because they are too lazy to understand it in its proper background, or because men in their pride

1. Beveridge states explicitly here that only ordination within the succession has the promised gift of the Holy Spirit, but since we have dealt with that in detail in the previous chapter we shall not go into it again.
refuse to accept anything they cannot fully apprehend, such as the
Trinity, Incarnation, etc. It is all the more important, therefore,
that we do not indulge our own fancies, or idolize our own private
opinions,

"but 'hold fast the form of sound words' delivered to us in the
Holy Scriptures, in that sense which the Catholic Church in
all ages hath put upon them".

Beveridge believes that since Christ purchased the Church with His
own blood He is not going to abandon her to walk forever in error
and heresy. He cares for the Church, and directs her, and if we
have in mind the Universal Church of all ages we can be sure that
the greatest part of her will always be in the right. It is part
of our Creed that the Catholic Church is holy, and this would be
impossible unless she were free from heresy, which is the very
opposite of holiness.

"He therefore that would be sure not to fall into damnable
errors, must be sure also to continue firm and steadfast to
the doctrine of the Universal Church, as being grounded upon
the Scriptures rightly understood: for so every thing is
that she hath taught us. For the Catholic Church never under-
took, as the Romish hath done, to coin new doctrines of her
own head: no, she always took the Scriptures for the only
standard of truth, and hath accordingly delivered her sense
of them, in such words as she judged to agree exactly with
those which are there used". 1

Beveridge, in his writings, frequently faces the problem:
Scripture is over the Church, but must be understood in and by the
Church. He refuses to permit the Romans to place tradition next
to Scripture as part of the foundation of faith. Scripture is
sufficient to itself and therefore must stand by itself.2

Scripture is its own witness to the unique authority it possesses.3

In fact Beveridge claims that we can be certain of what is contained

3. Ibid, p. 192
in Scripture simply because it is written, and he plays this off against the "unwritten traditions" of Rome.¹ At the same time the Church must have authority in the deciding of controversy. Scripture is the rule of faith and therefore the supreme judge of all controversies, but Beveridge suggests that it cannot decide a controversy when the dispute is concerning what the Bible itself says and means. Neither can disputing parties decide, for each thinks his own opinion is grounded upon Scripture. In these cases the Church must decide.

"If the particular persons which the church consisteth of may give the exposition of the scripture, much more the church itself, that consisteth of those particular persons. And as the exposition that any particular person passeth upon the scripture is binding to that person, so that he is bound to believe and act according to it; so whatsoever exposition of scripture is made by the church in general, it is binding to the church in general."²

But what is this Church that interprets Scripture and decides controversies? Beveridge has no explicit answer for this here, but when we consider what he has to say in other places about the ministry in relation to the Spirit, it is most likely that he means the lawfully appointed ministers of the Church, especially the bishops, gathered together in council. By lawfully appointed ministers Beveridge would mean those who stand in the apostolic succession, for it is they who minister under the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit.³

Yet Beveridge is always concerned to guard against the natural inclination of the Church to become Master of her own doctrine. He wants Christians of the 17th century to respect early Church tradition but he is at pains to explain that it is a Scriptural tradition and that is why they ought to revere it.

General Councils "never took upon them to form new articles of faith, but only to explain and establish the old ones: which being delivered in Scripture, were believed all along by the Catholic Church before that time. And certainly whatsoever hath been approved by General Councils, and received and taught by the Universal Church in all ages, we have all the reason in the world to believe it to be the true doctrine of the Gospel, every way corresponding with what is delivered in the Scriptures, though it be not toto\emph{tотидем verbis} contained in them ... For our Church, as to its doctrine as well as discipline, is settled upon so firm a basis, so truly Catholic, that none can oppose what she teacheth, without denying, not only the Scriptures, but the Scriptures as interpreted by the Universal Church".1

To Beveridge the Word can only be understood within the Church, because it is there that the ministry of the Holy Spirit is exercised.

"There are many ... passages in the New Testament, which clearly shew, that they only which are of the Church can partake of the Spirit which is in it; that they only who are members of that body, whereof Christ is Head, can be influenced and assisted by that blessed Spirit which flows from Him."2

On one other point Beveridge is to be distinguished from all the other Later Carolines; he absolutely never separates the Sacrament from the Word. He would never say, as Thorndike does, that on "all the more solemn assemblies of Lord's days and festivals" there should be a celebration of the Eucharist, whereas the sermon is to be "when it can be had".3 Beveridge might acknowledge that the lack of properly trained ministers will make it difficult always to have preaching, but he never speaks of preaching as though it were comparatively unimportant in relation to the Eucharist. When we work through his writings we encounter the phrase "Word and Sacraments" scores of times; he does not think of one without the other.4 He accepts Article XIX as being a plain

statement of truth, and in his comments on it says that

"Though there be a congregation of faithful men together, unless the word of God be truly preached, and the sacraments duly administered in it, that congregation of faithful men is not a church".1

All this, however, does not yet lead us to perceive the distinguishing characteristic of Beveridge's thought. Many of the other Later Carolines could affirm the necessity for Word and Sacraments and still be far removed from Beveridge's understanding of them. It is the latter's extraordinary perception of the mighty work of God Himself in His Word and Sacraments that sets Beveridge apart from the others. The reading and preaching of the Gospel and the celebration of the Eucharist are the tools of the Holy Spirit in the most literal sense. Christ has only one Minister and that is the Holy Spirit.2 Christ Himself is present by the Spirit in the public offices of the Church. In one of his sermons Beveridge bursts out:

"And therefore ye, whosoever you address yourselves to the public prayers of our Church, to hear God's Word read or preached, or to receive the Holy Sacrament, still keep the eye of your faith fixed upon Christ, as there really present, according to His promise, ready to dispense His heavenly blessings by His Holy Spirit, working together with the ordinance, to make it accomplish the end of its institution, even your sanctification in this world, and your eternal salvation in the world to come."3

Beveridge holds clearly in His mind the fact that it is only Christ Himself who can give His own gifts to the Church, while at the same time he sees that it is Christ's will to give them, not "immediately from Himself", but through the means He Himself has prescribed:

the Word and the Sacraments.\(^1\) Christ destroys the works of the Devil by His effective instruments; the proclamation of the Word and the celebration of the Sacraments.\(^2\)

But if we were not yet convinced that Beveridge places the proclamation of the Word side by side with the celebration of the Eucharist; if we still could not believe that he would acknowledge the preaching of the biblical message to hold an indispensable place in the life of the Church in conjunction with the Sacraments; if we were unable to accept the fact that he could speak of the Word in the same breath with the Sacraments as being instruments of the Holy Spirit; we would only have to listen to him as he states it simply at the close of his sermon on II Cor. 5:17.

"Nor, if these things be so, as be sure they are, who would not be 'in Christ'? Who would not become a 'new creature'? And blessed be God, which of us, may not, if he will? Christ dies for all, and therefore is ready to receive all that come unto Him; He Himself hath said, 'Him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out'. Let us therefore now take Him at His word, let us go unto Him, and close with Him upon the terms He hath propounded in His Holy Gospel; and for that purpose let us walk constantly in all those ways that lead towards Him. Let us fast, and watch, and pray, and read, and hear, and meditate upon His Holy Word, and receive His mystical body and blood; so that 'we may dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we may be one with Christ, and Christ with us'." \(^3\)

Finally, it is important for us to notice that Pearson, too, does not neglect to acknowledge the high place the preaching of the Word takes in relation to the new creature in Christ. In his discussion of the new birth, by which we become true sons of the Father in heaven, he says that it is by the "incorruptible seed" of the Word of God that we are begotten. And those who dispense it can say with Paul, "I have begotten you through the Gospel", though they

should remember that it is really God, whose Word it is, "who of his own will begat us with the word of truth." ¹

(b) The Sacraments:

I have said that many of the later Carolines are moralistic in thought, and that they often look upon God's grace as the power to enable men to keep the rules of the Gospel. Perhaps this will become clearer as we examine their doctrine of Baptism. While the earlier divines, in their writings on Baptism, emphasize God's action, the later Carolines tend to emphasize man's response. The extent of this shift in emphasis varies with each writer, but in all the later Carolines the direction of it is the same; from the work of God to the work of man.

Herbert Thorndike is the most difficult man to place. His thought is profound, complex, and to a certain extent inconsistent. The, at least apparent, inconsistency between his doctrine of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper forces the interpreter into the uneasy position of deciding whether this exposition of the former, or of the latter, is the more integral to his thought as a whole.

What then is his doctrine of Baptism? We can come to it through his discussion of the "covenant of grace". He maintains that

"a sincere and resolute profession to undertake Christianity, and to live according to it (believing as our Lord Christ hath revealed, and living as He hath taught), consigned to God in the hands of His Church by the Sacrament of Baptism, is that condition, which the covenant of grace requireth to qualify us for the promises which it tendereth. This resolution is directly against the Antinomians, and those that believe that a Christian is justified by the obedience of Christ imputed from everlasting to them whom He came to save;" ¹

¹. Creed, pp. 47f.
"which indeed nullifieth the covenant of grace, and converteth it to a mere promise on God's part, requiring no condition on man's part to be performed by him, to qualify him for it".

Thorndike's concern about Socinianism and Antinomianism leads him to emphasize the fact that there must be some "disposition" or "act of man's mind" that qualifies him for at least so much of that promise which the Gospel tendereth. And he claims that the Church of England, according to traditional custom in the Church, exacts from those who are baptized a solemn vow, promise, or contract to which they must remain faithful. We are therefore baptized with Christ unto death because in our baptism we have undertaken to mortify ourselves to the world, that we may live to God's service, "and, upon that condition, we promise ourselves that we shall be raised from the dead again, though by virtue of Christ's rising again". Thorndike goes on to speak of the many excellent effects of Baptism which, however, are dependent upon the "engagement" whereby we give ourselves up to Christ for the future.

"For, that this engagement should not be effectual till consigned unto the Church at baptism, cannot seem strange to him that believes the Catholic Church to be, as I have shewed, a corporation founded for the maintenance and exercise of that Christianity to which we engage ourselves by baptism." 4

Thorndike is convinced that the sects of the Church were bred by that concept which denies the covenant of grace has conditions attached to it. He says that the covenant presupposes terms which a man is called upon to accept and perform. Justifying faith is the condition of the covenant of grace. He insists that man must have the freedom of will to accept the conditions of his faith.

release from sin.¹

It would appear, then, that for Thorndike man is justified by his own faith, that is by his acceptance of, and obedience to, the conditions of the covenant. Christ secures from God the terms of our release at God's hands; in the gospel the conditions of our peace are declared and Christ promises His grace to help us keep these conditions.² Even when we allow for his desire to offer some check to the antinomianism he saw, or thought he saw, in some Puritan circles, there can be no doubt concerning the difference between his doctrine of Baptism and that of, say, Becon in the 16th century and Andrewes in the 17th. It is obvious from the Prayer Book that the profession of faith and obedience are integral to the ordinance of Baptism, and Thorndike is certainly not wrong in speaking of the "profession of baptism".³ But by focusing all, or perhaps most, of his attention on this profession as the condition of the covenant, he does what the classical anglican divines do: he allows man's sin and faithlessness to qualify God's grace.

In writers of more moderate ability than Thorndike, the shift from emphasis on God's part to man's part in Baptism, is even more apparent. Preoccupation with the Covenant is a distinguishing feature of the thought of these divines; but when they speak of Baptism in relation to the Covenant they always concentrate on man's undertaking of this Covenant. That is why Isaac Barrow can define the Church as the society of those who profess the gospel of Christ, and undertake the evangelical covenant.⁴ That is why Sherlock can

---

¹ Ibid, p. 523.
² Ibid, p. 528.
⁴ Vol. VII, pp. 626ff; see also p. 645.
say that being baptized into Christ is synonymous with being admitted into the Church by profession of faith,¹ and speak of Baptism and the Lord's Supper as a vow and a covenant in which we commit ourselves to be subject to Christ.² And that is why Henry Hammond can claim that

"the word of the Apostle 'have put on Christ' must necessarily be interpreted not of the actual putting him on, for 'tis certain that many men that have been baptized, have not actually done so ... and 'tis certain, that the Apostle could not so understand it of any of those Galatians, to whom he then wrote ... but so only as to note the obligation that lay upon them from their Baptism, and from thence the presumption of the Apostle, that they had undertaken and resolved it. As many as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, i.e. are most strictly obliged thereby, and are presumed to have resolved, and undertaken to put on Christ, and the new man".³

Having in mind the passage from Taylor's works given above in this chapter⁴, we shall expect to find his treatment of Baptism not far removed from Thorndike's. Nor is it. There are times, of course, in which Taylor's words sound like Jewel's.

"They are children of God, by faith in Jesus Christ, because 'they have been baptized into Christ', and so 'put on Christ'. This makes you children, and such as are 'to be saved by faith', that is, a covenant, 'not of works', but of pardon in Jesus Christ, the author and establisher of this covenant. For this is the covenant made in baptism, that 'being justified by his grace, we shall be heirs of life eternal; for by grace', that is by favor, remission, and forgiveness in Jesus Christ, 'ye are saved'."⁵

But when he begins to provide his interpretation of these words it is soon apparent that, rightly or wrongly, he is not of Jewel's company. We immediately see a kinship with Thorndike in Taylor's comment on the words "the just shall live by faith"; this means, he

says, that they live by that profession which they make in baptism.¹

Let us then analyse Taylor’s doctrine of Baptism carefully. He maintains that it is through Baptism that we are admitted into the Church — that is, by a baptism of water and the Spirit. By water we are sacramentally dead and buried, and by the Spirit we are made alive.² In fact we are born again in Baptism,³ for there all our sins are pardoned.⁴

It is in discussing new birth that we can best develop Taylor’s position. He reminds us first that this bringing to birth, or new birth, in Baptism is a greater change than is to be found in all periods of our growth to manhood, to "a perfect man in Christ Jesus". Baptism is not to be repeated because it does at once all that it can do if it were repeated a hundred times. Our rebirth in Baptism takes place only once.⁵ This rebirth is God’s work, and it antedates the work of man which must succeed it in due time.⁶ By no disposition or activity can man deserve this first grace of God. Taylor says that as long as man is unpardoned he is an enemy to God and unless he is prevented by the grace of God (preventive grace) he can do nothing towards his pardon and restitution. The first work of God is strictly His own and man can only entertain it. God gives His grace to man unless there is something in him which will hinder it. But if, Taylor insists, there is something in a man that is contrary to grace he (the man) must remove it. Jesus said that we must receive the kingdom as little children because there is nothing in children that is contrary to the kingdom. It

is apparent, then, that though a man may do nothing positive towards the receiving of grace he can at least do something negative, that is, remove the impediment to grace. This is done by faith and repentance.¹

When we look again at Taylor's references to the new birth we find that he means that a "new principle" has been put into us, the "spirit of grace", the "spirit of action".² And when we read the references in context we begin to notice the way he phrases it: Baptism "does the infancy of the work of grace", it "brings us but to the birth in the new life". We ought not to think that Taylor is concerned to depreciate Baptism; he is in fact, in this short treatise, trying to show how necessary it is that Baptism be not neglected. Yet his failure to understand the full and final character of Christ's work and his obsession with the holy life, have lead him to place the chief weight upon man's duty to purge himself of his own sin.

"After this ablution (Baptism) there remains concupiscence, or the material part of our misery and sin; for Christ, by his death, only took away that which, when he did die for us, he bare in his own body upon the tree. Now Christ only bare the punishment of our sin, and therefore we shall not die for it; but the material part of the sin Christ bare not: sin could not come so near him; it might make him sick and die, but not disordered and stained. He was pure from original and actual sins; and therefore that remains in the body, though the guilt and punishment be taken off, and changed into advantages and grace; and the actual are relieved by the Spirit of grace descending afterwards upon the Church, and sent by our Lord to the same purpose."³

Taylor has embraced a new doctrine of Baptism in another sense too, in throwing forward to Confirmation the gift of the

---
Holy Spirit. This, the early Anglicans, in their affirmation of two only Sacraments of the Gospel, had never done. They considered Confirmation to be a most profitable, and even necessary, ordinance, but not a sacrament. Jewel, for example, objects to the precedence which Confirmation has taken over Baptism in the Roman Church. They grant it this precedence, he suggests, because any priest can Baptize whereas only a Bishop can confirm. We must do justice to Taylor, however. He too denies that Confirmation is a sacrament in the same sense as Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and he says that it must be acknowledged to be "of a use and nature inferior to the two sacraments of divine, direct, and immediate institution". But he claims an extraordinary precedent for the rite of Confirmation: the gift of the Holy Spirit which followed Christ's Baptism in the Jordan! We must, he says, honor that example. We must receive the Holy Spirit of God, and this is the design and proper work of Confirmation. Here again, we need to exercise caution or we shall be guilty of misrepresenting Taylor's position. He does not always separate water Baptism and Spirit Baptism in such an obvious way. In his discussion of Baptism he refers to the fact that Baptism and its effects may be separated, and further that God does not always give His grace at the same time as the Church gives the sacrament; but he is not in this case referring to a completion of Baptism in Confirmation. He is merely saying that there may be some impediment in the baptized person preventing the work of God's Spirit. Taylor says explicitly that in the Sacrament of Baptism

the baptism with water is the material part of the Sacrament; only the Spirit gives life. The Holy Spirit moves upon the waters to cleanse the soul. Even when we keep all this in mind it is evident that Taylor has committed himself to an understanding of Baptism never espoused by reformed Anglicanism, for he does not see that through Baptism God draws us into the fulness of Christ's completed work. That is why Taylor can say this:

"But the principle thing is this: confirmation is the consummation and perfection, the corroborations and strength, of baptism and baptismal grace; for in baptism we undertake to do our duty, but in confirmation we receive strength to do it; in baptism others promise for us, in confirmation we undertake for ourselves, we ease our godfathers and godmothers of their burden, and take it upon our shoulders, together with the advantage of the prayers of the bishop and all the church made then in our behalf; in baptism we give up our names to Christ, but in confirmation we put our seal to the profession, and God puts his seal to the promise ... Your baptism was for the remission of sins there, and then ye were made free from that bondage: and what then? Why then in the next place, when ye came to consummate this procedure, when the baptized was confirmed, then he became a servant of righteousness, that is, then the Holy Ghost descended upon you, and enabled you to walk in the Spirit."  

In another place, after speaking of how poorly we keep the covenant of Baptism, failing to maintain a holy and innocent life, he tells us that God has provided a means to conserve baptismal grace by seeing that the "auxiliaries of the Holy Spirit" are ministered to all baptized people in the holy rite of Confirmation. Apart from his unanglican understanding of Baptism, is Taylor not at times assigning to Confirmation the role only the Eucharist ought to take in the Church? In his treatise on Confirmation he actually suggests that

1. Ibid, p. 123. 
"as the Lord's supper is appointed ritually to convey Christ's body and blood to us; so is confirmation ordained ritually to give unto us the spirit of God." 1

Let us look now at Cosin, who in his first series of Notes on the Book of Common Prayer (begun in 1619) refers to the relation between Baptism and Confirmation in words at times not unlike Taylor's; though his understanding of the Christian Faith, and of the Church, is quite different from that of Taylor. He calls Confirmation a holy Sacrament, which, taken in the right sense, he claims, is proper, and mentions that the Greeks sometimes called it ΤΕΛΕΙΩΜΕΝΟΣ, i.e. perfection, in relation to Baptism. It is not as though men have no strength given them in Baptism, but they receive a new strength in Confirmation.

"Indeed, the proper effect of Baptism is to make a man a Christian, but the proper effect of Confirmation is to give him the Holy Ghost." Cosin agrees with the rubric (in the pre-1662 Prayer Book) which says that no detriment shall come to children if Confirmation is deferred, for in their Baptism they have all things necessary for salvation. But he reminds us that this rubric refers to children; if a person dies not long after Baptism he is safe. For those who go on to adulthood, however, Confirmation is given that they might receive a more perfect power of the Holy Ghost for resisting the temptations of Satan. Cosin suggests that without Confirmation a Christian cannot ordinarily come to a "plenary and full perfection in the graces of the Holy Ghost". 2

The third series of Notes on the Book of Common Prayer (which the editor of Cosin's Works for L.A.C.T. thinks were done not later than 1640) reveals a slight different point of view. Here Cosin

2. Vol. V, pp. 142-149
takes time to point out that Confirmation is not of divine institution, and that in the ancient Church it was not always considered to be necessary, for some received Communion and holy orders without it, and he also points out that the Greeks, Russians, and others, use no other Confirmation than the chrism in Baptism. It is called Confirmation, he says, because here those who were baptized in infancy ratify the profession that was then made by others in their name. The bishop and people pray for them, and the bishop in the laying on of his hands, commends them to God.¹

Cosin also has a little discourse on Confirmation that is designed to be read as a preface to the Confirmation service.² Here he emphasizes again, and more strongly, the meaning of Confirmation in relation to prayer. Prayer is the means whereby we obtain the graces which God bestows upon us; and in Confirmation

"our prayers and imposition of hands in those prayers are an especial means ordained by God to procure that Blessing from Him upon them whom, by this solemn rite, we present unto Him for that purpose".

He says plainly here that Confirmation is not a Sacrament, and he repeats his comment from the first series of Notes that Baptism,

¹ Vol. V, pp. 482-290. Cosin expresses concern over the practice of confirming children on the basis that they can say the catechism, even when they are as young as seven years old. This, he insists, ought not to be; they should be confirmed only when they are between fourteen and sixteen years of age. He refers to Butzer who had criticized the first Prayer Book because it would permit youngsters to be confirmed too early. Cosin also in this section points out that it was only after the time of Arius that Confirmation was reserved to bishops, "for the better preservation of the Catholic faith and religion, whereof the Church would have a due account first rendered to the bishop".

² It had been inserted in his Prayer Book of 1619, but there is a difference of opinion when it was written. The editor of Cosin's Correspondence for the Siretes Society thinks it was written to be used in the revised Prayer Book of 1661. (pp. 69-72) The editor of his Works for L. A.O.T. believes it was written after 1662. Vol. V, p. 526.
not Confirmation, makes Christians; Confirmation only helps them and prepares them the better against the temptations of the world. When adults are baptized Confirmation takes place at the same time. But for infants their Confirmation is postponed until they can acknowledge with understanding what was done in their Baptism.¹

To search out Pearson's doctrine of Baptism it is necessary to bring together material from several different articles in his exposition of the Creed. The article on the forgiveness of sins gives us one part of his doctrine very explicitly. Forgiveness of sins is promised to all who are baptized. Socinian is wrong in attributing remission of sins to repentance without Baptism, or to the public profession made in Baptism. Supposing that the person being baptized, and the one performing the Baptism, have the necessary qualifications, then the Baptism does actually remit all the person's sins committed before the administration of the Sacrament. After the Sacrament, however, Church members receive forgiveness by repentance.

"And therefore the Church of God, in which 'remission of sin' is preached, doth not only promise it at first by the laver of regeneration, but afterwards also upon the virtue of repentance; and to deny the Church this power of absolution is the heresy of Novatian".²

Pearson points out that the covenant was ratified and confirmed by the remission of sins as wrought by the blood of Christ, and this ought to remind us of a condition that is required of us. It is the nature of a covenant to expect performance from both parties. We, therefore, who look to the forgiveness that is promised must

perform the repentance that is commanded. Repentance and forgiveness are always preached together, and what God hath joined, let not man put asunder.¹

Pearson discusses Baptism also from the vantage point of union with Christ. In his treatment of three parts of the Creed: Resurrection, Ascension and Heavenly Session, and the Holy Spirit; he emphasizes the fact that we are in a marvellous way united with Christ.

"He (Christ) laid down his life, but it was for us; and being to take up his own, he took up ours. We are the members of that body of which Christ is the Head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind. He is the 'first-born from the dead', and we 'the sons of the resurrection'. The Spirit of Christ abiding in us maketh us the members of Christ, and by the same Spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our Head."²

"The very name of 'Head' hath the signification not only of dominion but of union; and therefore while we look upon him at the right hand of God, we see ourselves in heaven."³

"The office of the Holy Spirit is to join us unto Christ, and make us members of that one body of which our Saviour is the Head. 'For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body' ... As we become spiritual men by the Spirit which is in us, as that union with the Body and unto the Head is a spiritual conjunction, so it proceedeth from the Spirit; and 'he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit'."⁴

It is from precisely this angle that Beveridge normally writes of Baptism, concentrating on union with Christ by the ministration of the Holy Spirit. In his sermons he is forever ringing the changes on this theme, and it is most interesting to watch how he handles it. Sometimes he speaks as though the desired goal to be reached is the reception of the Spirit, and he asks how a man may

receive this Spirit of Christ. The answer is, he maintains, that only those who are united to Christ and made members of His body may partake of His Spirit, in the same way that the various parts of man's natural body share a common spirit with the head. How then do we become members of Christ? By faith; by believing in Christ. But the man who believes must be baptized, for there he will be born of water and the Spirit. Water is the sign, the Holy Ghost is the thing signified, and by the Holy Ghost we are "born again and made the children of God" because we have been inserted into the Body of Christ.

At other times he speaks of union with Christ as the end for which we are destined, and the Holy Spirit the means, so to speak, by which this is consummated.

"It is only by 'His Spirit' that any man can be made His. It is impossible, that we who are so infinitely below Him, could be so nearly related to Him, as to be His, in such an high manner as this phrase imports, any other way than by His own Spirit: but by that we are incorporated into Him, and made members of His Body; for 'by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body', even the Body of Christ. By which means, as all the members of a natural body, being informed by the same soul that is in the head, and from thence is diffused into them, do therefore properly belong to that head; so we are therefore only the members of Christ, and belong to Him, because the same Spirit that is in Him is likewise in us, and moves, animates, and influences us in all the actions of a new and spiritual life. Hence it is, that as many as are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God, for having the same Spirit that is in His only-begotten Son, they, according to their capacities, thereby stand in the same relation to God as He doth; they are properly His sons also. Insomuch that Christ Himself 'is not ashamed to call them brethren'."

For our present purposes we must note that Beveridge sees in Baptism Christ's specially appointed ordinance, whereby the special

union between Christ and His people is established. He points out
that we are certainly not born of water without the Spirit; but
neither can we, in any ordinary way, be born of the Spirit without
water. Echoing Pearson's words in another connection, Beveridge
says that since Christ has joined them together, it is not in our
power to part them. ¹ Beveridge expresses the wish that everybody
would remember this. Jesus Christ is the only Saviour of the world,
and He saves none but those who are members of His own Body, the
Church; and men become members of the Church by being baptized
according to His appointment. If they wilfully neglect or refuse
this Sacrament they are "none of Christ's flock, and have no more
ground to expect even to be saved than other infidels and heathen
have, nor indeed so much; ..." ²

This latter judgment, of course, is the commonly accepted
position of the Church, and certainly all the Later Carolines be-
lieve that a man cannot be born of the Spirit without the water.
What distinguishes Beveridge from the others, perhaps even from
Pearson and Cosin, is the radical way in which he maintains the
other side of the proposition: that a man cannot be born of water
without the Spirit. This would not surprise us if it came from
certain (note I say certain) left-wing Protestants who have a low
regard for the Sacraments. But we have found no Anglican divine
(except perhaps Andrews) who speaks in more exalted terms concern-
ing the Sacraments than Beveridge. It is all the more important,
then, that we should mark his insistence that no man is born of

water without the Spirit. Not that any of the other Later Carolines would deny it. Nevertheless, it is Beveridge alone who, with rare faithfulness, refuses to banish God from the ordinances of His Church. It is Beveridge alone who insists at every point that the living God is Lord over the Church through the present working of the Holy Spirit. He will not even allow it to be said that water Baptism can be accomplished, and the Holy Spirit be given at some later time (as Taylor asserts so frequently). The Holy Spirit does not follow Baptism, He accompanies it; and in the very act of Baptism the Spirit unites us to Christ, making us members of His Body, and therefore of His Church and Kingdom. \(^1\) Beveridge also strongly resists certain aspects of the Roman doctrine of Baptism. He maintains that they claim too much for Baptism itself. The Fathers never say, as the papists do, that Baptism itself forgives sins and regenerates; they say rather that the grace and Spirit of God in Baptism perform this.

"For, saith St. Basil, 'If there be any grace in the water, it is not from the nature of the water, but from the presence of the Spirit'. ... We must pray for God's presence in the sacrament; for without that we can receive no blessing from it; but with that there is no blessing but we may have in it." \(^2\)

Looking at the question from the point of view of his doctrine of the Church, we can see that Beveridge takes with perfect seriousness the fact that the Church is the body of Christ. He therefore acknowledges, and bears witness to, the intimate relation between Christ and His Church. The Church cannot exist without Christ any more than a human body can live without its head. It is Christ,

---

then, who rules and governs the Church; it is He who influences and directs it; it is He who gives life, vigour, and motion to it.

"From Him as the head, 'All the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God;' which shews the strictest union that can possibly be, between Christ and His Church; and likewise His wonderful way of working upon it, by His Holy Spirit, which proceeding from Him, the head, is diffused into the whole body, and into every part and member of it. By this the whole is preserved, strengthened, increased; and by this every particular member is nourished, quickened, excited, and enabled to perform all the functions of the new and spiritual life, which He hath put into it: by this His Holy Spirit, as it is administered in the Sacrament of Baptism, we are inserted into His body, and made members of it; 'For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body', and so 'are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones'. And by the same Spirit administered in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we are strengthened and refreshed: for hereby 'we, being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread', the staff and support of our spiritual life. And therefore it is no wonder that Christ takes so great care of His Church, seeing it is so nearly related, so intimately united to Him, that it is His body, yes, so His body, that it is His 'Τρόφιμος', His fulness, that whereby He is full and complete, which otherwise He would not be, no more than a head is without a body, although in Himself 'He filleth all in all'. In Himself, absolutely considered, 'dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily'; but considered as Head of the Church, without that He would not be perfect, for He would want a body, and so could not be properly a head." 1

Before concluding this examination of Beveridge's doctrine of Baptism, a brief mention of his words on Confirmation is in order. It need only be brief because this ordinance does not receive much attention in his writings; yet it cannot be neglected by us, for to him it is an "essential part of the apostolic office" and he maintains that it has always been recognised as such by the Catholic Church of all ages. Confirmation can be performed by none but the Apostles themselves, and their successors, to the end of the world. Others have the power to baptize with water and the Holy Spirit,

but they cannot "confer any greater measure of the Spirit upon them". By prayer and the laying on of hands the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit are conferred to confirm baptized Christians in the faith, and in all goodness. In his discourse on the 39 Articles Beveridge points out that the Fathers did not use this as a distinct Sacrament, but as the "perfection and consummation of baptism; and the chrism or ointment which they used was only a ceremony annexed to baptism also, as the cross and other ceremonies were:

We will now go on to consider the later Caroline position on the Lord's Supper, beginning with John Cosin who, as it has already been suggested, manifests certain deviations in his thought from the Reformation tradition, but is nevertheless one of the strongest adherents of that tradition among the Later Carolines. A more accurate way of putting this might be that in the years preceding 1640 he affirmed doctrines that were to a certain extent at variance with that of his forbears, whereas during his period of exile in France from 1643 to 1660 he drew closer to the reformed Anglican position. For example, in the first series of Notes on the Book of Common Prayer we hear his say

"It is confessed by all divines, that upon the words of consecration the Body and Blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it; and all this not after a physical and sensual, but after a heavenly and invisible, and incomprehensible manner: but yet there remains this controversy among some of them, whether the Body of Christ be present only in the use of the Sacrament, and in the act of eating, and not otherwise. They that hold the affirmative, as the Lutherans, in Conf. Sax., and all Calvinists do, seem to me to depart from all antiquity, which place the presence of Christ in the

"virtue of the words of consecration and benediction used by the priest and not in the use of eating of the Sacrament, for they tell us that the virtue of that consecration is not lost, though the Sacrament be reserved either for sick persons or other."¹

Not that this definitely indicates that Cosin has abandoned the Anglican doctrine of the Eucharist. Yet one experiences a different sensation when one turns to his History of Transubstantiation which he wrote at Paris in 1656. In this he gives a strong affirmation of Reformation theology. In fact Chapter II is given over to show how, in the doctrine of the Real Presence, the Prayer Book, Jewel, Hooker, Poynter, Bilson, Andrewes, Casaubon, Mountague, Ussher, White, Laud, and Overall, are in accordance with the faith and doctrine of the ancient Catholic fathers, and to show that Continental Protestants uphold the same doctrine.² Cosin claims that the position of the Protestant divines (he includes the Church of England under the Protestant banner) has been slandered by the Romans who are not really acquainted with it.³

The Protestant position is that we have the real and true, though not carnal, presence of Christ in the blessed Sacrament.⁴ Protestants generally employ the term "spiritual" when referring to this presence, after the example of the Fathers. But since the Romans too use this word it is necessary that we know the distinction between the meaning they place upon it and that given to it by Protestants. Cosin quotes Bellarmine, who says the words "spiritual presence" signify

that Christ is not present in the sacrament either after that manner which is natural to corporal things, or that wherein His own Body subsists in heaven, but according to the manner of existence proper to spirits whole and entire, in each part of the host; and, though by Himself He be neither seen, touched, nor moved, yet in respect of the species or accidents joined with Him, He may be said to be seen, touched, and moved and so, the accidents being moved, the Body of Christ is truly moved accidentally, as the soul truly changeth place with the body; so that we truly and properly say, that the Body of Christ is removed, lifted up, and set down, put on the paten or on the Altar, and carried from hand to mouth, and from the mouth to the stomach; as Berengarius was forced to acknowledge in the Roman council under Pope Nicholas, that the Body of Christ was sensually touched by the hands, and broken and chewed by the teeth of the priest. Cosin suggests that Bellarmine (in company with Innocent III and the Council of Trent) is trying to determine the manner of the presence and the reception with more precision than is permissible. The Romans presume to understand the "manner of acting of God's Holy Spirit"; they are not prepared to accept by faith the incomprehensible. We must receive the sacrament in faith. Our faith does not cause the presence, but apprehends it as really and truly effected by the word of Christ. It is by the power of the Holy Spirit that

"we do invisibly receive the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, as much as if we should eat and drink both visibly".

"It is an article of faith in the Church of Rome, that in the blessed Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine is reduced to nothing, and that in its place succeeds the Body and Blood of Christ; ... The protestants are much of another mind; and yet none of them denies altogether but that there is a conversion of the bread into the Body (and consequently of the wine into the Blood) of Christ: for they know and acknowledge that in the sacrament, by virtue of the words and blessing of Christ, the condition, use, and office, of the bread is wholly changed; that is, of common and ordinary, it becomes our mystical and sacramental food; whereby, as they affirm and believe, the true Body of Christ is not only
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"shadowed and figured, but also given indeed, and by worthy communicants truly received ... This change, whereby supernatural effects are wrought by things natural, while their essence is preserved entire, doth best agree with the grace and power of God." 

Cosin sums up the controversy under four heads: (1) concerning the signs; (2) concerning the things signified; (3) concerning the union of both; and (4) concerning their participation. With reference to the first he claims that Protestants believe the substance of bread and wine to be the signs, whereas the papists believe the signs to be accidents only. Concerning the second, the papists say that Protestants hold only the merits of the death of Christ to be represented by the elements; this is not true: Protestants also believe that the very Body of Christ which was crucified, and His Blood which was shed, are truly signified and offered, that our souls may receive and possess Christ as truly and certainly as we see and receive the material and visible signs. Regarding the third point, because the thing signified is offered and received as certainly as the sign itself, Protestants believe in a union between the two, though they deny that the union implies the destruction of the substance of the sign. But they deny further that

"the elements still retain the nature of sacraments, when not used according to divine institution, that is, given by Christ's ministers, and received by His people; so that Christ in the consecrated bread ought not - cannot be kept and preserved to be carried about, because He is present only to the communicants".

With reference to the fourth point, Protestants do not claim to receive in the Lord's Supper but the fruits of Christ's death and Passion; they do not separate Christ from the advantages received from Him. This is, as Paul says, the communion of the Body and 

1. Ibid, p. 172
Blood of Christ, of the very body He took from the Virgin and finally carried up to heaven. Yet it cannot be in a carnal sense. The signs become sacraments only by the infinite power of God. It is God's right alone to institute sacraments in His Church, and He alone is able to give them virtue and efficacy.¹

The accusation that the papists are too precise in their definitions concerning Christ's presence in the Eucharist has been made by Cosin. This is a refrain sung by most of the Later Carolines, though few of them added any significant variations to it. John Bramhall claims that the Church of England accepts Christ's word "This is my Body" and leaves the manner of the presence to Him, whether it is corporal or spiritual, knowing that it is sacramental and efficacious. It does not try to determine whether the presence is in the soul of the receiver or in the Host as well; and if it is in the Host, the Church of England does not endeavor to define whether it is by consubstantiation or transubstantiation, "by production, or adduction, or conservation, or assumption"² It is true that earlier Anglican divines do not try to give precise definitions; but do they really leave it as loosely defined as Bramhall suggests?

Henry Hammond claims that the Fathers generally speak of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament as a mystery, and they are content to leave it at that; they consider it something to be believed but not "grossly fancied or described". At the same time Hammond affirms that the faithful do receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, while denying the corporal presence of

Christ on the Table or in the elements. He analyses I Corinthians 10:16 and suggests that the word "this" deserves careful examination. When Christ says "Do this in remembrance of Me", "this" refers to the whole action. Why then could it not have a similar connotation when Jesus says "This is my Body"? It too may signify the whole action. Hammond thinks it does. He believes that the whole administration is the real communication of the body of Christ to us.

"As verily as I eat the bread in my mouth, so verily God in heaven bestows on me, communicates to me, the body of the crucified Saviour ... God's part is the accepting of this our bounden duty, bestowing that body and blood of Christ upon us, not by sending it down locally for our bodies to feed upon, but really for our souls to be strengthened and refreshed by it, as, when the sun is communicated to us, the whole bulk and body of the sun is not removed out of its sphere, but the rays and beams of it, and with them the light and warmth and influences, are really and verily bestowed or darted out upon us. And all this is the full importance of 'This is My body' or 'This is the communication of His body'."

Most of the Later Carolines hold a position much like this last expressed view of Hammond's: that by the power of God Himself Christ's body and blood are given to us. However some insist that they are given locally, in the elements, and Taylor, for one, puts it this way; that the bread, "when it is consecrated and made sacramental, is the body of our Lord". He cannot agree with those who want to have Christ present only in a figurative sense, and he reminds them that to say the body is really present does not preclude the fact that "the reality may be spiritual". Taylor says that Christ by His own power makes the symbols to be instruments of conveying Himself to us. He has appointed bread and wine

3. Ibid, p. 306
by which "we may be corporally united to him; that as the symbols, being nutriment, are turned into the substance of our bodies; so Christ, being the food for our souls, should assimilate us, making us partakers of the Divine nature". ¹ In his earlier writings Taylor does not react against Transubstantiation as do the other Anglican divines. He suggests that the affirmation that there is an actual change of substance is made by those who want the assurance that it is indeed the body of the Lord. He is content to warn them that by embracing Transubstantiation they are getting themselves into more difficulties than before. If they will simply accept that the bread is the Body they will "no more be at war with reason, nor so much with sense, and not at all with faith". ²

One of the most striking things about Taylor's treatment of the Eucharist is this emphasis upon consecration, an emphasis that has not appeared in quite the same way in the writings of any Anglican since the Reformation - unless perhaps in John Cosin in his early years.

"When the holy man stands at the table of blessing, and ministers the rite of consecration, then do as the angels do, and behold, and love, and wonder that the Son of God should become food to the souls of his servants: that he, who cannot suffer any change or lessening, should be broken into pieces, and enter into the body to support and nourish the spirit, and yet at the same time remain in heaven, while he descends to thee upon earth; .. " ³

"In the act of receiving, exercise acts of faith with much confidence and resignation, believing it not to be common bread and wine, but holy in their use, holy in their signification, holy in their change, and holy in their effect: and believe, if thou art a worthy communicant, thou dost as verily receive Christ's body and blood to all effects and purposes of the Spirit, as thou dost receive the blessed elements into thy mouth, that thou puttest thy finger to his hand, and thy hands into his side, and thy lips to his fontinal of blood, sucking life from his heart; and yet if thou dost communicate unworthily, thou eatest and drinkest Christ to thy danger, and

"death, and destruction ... There is nothing necessary on thy part but a holy life, and a true belief of all the sayings of Christ, amongst which, indefinitely assent to the words of institution, and believe that Christ, in the holy sacrament, gives thee his body and blood. He that believes not this, is not a christian. He that believes so much, needs not to inquire further, nor to entangle his faith by disbelieving his sense."1

While Taylor continues to consider consecration as of great importance, his views on the eucharistic presence seem to change. The passages immediately above are from his Rule and Exercise of Holy Living which was published in 1650. In later writings, even in Real Presence and Spiritual which was published in 1654, he is more concerned than he was to guard against Transubstantiation. In strong language he shows the sort of impossible contradiction contained in that doctrine, and demonstrates that it is against Scripture. His own position can be summed up in these words:

"We by the real spiritual presence of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful by blessing and grace; and this is all which we mean besides the tropical and figurative presence."2

Thorndike has several interesting things to say about the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He relates the ascension of Christ in the flesh to the sending of the Holy Spirit, who inhabits the flesh of Christ. The Holy Spirit, who first dwelt in the humanity of Jesus Christ, is sent to the Church to make a "habitation" in the hearts of His people (though Thorndike adds the typical qualification: in the hearts of those "who upon faithful consideration of Christ's cross faithfully resolve to undertake it"). By the Holy Spirit the flesh and blood of Christ is present spiritually in the Eucharist and is also spiritually eaten. The movement

---

1. Ibid, p. 499  
must be considered in a twofold way: by the Holy Spirit we receive the Lord's body and blood, and by receiving the Eucharist we also receive the Holy Spirit. Just as in the Incarnation there was a supernatural conjunction and union of two natures in one Person, so also there is in the Eucharist "between the Body and Blood of Christ and the said bread and wine, thereby they become as truly the instrument of conveying God's Spirit to them who receive as they as they ought, as the same Spirit was always in His natural Body and Blood."²

Thorndike points out that the Fathers believed the elements to be translated into Christ's Body and Blood, not by the faith of the person communicating, but by the consecration.³ It is true that no man can receive the Body and Blood of Christ "that is not disposed with a living faith to receive the same," nevertheless, on God's part it is offered to those, who are not so disposed. If this were not true how could St. Paul say that those who eat and drink unworthily are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ, for not discerning the same? And how could our Lord Himself say in the present tense, "This is my Body"?⁴ All the same, Thorndike does acknowledge that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist does in some way depend upon faith. He does this in a special way. He distinguishes between the outward profession of Christianity which makes us members of the visible Church, and the inward performance or faithful purpose of performing this profession, which makes us true heirs of God’s kingdom. Having made the distinction
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Thorndike goes on to say that

"it is the visible profession of true Christianity, which makes the consecration of the eucharist effectual to make the Body and Blood of Christ sacramentally present in the elements of it; but that it is the invisible faithfulness of the heart, in making good or in resolving to make good the said profession which makes the receiving of it effectual to the spiritual eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood".

Consecration makes Christ's Body and Blood present to the body while living faith makes them present to the soul.¹

Two questions arise from this: first, what does Thorndike believe about the nature of the presence? and secondly, what does he mean by consecration? On the first question he affirms his conviction that the Council of Trent is perfectly right in saying that Christ's Body and Blood are "sacramentally" there, but quite wrong in pronouncing anathema upon those who refuse to grant that the substance of the elements is gone. There can be no proper understanding of the sacrament if we say that the sign and the thing signified are identical. The sacramental presence can be properly maintained only when we acknowledge "the true being and presence of the thing signified" and at the same time affirm that the sign remains in its true substance.² On the second question Thorndike suggests that the idea (which originated, he says, with the "school doctors") of consecration being effected by the recital of the words of institution, is wrong. Consecration is effected by giving thanks, by the prayer of the congregation, and by the delivery of the elements.³

The relation between Christ's Body and the Holy Spirit is also dealt with by Beveridge, though rather differently. He is

---
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discussing the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as administered by the Roman Church, and suggests that since with them the whole ordinance is "wrapped up" in a language the people do not understand, preventing the people from knowing what the priest says or whether he even consecrates the Host, since with them the people see only that the priest performs a great many ceremonies in an unintelligible tongue before putting the wafer in their mouths, there is nothing here that the Holy Spirit can make use of "to the comfort and edification of the people. 

"Especially considering that the priest intends not to minister the Spirit of Christ unto them, but only His real body, as they are bound to believe the wafer to be. But if it was possible, as it neither is nor can be, to convert the bread into the body of Christ, and give it to the people, what good could that do them, if abstracted from the Spirit? For, as our Lord Himself saith, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing'. But, after all this, I do not see how the promise of the Spirit can belong to the Sacrament, as they manage it. For the promise is made not to any one part of it as distinct from the other, but to the whole, as it was instituted by Christ, and where the institution is not rightly observed, neither can the promise annexed to it be performed." ¹

A comparable accusation is made against the English schismatics because they have separated from the Succession; they have cut themselves off from the Church of England and consequently from the Catholic Church.² Christ committed the Holy Spirit to His Apostles, sending them as He Himself had been sent by the Father. The Apostles gave to others the very gift of the Holy Spirit which Christ had given to them, and so this practice has continued to the present day. It is in this way that those who are ordained to the
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ministry become ambassadors for Christ.

"If I did not think, or rather was not fully assured, that I had such a commission to be an Ambassador for Christ, and to act in His name, I should never think it worth the while to preach or execute any ministerial office. For I am sure, that all I did would be null and void of itself, according to God's ordinary way of working; and we have no ground to expect miracles. But blessed be God, we in our Church, by a successive imposition of hands, continued all along from the Apostles themselves, receive the same Spirit that was conferred upon them for the administration of the Word and Sacraments ordained by our Lord and Master, and therefore may do it as effectually to the salvation of mankind as they did. For as they were, so are we, 'Ambassadors for Christ'." 1

At the risk of being more than usually tedious, I again draw attention to the point Beveridge himself never tires of making: that without the present working of the Holy Spirit none of the ordinances of the Church accomplish anything. Beveridge's faith rests always in the faithfulness of the Lord of the Church who promised to be with her until the end of the world. Without the action of the Spirit, he claims the Sacraments are empty signs and preaching is no more than beating the air.

But "Christ, according to His promise, being always present by His Holy Spirit at the administration of the several offices which He has ordained in His Church, they can never fail of their designed effect, if the persons to whom they are administered be but rightly disposed and qualified for it. By this means, they that are duly baptized are 'born again, not only of water, but of the Spirit also'; and so together with the 'washing of regeneration, they have the renewing of the Holy Ghost'. Hence also, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the worthy receiver does really by faith partake of the mystical body and blood of Christ, and of such influences of the Holy Spirit as shall enable him to walk as becomes a member of Christ. And whatsoever we read, preach, or publish the Gospel as Christ taught, the Holy Spirit goes along with it, so that it becomes the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth". 2

The issue of worthy reception, which is raised here, is something the reformed Anglicans have insisted upon from the very

beginning; and Article XXIX of the Thirty-Nine Articles says explicitly that the Wicked, and those who lack "lively faith", do not partake of Christ, even though they receive the Sacrament. Beveridge's words, in more than one sermon, demonstrate that he accepts this position. However, in a sermon on "The Worthy Communicant" he expresses concern over the fact that many people stay away from Communion because they believe that they are unworthy, and fear that if they receive the Sacrament without being worthy of it they will be damned. Beveridge tells them directly that St. Paul did not mean that. If he did, every man who has received the Sacrament will be damned, for no man has ever been worthy of so great a blessing. When St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians about eating and drinking unworthily he was referring to the great disorders which he had heard about in their Christian Assemblies, and the fact that they approached the Lord's Supper as though it were an ordinary meal, and did not express any respect or deference to the Lord's body. To eat and drink worthily consists in carrying and demeaning ourselves at the Holy Sacrament, both in souls and bodies, in a manner worthy and suitable to the body and blood which we there receive. There are three things that will prepare us for it, which are laid down in the Catechism: (1) Repentance of former sins, with a steadfast desire to lead a new life; (2) A lively faith in God's mercy in Christ, with a thankful remembrance of His death; (3) Charity towards all men.

be celebrated, whereas a sermon can be preached if it is convenient.  

Beveridge never separates the Sacrament from the Word. Nevertheless he does not like the Puritan concentration upon preaching to the detriment of the Sacrament, and he recalls that in apostolic days the main end of the gathering of the Church together, especially on the Lord's day, "was not to hear sermons, but to break bread."  

The climax, or "end" of the service was not in the preaching but in the Eucharist. Beveridge, in one of his sermons, has a very fine commentary on each step of the Communion service. This sermon clearly indicates his recognition of the fact that confession, absolution, comfortable words, and thanksgiving, are very much a part of the total event of God's giving and our receiving. After referring to each of these parts of the service, he continues,

"And now, if ever, our minds must needs be duly prepared to receive the blessed body and blood of our dear Lord; and therefore the minister having first acknowledged our unworthiness of so great a mercy, and prayed to God to assist us with His grace to receive it worthily, he then saith the prayer of consecration.  

"And now there is nothing either said or done, but what puts us in mind of something or other whereupon to employ and exercise our faith.  

"When we see the bread and wine set apart for consecration, it should mind us of God's eternal purpose, and determinate counsel, to send His Son into the world, and to offer Him up as a sacrifice for the sins of mankind.  

"The minister's reading the prayer of consecration alone, none of the people speaking a word, now any ways assisting him in it, should put us in mind how the whole work of our Salvation was accomplished by Christ alone, no more creature contributing any thing at all towards it. When we hear these words, 'Who in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread,' we are by faith to behold our Lord at His last supper, there instituting this Sacrament which we are now to receive, and distributing it to His Apostles with His own blessed hands.  

"When we see the bread broken, then we should call to mind all that grief and pain, those bitter agonies and passions which our Lord suffered for our sins, and in our stead. How

"He was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities; that the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, that by His stripes we might be healed; how His blessed body was broken, His hands and feet fastened to the cross with nails drove through them, and all for our sins, even for ours. 

"And so when the minister takes the cup into his hand, then we are by faith to behold how fast the blood trickled ... from His whole body, when He was in His agony; and all to wash away our sins ... "When we hear our Lord's words pronounced, the words of consecration, 'This is My body which is given for you'; and 'This is My blood which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins'; then are we steadfastly to believe, that although the substance of bread and wine still remain, yet they are not now common bread and wine as to their use, but the body and blood of Christ ... "When we see the minister distributing this sacramental bread and wine to the several communicants, we are then by faith to apprehend our Lord offering His body and blood, and all the benefits of His death and passion, to all that are willing and ready to receive them at His hands". 

We have here a demonstration of Beveridge's belief in the real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, and also a strong indication of his agreement with his Anglican forbears who affirmed Augustine's concept of the Sacraments as "visible Words". We can notice also, as we have already done with Taylor and the younger Cosin, a clear emphasis upon consecration. 

The language Beveridge uses with regard to the Lord's Supper as a Sacrifice, is reminiscent of Andrewes. In a sermon on 1 Peter 2:5 he draws attention to the fact that all Christians are priests, and as such must offer spiritual sacrifices. What are these sacrifices? We are called to offer our bodies as a living sacrifice, by devoting ourselves wholly to the service of God. Hence all manner of "good, pious, and charitable works" done in God's service, are called sacrifices. But sacrifice, as referred to in the text, should be more specifically understood of those duties whereby we set forth the glory of God in the public profession of our dependence.
upon Him. Thus public prayer, in praise and thanksgiving, is a spiritual sacrifice. However the sacrifice that is most proper and peculiar to the Gospel is the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, "instituted by our Lord Himself, to succeed all the bloody sacrifices in Mosaic law". It certainly is not another sacrifice for the living and the dead. Yet it has as much right to be called a sacrifice as any of those under the Law. Christ’s is the only true expiatory sacrifice. Those under the Law were types of His to come; the Sacrament commemorates His already past. In the Sacrament of the Altar we partake of the great sacrifice which the Eternal Son of God offered up for the sins of the whole world, and ours among the rest. We partake that Almighty God may be reconciled to us, and receive us again into His love and favour.

In his first series of notes on the Book of Common Prayer Cosin had outlined in brief a doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice that would have looked upon with suspicion by the Anglican Fathers.

"This is a plain oblation of Christ’s death once offered, and a representative sacrifice of it, for the sins, and for the benefit, of the whole world, of the whole Church; that both those which are here on earth, and those that rest in the sleep of peace, being departed in the faith of Christ, may find the effect and virtue of it. And if the authority of the ancient Church may prevail with us, as it ought to do, there is nothing more manifest than that it always taught as much." 2

"And in this sense it is not only an eucharistical, but a propitiatory, sacrifice ... Why should we then make any controversy about this? They love not the truth of Christ, nor the peace of the Church, that make these disputes between the Church of Rome and us, when we agree, as Christian Churches should, in our Liturgies: what private men’s conceits are, what is that to the public approved religion of either Church, which is to be seen in their Liturgies best of all?" 3
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But in the second series of notes Cosin moves somewhat from this position.

"Christ can be no more offered, as the doctors and priests of the Roman party fancy Him to be, and vainly think that every time they say mass, they offer up and sacrifice Christ anew, as properly and truly as He offered up Himself in His sacrifice upon the cross. And this is one of the points of doctrine, and the chief one whereof the popish mass consisteth, abrogated, and reformed here by the Church of England, according to the express word of God".  

At the same time he refuses to let Rome say that the Church of England holds the Eucharist to be "a naked commemoration only of Christ's sacrifice". Through the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by means of prayer, we do offer and present the death of Christ to God, that for His death's sake we might find mercy. In this respect the commemorative sacrifice of the Eucharist is propitiatory; and is profitable for all true members of the Catholic Church of Christ, present and absent, living and dead. A "true, real, proper and propitiatory sacrificing of Christ" in the Sacrament cannot be done without killing Christ again and this Cosin rejects as false and blasphemous.  

"The Eucharist may by allusion, analogy, and extrinsecal denomination, be fitly called a sacrifice, and the Lord's table an altar; the one relating to the other; though neither of them can be strictly and properly so termed. It is the custom of Scripture to describe the service of God under the New Testament, be it either internal or external, by the terms that otherwise most properly belonged to the Old, as immolation, offering, sacrifice and altar.  

Thorndike gives four "reasons" why the Eucharist may be called a sacrifice. The first relates to the oblation of the unconsecrated elements as an offering by Christians as part of their goods given to the service of God.  

1. Ibid, p. 353.  
2. Ibid, pp. 335f; see also Vol. IV, pp. 333f.  
with the offering of prayer for all estates and conditions of men, which prayer is bound to the intercession of Christ in heaven in which He presents Himself as the crucified one on our behalf.\textsuperscript{1}

The third "reason" why the Eucharist may be called a sacrifice arise out of the meaning and nature of consecration. Thorndike believes that it is wrong to consider that the Eucharist could be a sacrifice in a proper sense. That conception must definitely be excluded.

But the crucified Body and Blood are contained in the elements, and therefore the Eucharist is the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross "as the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross is represented, renewed, revived, and restored by it".\textsuperscript{2}

"Let it therefore have the nature of a sacrifice, so soon as the consecration is past. It shall have that nature improper so long as it is not the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross; though truly, so long as the sacrament is not empty of that which it signifieth."\textsuperscript{3}

By virtue of the consecration the Eucharist becomes both a propitiatory and impetratory sacrifice.\textsuperscript{4} The knowledge that the Eucharist is of this character should advance the zeal of all to communicate frequently.

"For what can more oblige a Christian to the frequent and worthy communion of this sacrament, than to consider, that by receiving it he is re-estated in his right to those promises which the Gospel tendereth; provided, that he on his part re-establish in his own heart that resolution to Christianity, by profession which he was at the first estated in God's kingdom?

"Hereupon arises a fourth reason, why this sacrament is a sacrifice; to wit, of the bodies and souls of them, who, having consecrated their goods to God for the celebration of it, do by receiving it profess to renew that consecration of themselves to the service of God according to the law of Christ which their baptism originally pretendeth. For inasmuch as we revive and renew the first profession of our Christianity in receiving the eucharist, we do also, by the same means,

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid, pp. 107f.  \textsuperscript{2} pp. 112f.  \textsuperscript{3} p. 114; italics mine.  \textsuperscript{4} pp. 116f.
"offer up our bodies for a living sacrifice, holy and well pleasing to God, which is our reasonable service' of God, as St. Paul commandeth, Romans, xii, 1." 1

Taylor frequently connects the Eucharist with the pleading of Christ's sacrifice in heaven. As Christ is our high priest in heaven forever, and yet does not sacrifice Himself afresh, but by a daily ministration and intercession represents His one sacrifice to God, so He does upon earth by the ministry of His servants.

"He is offered to God; that is, He is by prayers and the Sacrament represented or 'offered up to God as sacrificed', which in effect is a celebration of His death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the Church as we are capable by a ministry like to His in heaven." Taylor claims that "ministerially and by application" the Sacrament is a propitiatory instrument. Certainly it is eucharistic, it is an act of homage and of adoration; but it is also impetulatory and obtains for us, and for the whole Church, the benefits of the one sacrifice which is now celebrated and applied. 2 It would appear that it is the application of the one sacrifice to the present, that is Taylor's concern: the one sufficient sacrifice must be "made eternally effectual to the several new arising needs of all the world." It was and is to this end that Christ remains a priest forever. 3

"Since it is necessary, that he hath something to offer so long as he is a priest, and there is no other sacrifice but that of himself offered upon the cross - it follows, that Christ, in heaven, perpetually offers and represents that sacrifice to his heavenly Father, and, in virtue of that, obtains all good things for his church.

"Now what Christ does in heaven, he hath commanded us to do on earth; that is, to represent his death, to commemorate this sacrifice, but humble prayer, and thankful record; and, by

"Faithful manifestation and joyful eucharist, to lay it before the eyes of our heavenly Father, so ministering in his priesthood, and doing according to his commandment and his example; the church being the image of heaven: the priest, the minister of Christ; the holy table being a copy of the celestial altar; and the eternal sacrifice of the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world, being always the same: it bleeds no more after the finishing of it on the cross; but it is wonderfully represented in heaven, and graciously represented here; by Christ's action there, by his commandment here."

CHAPTER VI

THE CHURCH UNDER CHRIST THE KING

O Lord, raise up (we pray thee) thy power, and come among us, and with great might succour us; that whereas through our sins and wickedness, we are sore let and hindered in running the race that is set before us, thy bountiful grace and mercy may speedily help and deliver us; through the satisfaction of thy Son our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost be honour and glory, world without end ... Amen.

Section I - The Sixteenth Century

"In the medieval Roman Church the Greek view of God and nature was carried over into the relation of heaven and earth, the Kingdom of God and the Church. Nature was regarded as impregnated with final causes, so that the eternal pattern embedded in nature could be read off by natural theology or deductive science. Likewise the Church was regarded as impregnated with the Kingdom of God, so that the pattern of the Kingdom embedded in the earthly structure of the Church could be read off the historical consciousness of the Church by the teaching office. Here the Eschaton is so domesticated and housed within the Church that far from standing under final judgment the Church dispenses it by her binding and loosing, far from being repentant and reformed, the Church can only develop according to her own immanent norms which correspond to the fixed pattern of the Kingdom. To this theology the idea that eschatology is concerned with history is almost 'totally alien' ... In contrast the Reformation stands for the rediscovery of the living God of the Bible, who actively intervenes in the affairs of men, the Lord and the Judge of history, and with that comes a powerful realization of the historical relevance of eschatology."

Though Professor Torrance in this article is dealing with Luther, Butzer, and Calvin, the words above apply equally well to the English Reformers. Their writings are full of references to the God of whom the Scriptures speak, the God who encounters the

Church with His mighty Word. The Church does not have control of the Word; the Word controls the Church. "The gospel hath not its being out of the church, but the church out of the gospel."1 "If the word shall judge in the last day, much more it ought to judge our doings now."2 Whereas according to medieval theology, individuals had to submit to the judgment of the Church in this world and look forward to a judgment by God after death; the Reformers believe that the Church herself comes under the judgment of God, and that that judgment has come upon her in the present time. Jewel in particular returns to this theme frequently. Though the Church has been guilty of apostasy, Christ the King is reasserting His sovereignty over the Church; the Kingdom is now impinging upon Christendom with power. We find these references chiefly in Jewel's commentary on the Thessalonian epistles and in his sermons; almost without exception he treats the concept positively. God's judgment is God's salvation: God has taken action to renew and save His people; if to some this means condemnation it is because they refuse to accept and conform to God's Word. For it is God's Word that has brought the crisis. The "light of the Gospel has come among us; and ... we are they upon whom the latter end of the world is come, and in whom (God) doth shew forth the great might of his power."3

The rediscovery of the biblical message is part of the work of Christ the King. Christ is manifesting His power, for with the preaching of that rediscovered message He shall consume His enemies "with the spirit of his mouth." (II Thessalonians 2:8)

1. Philpot, p. 344.  
2. Ibid, p. 47  
"These words are diversely taken. Some expound them thus: God shall appoint the great angel Michael to set upon antichrist; and he shall destroy him. Others take these words to be spoken of the day of judgment; and then this shall be fulfilled, when Christ shall say, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire'; that this is the spirit of the Lord's mouth wherewith he shall be consumed. But the apostle speaketh of the preaching of the gospel. That God by his word, which is mighty to do all that he appointeth it shall make his workings manifest, and let all the world see that he was not sent of God; that he did never set forth the glory of God; that he hath not sought the salvation of the people; that in matters of faith and in all his works he is adversary to Christ — this is that breath that shall despy his errors and vanities, this is that spirit which shall consume the kingdom of antichrist. This overthrow is already begun, as our eyes behold this day." 2

In Jewell's mind the Reformation movement has to be understood in relation to the Last Judgment. It is debatable whether he actually believes the return of the Lord to be imminent. He is certainly not calculating about it, as Luther came to be. But he does believe that the renewed preaching of the Word is part of the activity of the Racheton. At one point he speaks in terms of a great battle, and the words he uses are those of the Last Judgment. But here it turns out that he is talking about the battle, or encounter, that takes place in the hearts and consciences of the people when the true Word is preached. Yet he is setting that against the backdrop of the latter days that are coming upon Christendom. Even now the Kingdom is thrusting itself upon the Church. 3

"The Kingdom of God now suffereth violence. The sound of the gospel hath gone over all the world; and the whole world is awaked therewith, and draweth to it. The sun is risen: the day is open: God hath made his kingdom wonderful among us. It is now time, now is it time that we should arise from sleep; for now is our salvation near. Now it is in our mouth: we can speak of it: God grant it may be nearer us, even in our hearts. The night is past; God grant it be past for ever; that we be never again thrown into the darkness of death, that the word of life, the truth of Christ, be.

1. i.e. Antichrist. 2. Commentary on II Thess. 2:11f. 3. Loc. cit.
"never again taken from us. And it shall never be taken away, if we be thankful".  

But it can be taken away. That is another important difference between the Reformers and their Roman opponents; the latter believe that the truth is infallibly embedded in the Church: the Church does not stand under judgment in its understanding of the Truth. The Reformers, however, emphasize the Church's subordination to the Word, and acknowledge that unfaithfulness to the Word means the Church loses the Truth. The Church possesses the Truth only in the sense that she has in hand the Scriptures. If God's people do not listen gladly to the Scriptural message, God removes His Word "from out of the congregation" and no longer permits the light of his gospel to shine upon them. In fact Jewel claims that God even takes the Kingdom away.

"But alas! when God's kingdom is taken away, in whose kingdom and dominion do the people then live? when God's gospel and his word is no longer preached, what learning, what doctrine, what discipline is there left to be taught? And this oftentimes cometh to pass by means of our own sin and wickedness; that, for the misusing of God and his gospel, we neither have God's kingdom nor his gospel amongst us. But then, alas! in what great misery, in what wretchedness, in what woful case shall we stand? For if God's kingdom be shut from us, whither shall we fly? If God will get him away from us, who shall be our succour? And therefore no man ought to rejoice hereat, no man ought to be glad of such a change. But, though God's kingdom be taken away from us, though God's gospel be no more preached unto us, though God fly from us, and will hide himself away, yet is God and his gospel nothing thereby altered: God is still one and the same God; his gospel is the same gospel that it was before; his kingdom continueth in one stay and estate, it is not changed or altered. For saith Christ: ... 'Heaven and earth shall perish; but my word shall not perish'."  

These words could never have been written by a Roman divine. Jewel

1. Sermon on Romans 13:12  
2. Jewel, Sermon on I Cor. 4:1,2.  
3. From Sermon on I Cor. 4:1,2.
is cutting away the medieval identification between Church and Kingdom, refusing to see the fortunes of the Kingdom to be identical with the pattern and activity of the visible Church. He is suggesting in fact that for many years the Church has been denying the gospel, and that the Kingdom has been taken away. But he is also stating that now with the rediscovery of the biblical Word the Kingdom has come upon them. "God's kingdom, my brethren, is even now come upon us." 1 "O what a comfortable saying is this! Whencesoever we hear the gospel taught us, whencesoever we hear God's holy word preached unto us, then is the gate of salvation set open unto us, and then is the time of grace." Yet some men are asking why God permitted the world to be so long in blindness. Jewel replied: who are we to call God to account?

"Good people, let us consider that God of his goodness hath sent unto us this acceptable time, the time of mercy and grace, that he hath delivered us from the horrible thraldom that we sometimes lived in; that God hath put away the blindness, and dispersed that great darkness whereunder the whole world was sometime whelmed: that we may now worship him in spirit and holiness, without superstition or idolatry; that we may now walk in the light, without any error or wandering." 2

It is only partly true to say that the Reformation grew out of this new, or renewed, eschatology. Quite clearly the new, or renewed, eschatology arose in part out of the movement towards reform. The Reformers saw themselves standing at odds with the rest of the Church, and because they were convinced that in their efforts for reform they were being faithful to the Word, they claimed that the Church was resisting the Word. If the Church as such, the whole body of the hierarchy from the pope down, was

opposing the Truth then it can and must be true that the Church
stands under judgment. It is not legitimate to make an equation
between Church and Kingdom, for the Church can be guilty of apostasy.
The Reformers went further; since the Church, under the authority
of the pope, is opposing the advent of the gospel of Christ, then
the Church is resisting the authority of the King of the Church:
the pope is antichrist. Certain passages of Scripture came easily
to hand, for in I John it says that antichrist has gone out from the
brethren themselves, and Paul claims that Satan comes disguised as
an angel of light. The Reformers continually speak of the bishop
of Rome as antichrist, and they claim that the reformation is at
once judgment upon the Roman Church and a re-formation, or re-
gathering, of the Church under the royal sovereignty of Jesus Christ,
by means of the proclamation of His Gospel.

In the portions from Jewel's writings already referred to we
have seen that this is how he looks upon the Reformation. In
England there has indeed been a re-formation of the Church. It is
true of course that in England no "re-gathering" of the Church was
necessary, for the hierarchy, in conjunction with the civil power,
carried out the work of reform. But the Church was reformed, and
that is what Jewel is so jubilant about; the Church in England has
been reshaped in doctrine and worship in obedience to the Word and
according to the practice of the early Church. All this, according
to Jewel, is the result of the judgment and mercy of Christ the King
exercised through the proclamation of the Truth.

In England, then, as on the Continent, there has been a reaction
against the Roman domestication of the Sachaton within the Church.
The Reformers protest that the Church itself stands under the final judgment of her Sovereign Lord, and therefore must repent and allow herself to be reformed. When we come to examine the 17th century divines we shall be watching to see if this eschatology is retained in such a way that it applies not only to the Roman Church but also to the reformed Church of England.

Before we turn to the 17th century, however, there is a further matter to be discussed. The Reformers believe that the kingship of Christ has been reasserted by the renewed preaching of the true gospel. But they appear to see the reassertion of Christ's sovereignty also in the re-establishment of the sovereignty of the King of England over the Church. Let us listen to part of Cranmer's brief oration at the Coronation of Edward VI. After demolishing the pope's claim to "dispose of the sword and sceptre" to whom he pleases, Cranmer proceeds:

"Your majesty is God's vice-gerent and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josiah, God truly worshipped, and idolatry destroyed, the tyranny of the bishops of Rome banished from your subjects, and images removed. These acts be signs of a second Josiah, who reformed the church of God in his days. You are to reward virtue, to revenge sin, to justify the innocent, to relieve the poor, to procure peace, to repress violence, and to execute justice throughout your realms. For precedents, on those kings who performed not these things, the old law shews how the Lord revenged his quarrel; and on those kings who fulfilled these things, he poured forth his blessings in abundance...

"Being bound by my function to lay these things before your royal highness, the one as a reward, if you fulfil; the other as a judgment from God, if you neglect them; yet I openly declare before the living God, and before these nobles of the land, that I have no commission to denounce your majesty deprived, if your highness miss in part, or in whole, of these performances".

These words would of course come as no surprise to Cranmer's...

audience. Henry's Supremacy Act had given the King final authority to correct wrongs in the Church, even to the point of judging heresy. The Bishop's Book of 1537 and the King's Book of 1543 had said that the royal power, which is ordained of God, is not restricted in its function to the enforcement of law and preservation of order, but is given principally to defend the true Faith, "to conserve and maintain the true doctrine of Christ", and to abolish all "abuses, heresies, and idolatries" in the Church. Cramner in his oration was simply re-stating the official position. To the Reformers the King was on earth "God's vicar and chief minister".

Hooker has occasion to refer to this matter, though he is writing not against the Romans but against the Puritans. The latter are trying to demonstrate that the King cannot, or at least should not, exercise sovereignty over the Church. Thomas Cartwright approaches the question in a very interesting way. He states that whereas ecclesiastical jurisdiction comes from God via Christ, and is subordinate to Christ, the authority of the civil magistrate comes immediately from God and is not subordinate to Christ. There are then two spheres of jurisdiction: the secular directly under God the Father, and the spiritual under the Father through the Son. Cartwright does not advocate the complete separation of these two spheres but believes that there should be a greater distinction between them than is practised in England. Because the King does not reign through Christ he ought to have control over spiritual matters. Hooker replies that there is no power but from God through

---

1. Lloyd, Formularies of Faith put forward by authority during the reign of Henry VIII, pp. 120f.
2. Crammer, II, p. 197
the hands of Jesus Christ. Christ is the Prince of the Kings of
the earth. Whatever is necessary for our life is given by the Son
of God, and certainly government among men, being so necessary,
cannot but be originally from Jesus Christ and be subordinate to Him.

"Touching that authority which civil magistrates have in
ecclesiastical affairs, it being from God by Christ, as all
other good things are, cannot choose but be held as a thing
received at his hands; and because such power as is of
necessary use for the ordering of religion, wherein the essence
and very being of the Church consisteth, can no otherwise flow
from him, than according to that special care which he hath
to guide and govern his own people: it followeth that the
said authority is of and under him after a more peculiar
manner, namely, in that He is Head of the Church, and not in
respect of his general regency over the world. "All things"
(saith the Apostle speaking unto the Church) "are yours, and
ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." Kings are Christ's,
as saints: and kings are Christ's, as kings; as saints,
because they are of the Church; as kings, because they are in
authority over the Church."1

The student of 16th and 17th century Anglican thought, even if
he is making a theological analysis, is compelled to acknowledge
that the doctrine of the royal supremacy arose in part at least out
of hostility to papal authority, and was maintained because of the
perpetual threat of Roman power and influence from without, and also
because of the growth of Puritanism from within. Without the civil
power the Church could not have been successfully reformed; without
that same power the reformed Church could not have been preserved
from change or destruction. This does not, it seems to me,
explain the doctrine of royal supremacy that the Anglicans held; it
only sets it in its context.

All this leads to an important question: did they ascribe to
the prince an authority in the Church that stood above judgment?
This is not a simple question to answer.

1. E.P. VIII, iv, 6.
Cranmer, in his oration, made plain to the King his duty as a Christian King, though the judgment that would follow disobedience would, according to him, come only from God. Elizabeth's Supremacy Act, unlike Henry's, qualified her jurisdiction to a certain extent. Henry, by his Act, was actually left by law sole judge of heresy! Elizabeth's Act said that nothing was to be accounted heresy except by the authority of Scripture or the General Councils of the Church, "or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged, or determined to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament of this realm, with the assent of the clergy in their Convocation". This qualification of the Queen's authority is important. The criterion of truth and heresy is not the opinion of the Queen nor of her representatives; it is the Scriptures and the General Councils of the Church. Yet it is significant that any further "orders", "judgments", or "determinations" on the matter of heresy will not come from Convocation with assent of Parliament, but vice versa. We must of course remember that when the Act places the authority with the High Court of Parliament it does not mean that this is one decision that is removed from the Queen's jurisdiction; on the contrary, it means simply the Queen-in-parliament - with emphasis upon the Queen.

As yet, however, we have not answered the question: do the 16th century divines ascribe to the monarch a sway over the Church that could not be checked or reformed? The activity of the Reformers when Mary succeeded Edward may give us more of the answer. Mary, acting sincerely according to what she believed to be the right thing

1. Goo & Hardy, Documents Illustrative of the History of the English Church, pp. 243f.  2. Ibid, p. 455
for England, began systematically to undo what had been accomplished during her brother's reign. Cranmer and his fellow workers sincerely believed that the Queen was mistaken, yet they made no endeavor to organize resistance to her work, nor did they ever question her right to do what she did. And even in his final dramatic speech when he recanted his recantations, Cranmer exhorted every one that, next under God, they should

"obey your king and queen willingly and gladly, without murmuring or grudging; nor for fear of them only, but much more for the fear of God: knowing that they be God's ministers, appointed by God to rule and govern you; and therefore, whosoever resisteth them, resisteth the ordinance of God." ¹

This is really quite remarkable, for Cranmer could not know that Mary would live only three years more. For all he knew Mary might for twenty or thirty years use her authority to rid England of every remnant of the work of the Reformers, work that Cranmer was convinced had been done in obedience to the word of God. It is perfectly clear that to Cranmer the prince could be judged by God only.

The Elizabethans are in a different position, for they believe in the Establishment, and to them Elizabeth is a godly, Christian prince. Whitgift admits that a separation of Church and State might be legitimate if the Church were linked with a "heathenish and idolatrous commonwealth".² If he includes papists under that term would he, unlike Cranmer, have been willing to try to withdraw the Church from Mary's control? But of course all that is behind Whitgift; he is concerned with the present reign, and Elizabeth is not a papist but a "virtuous, religious, and godly prince".³ He gladly ack-

---

² Whitgift, I, pp. 21f; see also pp. 27, 268.
³ Whitgift, 263.
acknowledges her position as "principal governor of the church under Christ". Nothing should be done in the government of the Church except what she considers to be "convenient and profitable". Even the polity of the Church depends upon the Queen's choice. If she were to decide that the Church of England should be governed without bishops, or perhaps that the power to ordain and confirm should be transferred from bishops to, say, the deans of cathedral churches, nobody could say that she was doing anything beyond her legitimate right. Thomas Bilson writes that "whether princes be with God or against God, Priest and Bishop must with gladness obey, or with meekness abide the sword". In his famous Sermon Preached at Paul's Cross, Bancroft actually asserts that

"not only the title of supreme governor over all persons, and in all causes, as well Ecclesiastical and civil, did appertain, and ought to be annexed unto the Crowne: but likewise all honours, dignities, preeminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities which by usurpation at any time did appertain to the Pope".

It is only the sober Hooker who discusses the limits to the sovereign's authority, pointing out first that the King is under God, and secondly that he must hold and exercise his authority under the law. The King ought to guide the state and the law guide the King. But can the King be resisted if he does not permit the law to guide him? Shirley says that Hooker might acknowledge a right to refuse to obey the King if his actions were against God's law; but not a right to rebellion. For Hooker, passive resistance is the maximum protest.

1. I, p. 393
3. True Differences Between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion, 1596, p. 129.
5. E.P. VIII, ii.
One of the chief characteristics of the theology of the English Reformers was an eschatology which brought the Church under the present judgment of Christ the King. This eschatology had a very concrete historical reference, for the judgment was exercised by Christ through the Word. But at the same time the Reformers articulated a doctrine of royal supremacy that placed the power and jurisdiction of the English monarch over the Church beyond judgment. This is easy to understand, of course, for the formidable authority of the Tudors was an unmistakable reality, and for the most part it was to the Reformers a welcome reality: a strong central power holding the nation together in face of internal and external attack. Moreover, the 16th century Anglicans thought that under the king the whole nation was to be shaped and formed according to the will and authority of Christ. Bullinger's words, contained in the dedication to Edward VI of his third and fourth "decades", undoubtedly received the approval of all the Anglican divines: that kings should "give and submit themselves and their kingdoms to Jesus Christ the only-begotten Son of God, being King of kings, and Lord of lords that they should "not follow in all their affairs their own mind and judgment, the laws of men that are contrary to God's commandments, or the good intents of mortal men; but do themselves follow the very laws of the mightiest king and monarch, and also cause them to be followed throughout all their kingdom, reforming both themselves and all theirs at and by the rule of God's holy word". There is no doubt, however, that though Bullinger in this dedicatory epistle is the very model of mildness, he speaks more strongly of the king's responsibilities toward God's Word than any of the Anglicans do.

They are content to be silent about the monarch's duties. And they absolutely never turn the critical and reforming judgment of the Word against the Prince, nor do they give any serious indication that it might ever legitimately be done. It is almost as though there are two parallel authorities under Christ in the historical body of the Church: the Word and the prince. Though all of them would naturally say that the prince stands under the Word, at no time do they suggest that the Word might on some occasion call the Church to resist the will of the prince.

Section II - The Early Carolines

The mood of the early Carolines is different than that of the Reformers. This is not surprising; the spirit of conservation is always in sharp distinction to the spirit of reform. However the change in mood to which I refer goes deeper than that. The Reformers felt they were living in the last times, when God's hand rested heavily upon them, and on the whole this feeling is not to be discerned in the Carolines. It would be a mistake to think, however, that the Carolines have turned back to the medieval eschatology; in spite of genuine differences between them and the Reformers, they still uphold the basic reformation conception of the relation of Church and Kingdom.

Indeed, Joseph Mede reads in places very much like the earlier divines. His interpretation of chapters ten to twenty of the Book of Revelation is in line with the eschatology we have found in Jewel Mede finds in the Reformation, and in the work of all those who have
succeeded the Reformers, the fulfillment of the prophecies of Revelation. He acknowledges that the "time of judgment" referred to in Revelation 14:7, if strictly taken, should refer to the initial overthrow of heathenism.

"But I had rather extend it more largely, and take it universally, for the kingdom of Christ begun and published in the last times, in which Idols are not any more to be suffered; according to that of our Saviour in the Gospel of John, Chap 12:31. 'Now is the judgement of this world, now shall the Prince of this world be cast out'."

Mede claims that Revelation 16:2 was fulfilled when the "Christian common people" called the Waldenses, Albigensians, Wyclifists, Hussites, etc., began to renounce the authority of Rome. And he says that 16:3 was fulfilled

"when by the labour of Luther and other famous reformers of the Church of that Age, God wonderfully blessing their undertakings, not now some single person only of the common people of Christendom, but even whole Provinces, Dioceses, Kingdoms, Nations, and Cities renounced communion with those of the Beast".

For Mede then, as for the Reformers, eschatology has an immediate historical relevance. He expresses it more plainly in this respect than his contemporaries, but he is not alone in his view. Joseph Hall compares the Reformation to the bringing of Israel out of Egypt. He frequently refers to God's present judgment upon the Church and nation. He attributes, for instance, the rise of the sects in England to God's judgment upon the nation for her sins. Such things as the oppression of the poor, contempt of God's ministers, sacrilege, etc., are singled out as the causes of this judgment. On one occasion, when preaching to the

House of Lords, he denounces in exceedingly strong language the sin and selfishness of the rich and the powerful, claiming that because of them God's wrath is now being poured out upon England.¹

It is apparent, then, that though the mood of the early Carolines differs from that of the Reformers, there is no move to domesticate God and His judgment. The early Carolines are not trying to reform the Church but to protect it and build it up; yet they do not exalt the Church in the wrong way - i.e. at the expense of Christ's sovereignty.

We should have little doubt about Andrewes' position. The fact that he consistently looks upon the nature of the Church under the doctrine of the Holy Spirit makes it probable that he will not arrogate to the Church a divine life of its own. All the same, the medievalists were not ignorant of the fact that the Church lives by the Holy Spirit. It was not a failure to see the Church in terms of the Holy Spirit that led them into error; it was that they so annexed the Holy Spirit to the life of the Church that His transcendent sovereignty was qualified. In Andrewes this is never the case; he affirms the sovereignty, the Godness, of the Holy Spirit in every way he can. He warns us that we ought not to deceive ourselves, for we do not spin the Holy Spirit out of ourselves like the spider does her web.² If we want to distinguish the Holy Spirit from any other spirit we must remember that It comes from Christ; He breathes it.³

It is the possession of the Sacraments that gives to Roman divines their confidence that the Church can perpetuate its own

---

¹. Ibid, pp. 375f; see also pp. 511ff. ². Vol. III, p.211. ³. Ibid, p. 276
life as the Church. The Sacraments being housed within the Church means that the Church has had given over to it the life by which it lives. Andrewes also believes that the Church lives by the Sacraments, but only because He believes the Church lives by the work of God the Spirit. It is true, he says, that the Church does not live by the Spirit alone, without the water and the blood. But neither can she live by the water and the blood without the Holy Spirit. Andrewes looks upon the Sacraments, along with Prayer and the Preaching of the Word, as "arteries" conveying the Spirit to the Church, but the Spirit is never simply the Gift, He is also the Giver of the Gift. Andrewes used comparable terms about the Eucharist: Christ is never simply the Food of the Supper; He is "Pastor et Pabulum, 'the Feeder and the Food', both.

This determination, to let God be God, is one of the characteristics of the reformed Anglican tradition, and Bishop Davenant, like Andrewes, stands squarely within this tradition. In his commentary on Colossians in particular, he tries in every possible way to affirm the sovereignty of Jesus Christ over the Church. The Church lives by the Holy Spirit, though she does not control Him; He is given to the Church by the gracious mediation and intercession of Christ sitting at the right hand of the Father. It is Christ, as God, together with the Father, who gives the glorious power of the Holy Spirit to His people. God alone, Davenant insists, can give God. And this means that, although Christ is seated in heaven, He is not separated from His Church. He is the living Head of the Church and really united to her, even though the Church is still on

Christ as the Head of the Church "communicates the vital power of his Spirit to all his members." There is between Christ and His people "a certain uninterrupted union by means of the Holy Spirit." Davenant discusses Christ's relation to the Church as Head to the Body, Bridegroom to the Bride, Root to the Branch, trying to show first the intimate union between Christ and His people, and secondly that the maintenance of that union rests in the personal prerogative of Christ Himself. The Church's confidence must never then, rest upon herself, but always upon God. We have already had occasion more than once to refer to Davenant's answer to Bishop Hall's request for help in his dispute with the Puritans: Hall had brought down upon himself the wrath of some of the Puritans for calling the Roman communion a true visible Church. Davenant supports Hall because he (Davenant) looks first not to the Church but to God's Word and work. The being of the church, he tells Hall, stands upon the gracious calling of God through Word and Sacraments. Therefore wherever God continues to call to a people, even though they corrupt His ordinances, there is to be found the true being of a Church.

It is apparent that in neither Davenant or Andrewes is there any reversion to the static concepts of medieval theology. The relation between Christ and His Church is a dynamic one, and though the relation is not by any means insecure, this is due entirely to the omnipotence and the faithfulness of Christ, the Lord and Head of the Church. That is why Andrewes can at one moment claim that the Church is the Kingdom of Christ, and at another say quite

1. On Colossians 1:11
2. 1:18.
4. In Hall, Works, p. 742.
naturally that we must pray that that Kingdom should come. In the latter case he is not referring only to the Kingdom of glory. He tells his congregation, indeed, that finally the Kingdom of glory is the principal Kingdom that we desire, and that is what we pray for when we say "Come quickly Lord Jesus". But he is at this point exhorting them to pray for, and to desire, the Kingdom of grace (i.e. the Kingdom of Christ) for without it "we shall never be partakers of that other Kingdom".  

We cannot overemphasize the fact that this dynamic quality which distinguishes Andrews' and Davenant's doctrines arises from their respect for the sovereignty of the living Lord Jesus Christ over His Church. Although in their work this quality is most clearly manifested, it is to be found also in most of the Early Carolines. The placing of so much weight upon the Word and the Sacraments as the marks of the true Church, is due to the belief of the Early Carolines that the being of the Church rests solely upon the activity of God. Even though, by this time, there are serious signs of a hardened conception of the nature of "right doctrine", still the conviction remains that true doctrine is the "very Touchstone of the Church". This is the result of the Early Carolines understanding of Christ coming to His people through His Word. Submission to the Word, i.e. to the truth of the Scriptures, is accounted by them to be submission to Christ. The Church is not alone; the presence of the Bible in the Church is the decisive sign that she stands under authority. She cannot live and develop

1. Ibid, pp. 393ff. 2. Lec cit
Restoring Brotherly Communion, pp. 24, 30;
according to her own caprice, but she must acknowledge the direction and control of God by giving the Bible an unquestioned authority in her life and work.\(^1\)

Looking at strictly in terms of eschatology we can distinguish the Early Caroline position from the Roman, in that the former take seriously the fact that the Church lives in the time between the first and second coming of Christ. We have already seen that the doctrine of the relation of the ascended Christ to His Church is such that the personal sovereignty of Christ over His people is affirmed. At the same time they see that the bodily separation of Christ from His Church is of such a nature that the Church still waits for the manifestation of its glory. This it will see only in the glory of Christ's second coming. The Church does not live in glory now. In its form and its order, in its doctrine and its life, it has not captured Christ's glory. The Church in the present time lives by grace; it is the time of grace, the time of the Holy Spirit, the time of the Kingdom of Christ. These latter terms are used repeatedly by Andrews, especially those of "grace" and the "Holy Spirit". In almost every sermon, Andrews closes with a reference to the Kingdom of glory to which we look forward with hope and confidence, and that is contrasted to the Kingdom of grace in which we now live.\(^2\) It is not as though in the Kingdom of grace there is no reflection at all of the Kingdom of glory, for do we not receive grace from the glorified One? And glory is

---

1. See Laud's discussion of the authority of Scripture over the Church, Vol. II, pp. 70-142; also pp. 175ff.
"nothing else but grace consummated".\(^1\) However grace is given to the Church in an earthen vessel, and the vessel remains earthen. The Church herself, in fact, though she does by grace bear within herself salvation, is an earthen vessel and must not pretend to be anything more. The Roman Church has forgotten this, and pretends to a glory that is not in accordance with the true character of the militant Church. Rather must the Church in this world exhibit only the strength and glory of the Cross.\(^2\) She must be content to live by grace; for God dwells with the Church by grace, giving to the Church the sure hope of dwelling with Him in heavenly glory.

The Eucharist is to Andrews the decisive sign of the promised glory. God has provided this ordinance for His Church that by it Christ may effect a unique personal union with His people. Andrews closes almost every sermon with a reference to the glory yet to be revealed; and just as consistently, he refers to the Eucharist as the chief instrument whereby we are assured of sharing in that glory. For example, in an illuminating Christmas sermon on "Immanuel" he begins his conclusion with a strong reference to the Sacraments as God's means of making Christ to be "with us" under the conditions of our present life. Then he continues:

"We are not together; we are parted, He and we. He in heaven and we in earth. But it shall not always be. Beside today Immanuel hath another day, and that day will come; and when it doth come, He will come and take us to Himself. Thus He hath been our Immanuel upon earth, so He may be our Immanuel in Heaven; He with us, and we with Him, there for ever.

"This of the Sacrament is a preparative to that; will conceive and bring forth the other. For immediately after He had given them the Holy Eucharist, He prayed straight to them that had so been with Him in the blessed Sacrament - 'Father, My will is', My prayer, My last prayer, 'that where I am they may be also'."\(^3\)

---

The Early Carolines then do not revert to medieval eschatology; they do not place the Church above judgment and reform. Yet we must notice that they refuse to accept the judgment pronounced by the Puritans upon the Church of England, and they will not agree to the reforms advocated by the Puritans. However, this is not necessary a sign of inconsistency on their part. Human beings have a propensity toward self-justification in the face of criticism, and the early Carolines certainly are human in this respect. In spite of this, we do not find any suggestion that the Church of England is in principle above judgment. The objections are to the specific proposals made by the Puritans, and specific arguments are given. Even when some of the early Carolines defend the Church of England in extravagant terms, they do it by pointing to definite qualities manifested in the Church's life. What nation under heaven, Hall asks, yields so many learned divines? What times ever yielded so many preaching bishops?¹

"Do but cast your eyes a little back, and see what noble instruments of God's glory he hath been pleased to raise up in this very church of ours, out of this sacred vocation²; what famous servants of God; what strong champions of truth and renowned antagonists of Rome and her superstitions .. ."² Hall claims that God has enabled the Church of England to purge herself of those things that are contrary to the truth, and has made her

"a truly orthodox Church, eminent for purity of doctrine, for the grace and reverend solemnity of true sacraments, for the due form of government, for the pious and religious form of our public Liturgy".³

We see, then, that in their conception of the relation of the

2. i.e. episcopacy
4. Works, Vol. V, p. 574; see also p. 405
Church to the Lord of the Church, the Early Carolines maintain the Reformation tradition. Do they also support the 16th century conception of the monarch of England as "Head" of the Anglicana Ecclesi? This is a question that hardly needs asking, for every schoolboy knows that it must be answered in the affirmative. The popular mind places the responsibility for the Divine-Right-of-Kings concept at the door of the first two Stuart Kings. But we know that that is not a fair judgment. The 17th century simply develops a doctrine it inherited from the 16th.

It is interesting and important, however, to see how this came about. Andrewes maintains that the kingly office possesses a divinity whether or not the office is filled by a godly prince. The King is the "Anointed One" even if he is not a religious King. The Old Testament, Andrewes points out, applies the title Christos Domini to Cyrus as well as Josiah, to Saul as well as David. The authority and the person of a King are therefore to be respected regardless of the quality of his rule. In his sermons commemorating James' escape from the two famous Plots, Andrewes ransacks the Old Testament and the New, in order to find the places where resistance to kings is shown to be sin.

"They that rise against the King, are God's enemies; for God and the King are so in a league, such a knot, so straight between them, as one cannot be enemy to the one, but he must be to the other."2

This is the accepted Anglican doctrine: that the King is, and ought to be, beyond the critical judgment of his subjects.

James I, himself, writing on this question, claims that the English

1. IV, pp. 57f. 2. Andrewes IV, pp. 13f; see also pp. 32, 52ff, 80, 230ff, and Vol. V, pp. 140ff.
monarchy arose out of conquest, and not from any kind of law or contract framed by the people. It is not "by birth, not by any right in the coronation" that the king comes to his crown. To the king must be rendered unquestioned obedience, because:

"As to dispute what God may do is blasphemy ... so it is sedition in subjects to dispute what a king may do in the height of his power" 2

Kings are the authors and makers of laws, not vice versa; and therefore the royal will is the final source of political authority. 3

In a pamphlet, supposedly written by Richard Mocket, called God and the King, all resistance is condemned as contrary both to the law of nature and the moral law, and not even in the defence of Christianity itself is resistance to be allowed. Roger Maynwaring, in 1627, preached two sermons before Charles on "Religion and Allegiance", in which he asserts that "lawful sovereigns are no less than Fathers, Lord, Kings and Gods on earth", 4 only lower in the hierarchy of all created beings than God Himself. Even God stands "in the assembly of Princes as one of them", 5 and "no power in the world (c) in the hierarchy of the Church can lay restraint upon these supemes", 6 for the power of kings "is not merely human but superhuman, and indeed no less than a Power Divine". 7

We must, however, keep in mind the godly prince concept. Although Andrewes refers to the authority held even by a pagan king still the important thing to him, and to all of his colleagues, is

1. The True Law of Free Monarchies, 1603; for this and the following see Hawkins, Allegiance in Church and State, 1928, pp. 3-17.
2. The Duty of a King in His Royal Office, 1642 ed.
3. True Law of Free Monarchies 4. Sermon at Oatlands
5. Sermon at Alderton 6. Sermon at Oatlands
7. Sermon at Alderton
the fact that England is ruled by Christian monarchs. Elizabeth, James, and Charles were all godly Christian princes ruling a Christian nation. Like Cranmer and Hooker, many of the early 17th-century divines draw a parallel between England and Israel, and attribute to the English king the same power and responsibility with regard to ecclesiastical affairs as had the kings of Israel. It is true of course that the King already possesses this power. In the ecclesiastical body, as in the civil, all offices belong ultimately to the King. But the early Carolines believe this state of affairs is doubly justified by the fact that a Christian King rules England. They can with double assurance speak of the King as being Christ's vicar and consider it perfectly natural that all ecclesiastical authority should be gathered together in him.

In the Roman Church all power of order and of jurisdiction flow from the pope; in the Church of England all power of jurisdiction comes from the King. At the Reformation, according to Andrewes, ecclesiastical supremacy passed from the pope to the Crown, which was merely the King's recovery of an authority that had been usurped by the Pope; while spiritual supremacy, i.e. the power to define faith, to celebrate the sacraments, and to preach — reverted to the spiritual heads of the Church, the bishops. There can be no doubt about the fact that the Early Carolines speak about the King's authority over the Church in terms not

1. e.g. Andrewes, Sermons, Vol. II, pp. 10, 30ff; Vol. IV, pp. 80, 87, 277ff; Carleton, Jurisdiction etc., pp. 13f; Laud, Works, Vol. I, pp. 15, 89; Overall, Convocation Book, Canon XXI
unlike those used by Catholics defending papal supremacy.

The fact that the Early Carolines pit the royal authority against papal authority has very important consequences for their conception of the unity of the Church. If we go back for a moment to Hooker we can perhaps follow the argument through. Hooker counters the Puritan argument that there is no need for a substitute "Head of the Church" (i.e. the King) since Christ is never absent from His body, by saying that this is a confusion of the visible with the invisible Church. "Christ, touching visible and corporal presence, is removed as far as heaven from earth is distant." ¹

Hooker demonstrates the necessity of visible government over the visible Church, and then comments that it has been expedient for Christ to divide his kingdom into many portions and to place many heads over it. In the same way that other societies may have heads over various sections with all of them subject to one general head, so may the authorities over the various churches all be subject to Christ, the one Head of the Church.

"For if Christian churches be in number many, and every of them a body perfect by itself, Christ being Lord and head over all; why should we judge it a thing more monstrous for one body to have two heads, than one head so many bodies?" ²

The phrase about each of them being "a body perfect by itself" is very important. It is Hooker's way of avoiding the logical step of having to say that it is expedient that there be one visible "Head" over the many visible "heads".

¹ This is rather amusing. A few years earlier Hooker's patron, Bishop Jewel, had used the very same chain of reason against the pope as "Head of the Church", that the Puritans are here using against the Royal Supremacy. His opponent, Harding, had employed precisely the same answer that Hooker here turns against the Puritans. Jewel, III, pp. 59, 281.
² VIII, iv, 7.
Carleton avoids taking this step too. His premise is that though there is only one Church with one Head, this is the invisible Church known only to God. Anglicans recognize, as Romans do not, that the visible Church has been scattered in many places and must have many heads or governors. Since "external coercive Jurisdiction" must be handled by temporal governors, Anglicans acknowledge the sovereign of any realm to be "governor next and immediately under God, of his own dominions, and consequently of persons and causes within his own dominions ..." 

This is the issue then: if the King has by "divine right" the full authority over the Church, then no authority from outside the realm must encroach upon it. Laud is quite clear on the point: there cannot be a "King" over the whole Church because no sovereign of a nation is going to permit another king, greater than himself, to control some or all of his subjects. It is quite true that within a kingdom there are many judges all of whom are under one supreme judge; but Laud maintains that it does not necessarily follow that since there are many judges over the Church throughout the world that they must all have one supreme judge. Supposing that there were such a judge (i.e. the pope) "how will he enter to execute his office, if the kings of those kingdoms will not give leave?" The Church of England, Laud says, does not believe there is any necessity to have one bishop over the whole Christian world, any more than it is necessary to have one emperor over the whole world, "which, were it possible, she cannot think fit". Similar arguments can be found in the writings of Thomas Jackson and
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Over the issue of external authority the difference, so far as the early Carolines discuss it, between Roman and Anglican, narrows down to the point of the one or the many. The Roman claims that there is but one Church, visible and invisible, and over the visible Church there reigns Christ's vicar. The Anglican assumes that though there is but one invisible Church with Christ as the Head, on earth the visible Church is separated into many parts according to the divisions of national states, and over each part there reigns a vicar of Christ, who is the King.

Even if the Churchmen did not take the King's status as seriously as James and Charles did, they do make the king the centre of things to such an extent that the physical unity of the English Church with churches abroad never even enters their minds. Unity within the Commonwealth is absolutely imperative; unity beyond the borders of the State could mean nothing but submission to Rome. No other alternative is ever remotely considered. This absolute identification of the Church in each national State with the State itself carries with it important consequences. If we look forward later to Isaac Barrow in the century we find a comment in his Discourse on the Unity of the Church that points to the problem. He claims that it is no longer expedient that a General Council should ever be held, since Christendom is divided into many "temporal sovereignties". The resolutions of a General Council may oppose the interests of some of the princes, and they might not be congenial to the civil laws and customs of every State.

2. See James I - The Duty of a King in His Royal Office, 1642.
Yet the Church of England has not by any means withdrawn from outside contact. Andrews carries on his discussion with Bellarmine and Laud has his debate with Fisher. Not only that, the early Carolinians call themselves Protestants and believe in a spiritual unity existing between themselves and the Protestants of the Continent.\(^1\) They become involved in the Arminian debate and James even sends representatives to the Synod of Dort (1619) which was called to settle that issue. The Englishmen, Hall, Carleton, and Davenant, vote with the orthodox against the Arminians. And it is significant that Davenant, some twenty years later, publishes two small works exhorting the Protestant churches to "brotherly communion".\(^2\)

Since there is, between the Protestant churches, agreement over fundamental doctrine, he insists that there is no justification for the estrangement that now exists between them. It is difficult, however, to determine exactly how far Davenant thinks the various churches should go towards unity. There is one tantalizing sentence that needs to be quoted verbatim.

"If a Civill and outward Peace is to be kept with so great desire betwixt all men, without doubt, the Spiritual and Ecclesiasticall Communion betwixt Christians, is to be procured and cherished with farre greater Endeavours."\(^3\)

Is "Communion" here but a synonym for "Peace"? Does Davenant look only for the absence of spiritual and ecclesiastical strife? Or does he hope for an actual spiritual and ecclesiastical union?

Since he goes on to speak of the schisms of the churches being taken away\(^4\) it would seem possible that he refers to an actual

---
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ecclesiastical union. If he does mean that, he is the only man among the Early Carolinians that even considers such a step desirable; let along possible. It is not as though the others are hostile towards the continental Protestants; it is simply that they believe that England's Church is a national Church and part of the inheritance that God Himself commits unto the sovereign of England.

That being the case "brotherly communion" with other churches is both possible and desirable; any closer association is out of the question.

In the Church then there are two authorities: Christ and the King. Not that the Early Carolinians would have admitted that there were two; to them they were but one authority. Christ's was the imperial, while the King's was the ministerial, authority. The King was there by Christ's will and decision and it was the King's place to rule the Church in Christ's name and according to His will. But where is Christ's will to be found? We have already seen that the Early Carolinians consider subordination to the Word the one thing that can keep the Church from living according to her own caprice. Supposedly the education of clerics in the Word, and in the works of the Fathers, is to prepare them to lead the Church in the knowledge and the will of Jesus Christ. But does the King have that training? I raise the point in this way because it seems to me that the succession of James to the English throne gave the Anglican doctrine of royal prerogative a great boost. They discovered that James was not only a prince but a theologian.

The fact that James had actually a comparatively shallow
that he made many exceedingly foolish decisions, and that in his conversation he was often coarse and boorish, must not prevent us from seeing the great impression he made upon the minds of the Early Carolines. So much hung upon the King that we can imagine how apprehensive the Churchmen were in 1603 concerning James' stand with regard to the current controversial issues. How relieved the bishops and their colleagues must have been to find that he took a great delight in theological discussion and that he supported them in almost every question under debate with the Puritans! This not only confirmed for them the rightness of the King's position over the Church, but heightened their conception of kingly authority. And Charles' succession strengthened them in their assurance that the Establishment was above reproach, for his work seemed to them to arise out of an even more genuine concern for the life of the Church than James had ever felt.

It was largely because of the character of these two kings that the Early Carolines could so readily assume that the authority of the King over the Church would necessarily guarantee its peace and order under Christ. James was a learned King and Charles was a devout King; were they likely to lead the Church contrary to the Gospel? And so the Carolines continue to write and preach about the King's jurisdiction as an unmitigated blessing, and to insist that the King is beyond human check. He does not have to give account of himself to anybody but God, not to Parliament and certainly not to Convocation. Subordination to the Word:

1. Joseph Hall, who was no time-server, claimed that James in learning and knowledge exceeded all his 105 predecessors. Vol. V, p. 106.
subordination to the King; they do not seem to feel that the
Church of England will ever have to choose between these two.
They certainly believe that the work of the Puritans before, and
especially after 1640, is as contrary to Christ as it is to the
King, contrary to Christ because it is contrary to the King.

Section III - The Later Carolines.

Beveridge will be chief spokesman in the following section.
Not simply because he is, of all the Later Carolines, the greatest
exponent of reformed Anglican thought, but because he deals rather
more extensively than any of his colleagues with the concepts
under discussion.

"That the catholic or universal church is infallible, so as
constantly and firmly to maintain and hold every particular
necessary truth delivered in the gospel in one place or
another, cannot be denied; but that any particular church,
or the church of Rome in particular, is infallible, we have
it expressly denied and opposed in this article."1

This is part of Beveridge's exposition of Article XIX. It
might well be asked if this does not contradict the statement that
Beveridge is an exponent of reformed Anglican thought. In the
two previous sections of this chapter we have shown that the
Anglican divines repudiate any idea of Church infallibility, and
that they refuse to place the Church above judgment. Is it possi-
ble that in spite of his claims that Rome herself is not infallible,
Beveridge has reverted to a Roman doctrine of the Church?

I do not think he has, but rather that in the above selection,
Beveridge is repeating in a different way what the Anglicans have

been saying since the Reformation. Cranmer says that the Church "doth never wholly err"; there are always some whom God has kept "in his true religion". Cramer\(^2\) all claim that if the whole Church were to fall into heresy she would cease to be; they maintain that there are always some who remain faithful to the fundamental articles of the Gospel. There is no doubt that Beveridge's wording puts the issue in a slightly different light and could perhaps lead to a Roman interpretation, but his comment on Article XX dispels that possibility. There he acknowledges, as demanded by the Article, the subordination of the Church to Scripture.\(^5\)

But Beveridge has, all the same, a very exalted conception of the Church. Whereas at the time of the Reformation the Anglican doctrine of the Church is rather subdued, due chiefly to the Reformers' concern to emphasise the authority of the Word over the Church, Beveridge is very much concerned to expound at length the marvellous character of the Church as the body of Christ. In his sermons he tries to give his congregation an idea of the greatness and glory of the Church. We will not go into that, however, except to bring out his understanding of the Church under authority.

In former chapters we have had more than one glimpse of his high doctrine of the Church; here we are to see how his doctrine of Christ, and his doctrine of the Spirit also, control his understanding of the Church. He never deifies the Church; he testifies that there is only one Lord in the world, God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

---

The greatness of the Church comes from the fact that she is Christ's special possession. What more can be said of the Church than that she is the body of Christ? The devil may as well try to destroy Christ's real body in heaven as His mystical body upon earth. The Church lives in the confidence that Christ has kept and is keeping, His promise that where two or three are gathered in His name He is in the midst of them. "He doth not only promise that He will be, but He affirms that He is there. Neither doth He say, that His power, His grace, His blessing, His angels, or the like are there, but that He Himself is there; 'there am I', saith He, 'in the midst of them'."

Because Beveridge thinks about the Church in this way there is no extravagant claim that he cannot make on her behalf; yet to him she is and remains a Servant of Christ. Christ possesses the Church, not the Church Christ. The Church does not domesticate Christ, Christ domesticates the Church. And since it is not just the power and blessing of Christ, but Christ Himself, that is to be found in the midst of the Church, there is no possibility of the Church possessing the ground of her own life.

When we understand this aspect of Beveridge's thought we can watch him and see how expertly he sets the matter out in his sermons. In one sermon, for example, he draws the congregation's attention to the fact that in the New Testament the phrase the "Kingdom of God" refers not only to the "high and holy place, where the Saints and servants of God enjoy perpetual rest and felicity" but also to the Church on earth since it too is "under the guidance and governance..."

of Almighty God." This applies not just to the invisible company of the faithful; for our Savior compares the Kingdom of God to a field containing both wheat and tares, and to a net gathering bad fish as well as good. Therefore it is the visible Church that is the Kingdom of God. But how can this be? The Church containing both faithful and unfaithful is the Kingdom of God because it is there in the Church, by the administration of the Word and Sacraments, that God exercises His power in the hearts of men.¹

The Church is nothing in herself, but as the sphere where God exercises His regal power she holds a position of supreme importance. Neither are the officers of the Church anything in themselves, but as His ministers, His ambassadors, they possess a unique status. Of course it is Christ alone who can make their ministry effectual; without Him they can do nothing. But they do not have to work without Christ, for He is always present with them in the exercise of their office.

"He takes particular care of His Church, as His own proper kingdom and people ... He defends it all along by His Almighty Power; He directs and governs it by His Holy Spirit; He disposes of all things both in it, and out of it, for the benefit and advantage of it; and so will continue to do, till that which is militant here on earth, be made a glorious Church triumphant in Heaven; and all because, as the Apostle here adds, 'The Church is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all'."²

Beveridge's doctrine does not encourage the Church to be self-satisfied. There is no reason for her to be confident in herself and her own resources. Jesus Christ is her Lord and Patron, her Master and Governor; she is always at His service, under His command, entirely subject to His will and pleasure. He may do with

¹ Vol. II, pp. 178f.
her what He will, and she cannot contradict it; He may command what He pleases, and she is bound to do it; neither must she look upon Him as her Lord only at a distance, but as one that is always present with her. 1 Beveridge cuts away anything that might lead the Church to think that she has herself and her Lord under her own control. When he tells his congregation that though errors and heresies may trouble and disease parts of the Church but never infect the whole Universal Church, he does so because he believes that the Church is the body of Christ and that Christ "acts and guides, directs, and governs it by His Holy Spirit". He goes on to caution his people:

"He therefore that would be sure not to fall into damnable errors, must be sure also to continue firm and steadfast to the doctrine of the Universal Church, as being grounded upon the Scriptures rightly understood: For so every thing is that she hath taught us. For the Catholic Church never undertook, as the Romish hath done, to coin any new doctrines of her own head; no, she always took the Scriptures for the only standard of truth, and hath accordingly delivered her sense of them, in such words as she judged to agree exactly with those which are there used". 2

What, then, is the Catholic Church? Where is it? If it is to be distinguished from the "Romish" Church is it all the non-Roman churches together? We cannot be absolutely certain, but Beveridge seems to think the Catholic Church to be simply that part of the Church that holds the Catholic faith. What is the Catholic Faith? The doctrine of the Scriptures, and as understood and expounded by the Fathers. Beveridge's thought is obviously circular, for in a way he is saying that the Church in the first

few hundred years was the Catholic Church because it held the Catholic Faith, and the Catholic Faith is the Faith held by the Church in the first few hundred years. Ultimately of course Holy Scripture is the measuring stick of the Catholic Faith. But when a dispute over Scriptural doctrine arises only the Church itself has authority to decide the question.  

It is important, however, to notice how Beveridge develops this on certain occasions. He tells his congregation in one sermon that since the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England are taken out of the Scriptures, if anything is contrary to the said Articles or Liturgy they can be sure it is also contrary to Scripture.  

"All things considered, it is morally impossible that you should be led into error, be ignorant of the truth, or miss of grace and Salvation, if you hold constant communion with our Church and sincerely believe and live according as you are there taught,"  

This colossal assurance is reflected in other places. In his exposition of Article XIX he suggests that he has proven, and will continue by God's help to prove, that the doctrine of the Church of England is consonant to Scripture, reason, and the Fathers.  

"Therefore whatsoever is any way contrary to what is here delivered must needs be an error. And so that besides other errors which the church of Rome holds, be sure, whereinsomuch it differs from the doctrine of the Church of England, thence it erra."  

Indeed the Church of England, as to its doctrine as well as discipline, is settled upon so firm a basis,  

"so truly Catholic, that none can oppose what she teacheth, without denying, not only the Scriptures, but the Scriptures as interpreted by the Universal Church."

4. Vol. I, p. 120.
Beveridge challenges all the enemies of the Church of England to consider exactly what sort of Church is established in England.

She is "a Church so exactly conformable to the Catholic in all things, that none can separate from her without making a schism in Christ's mystical body, and consequently endangering the salvation of his own soul. A Church so far exceeding Rome and Geneva, that would either Papists or Sectaries lay aside their prejudices, and impartially consider what our Church is, and compare it with their own, they would need no other arguments to persuade them to return unto her, and to live and die in constant communion with her. A Church, to say no more, as orthodox in its doctrine, as regular in its discipline, as grave and solemn in its worship, as agreeable to Scripture-rules, as well accommodated to the whole design of the Gospel for the bringing of souls to Heaven, as any Church in the whole world".1

Finally we must ask if there is any difference between the confidence Beveridge has in the Church of England and the confidence the Romans have in their Church, or if there is any difference between Beveridge's confidence and the confidence some of the left-wing Puritans have in the purity of their "gathered" churches.

To the first question we answer that there is a great difference, because the seat of infallibility has shifted from the inside of the Church to the outside. There is only one infallible authority upon the earth and that is Holy Scripture, which is fixed and beyond the control of the Church. Even if we twentieth century Christians find it impossible to accept his particular conception of biblical infallibility, we ought to note that the authority of the Bible is never for Beveridge separated from the authority of Christ. The Bible is the Word of God because it "contains" Christ who is the Word of God. And the domination of the Bible over the Church is a trustworthy - an infallible - sign of Christ's dominion over the Church. When therefore Beveridge extols the virtues of the Church

of England we must in all fairness insist that he has not forgotten the Church's position under Christ. We might wish that he would express himself with more restraint. We might feel that such outbursts could prompt others, if not himself, to take the attitude that the Church of England would never have to submit to reform by the Word. But we must recognize that theologically Beveridge always places the Church in the role of servant not Lord, and further, in the very places where he is speaking so strongly on behalf of the Church of England, he, like Hall, justifies his statements with concrete references to the way in which the doctrine and worship of the Church of England conforms to the precept of Holy Scripture.¹

To the second question we answer that there is a difference here, too, because Beveridge acknowledges the purity or holiness of the Church to be in a sense outside and not inside the Church. By that we mean that Beveridge believes that the very Church which we call both Holy and Catholic contains false as well as true believers. The Church is a distinct society in the world not first of all because of the personal holiness of its members, but because its members are baptized in the name of the Trinity.² Beveridge's particular claims on behalf of the Church of England rest on his confidence that of all churches none corresponds in the whole form of its existence to the nature of the Gospel more than this Church. Nevertheless, Christ alone is without sin. All the rest, even those who are baptized and born again of the Spirit, dwell in sin, though indeed sin does not "reign" in the members of Christ. But

¹ e.g. Vol. II, pp. 451-451.
"if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us".¹

One gets the impression that, of all the 17th century Anglicans, John Cosin changed the most in theological outlook from youth to maturity. Despite his intimate association with Bishop Overall, there are, in his earlier writings, signs of a break with the reformed Anglican tradition. His later works, however, are theologically at one with that tradition. Let us consider for our present theme the following selection from a fragment of a sermon preached at Paris in 1651:

"He that sits upon His throne in heaven is the Head of that Church, and rules over it by His own laws; by exercising His power and His wisdom, His justice and His mercy, upon it all the world over. There is no other head nor ruler over it, but He".²

This is a statement which might be made by a number of people with a variety of theological persuasions, but set in the context of the sermon, and of comments elsewhere, it is not without importance. It is the thing that we find Jewel, Andrews, and Davenant emphasizing, each in his own way. Cosin, following them, is in fact stressing the literal supremacy of Christ over the Church so that his hearers will understand that no other authority needs to be found to replace Him. Christ is there to administer His own affairs, using as His sceptre His word, "held forth to us in the Scriptures". For the Church is Christ’s kingdom - not the kingdom of glory, but the kingdom of grace, "which is the true and visible Church of Christ here upon the earth".³

Cosin not only appropriates these concepts from Andrews; he

also employs them as Andrewes does. The Kingdom of grace is, it appears, simply the sphere where Christ exercises His sovereignty through grace. The visible Church is the place where Christ bestows His grace and therefore the place where He rules by grace. And this is so, even though both wheat and tares are to be found in the Church. Cosin's handling of the wheat and tares theme sets him decisively outside the Roman theological tradition, for to him the tares are not simply unfaithful members of the Church. Tares can be found throughout the whole life and doctrine of the Church; there are therefore "tares of doctrine, as well as tares of life and manners". The Roman claim that the Church is above error cannot be sustained. "Abuses and tares have crept into their masses, and images, and indulgences."

Cosin does not absolutize the Church, but counsels her in proper humility. He does not seek to domesticate God's Kingdom in the Church. Still, he insists, though there is no "present fruition", that the Church is the Kingdom of grace and is therefore the gate of heaven, for Christ will one day translate the Kingdom of grace into the Kingdom of glory.

"And it is a great comfort to us this, that our Saviour thus mingles His kingdoms; that He makes the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory all one; the Church and heaven itself all one; assuring us, that if we see Him as He looks in hoc speculo, in this His glass, as St. Paul terms it, the glass of His ordinances and statutes in this kingdom of His word and sacraments, we have already begun to see Him as He looks in heaven, and as He is in His majesty in that kingdom of eternal glory."²

And if after saying all this Cosin returns to the wheat and the tares theme and reminds his congregation that in the Church upon

1. Pp. 245f. 2. P. 353
earth are to be found the goodness of God, the malice of the devil, and the negligence of men, it is only that they might give God the glory.

In the writings of Cosin, Pearson, and especially Beveridge, one is never in any doubt about the fact that the Church has to do with a living Lord. Christ's ascension does not mean absence from His people; perhaps the most appropriate text we could apply to their works is Ephesians 4:10, "Christ ascended far above all the heavens, that He might fill all things." To them one of the most important doctrines of the Christian faith is the ascended Christ fills the Church with His holy Spirit.

When one reads the other Later Carolinna, however, one is struck by a different atmosphere. No one can deny that there are a surprising number of men here who possess great ability. Barrow, Bull, Taylor, and Thorndike, alone, lend the period considerable distinction, not to mention others, such as Sanderson, Sherlock, and Stillingfleet. However, though they are men of great talent, it is undoubtedly true that their understanding of the Gospel, the Church, and the Christian life differs from reformed Anglican theology.

As long as the doctrine of the Holy Spirit played a full role in Anglican theology, Christ's dominion over the Church was recognized as being personal and effective. But when during the Later Caroline period, these divines let their doctrine of the Spirit grow anemic, then the lord of the Church becomes increasingly an

1. Loc cit.
"absentee-lord". Of course this happens quite unconsciously, and it is not always what they say, but often it is what they do not say that reveals where they stand. For example, Hammond compares Christ's commission to His Apostles, with Moses' commission to Joshua and suggests that the Apostles, after Jesus' "departure", succeed Him in His commission as Joshua succeeded Moses in his.\(^1\) Surely this is not wrong as far as it goes; what makes it a questionable comparison, is the fact that Hammond does not expand and qualify it. Is Jesus' "departure" from this world really the same as Moses'? Theologically speaking, is not the One who commissioned the Apostle the same One who commissioned both Moses and his successor? Hammond's analogy breaks down not because it has no validity at all but because he did not give it the kind of theological qualification that is necessary. It is imperative that any reference to Christ's "departure" from this world be balanced by a proper theological exposition of the work of His Holy Spirit. If it is a proper theological exposition it will never ignore the earthly, human, historical institutions in which, and through which the Holy Spirit chooses to work. And that is important too. It must be acknowledged for that reason that Hammond's concern for apostolic succession is quite legitimate. And on principle no one should object to his suggestion that the Church no longer receives its mission, or commission, directly from the Supreme Power (Him being ascended) but rather from those who did receive directly from Him.\(^2\) But should we not object when no acknowledgment is given by Hammond of the fact that Christ is not absent? It may be legitimate for

\(^1\) Letter of Resolution, p. 330

\(^2\) A.P.P. 302f
the ambassadors of a human king to assume that they are alone when they carry out a commission, but can the ambassadors of Christ ever assume such a thing? Surely Beveridge is absolutely right when he demands of the Church that she acknowledge, at every turn, that Christ is present doing what only He can do. Surely he is right when he refuses to discuss the Church's life and work in any way apart from the life and work of Him who was, and is, and is to come. Hammond falls down at this very point; so do most of his contemporaries.

It is important to remember, however, that their failure is not always obvious. Sometimes, as has been seen with Hammond, it is not simply what they say but what they do not say that reveals their real position. At other times one gets a balanced picture of what they think of this issue, only by setting what they write specifically on it, over against comments made in other parts of their work. Like all of us, they often reveal more clearly what they mean when they are off guard. When Sherlock writes specifically about Christ as Lord and Governor of the Church one may suspect, but cannot say for certain, that he has departed from Anglican doctrine. He points out that Christ does not govern "immediately" since He has ascended into heaven.

In Heaven Christ "powerfully intercedes for his Church, and by a vigilant Providence superintends all the affairs of it, but hath left the visible and external conduct and government of his Church to Bishops and Pastors, who preside in his name, and by his authority: ... Christ now governs his Church by men, who are invested with his Authority: which is a plain demonstration of what I discoursed above, that the Union of particular Christians to Christ, is by their Union with the Christian Church; which consists in their regular subjection to their spiritual Guides and Rulers, and in concord and unity among themselves."¹

¹. Knowledge of Christ, pp. 113f.
What does he mean by a "vigilant Providence"? Nowhere in his book can we find any clear suggestion that Christ is actively and effectively at work in the Church and the world, that Christ's personal power and authority effectively reach the affairs of men. Because Christ is, in effect, cut off from the world, Sherlock is forced to discuss man's "union with Christ" only from man's side. A person's union with Christ, he claims in the above quotation, is by means of a union with the Church.\(^1\) To "abide in Christ" is to make a public profession of faith in Christ and to let Christ abide in us is to let His doctrine and precepts take fast hold upon our wills and affections.\(^2\) Baptism is a Sacrament of union with Christ, for by it we are admitted into the Church by public profession of faith.\(^3\) Where is Christ in all this? What is He doing? Is He only acted upon, or is He also active? Is He not, in fact, the Chief Actor? These questions are neither raised nor answered by Sherlock.

Significantly, Sherlock maintains that to know Christ is not to be "acquainted with His Person, but to understand His Gospel in its full latitude and extent".\(^4\) This would never have been framed in quite the same way by the earlier Anglicans though they certainly do say that we know Christ in and through His Gospel. The same Spirit by whom the Apostles wrote and spoke is at work when the Gospel is read and preached and it is only by Him that it comes home to us in such a way that we encounter Jesus Christ. However, the important fact is that by the Spirit acting upon the Word we do meet none other than Christ Himself. It is the absence of

\(^1\) See also pp. 100f. \(^2\) pp. 103f. \(^3\) p. 107 \(^4\) p. 94
this understanding that makes Sherlock's statement so questionable; and it is the absence of this understanding that makes so dangerous his assertion about union with Christ being in essence union with the Church. The danger is not taken away by warnings that the Church must not "prevaricate in the laws of Christ" nor "corrupt his Religion". For already the Church is on its own. Christ, in being left in heaven, is actually left behind, and the Church must henceforth chart its own course, in subjection of course to the proper "spiritual Guides and Rulers"!

This is where we must turn to Taylor. He, above all others, is concerned about lawful spiritual Guides and Rulers. He, more than any other person since the Reformation, insists that without bishops standing in the historic succession there can be no Church. On reading certain parts of his works one is tempted to say also that he, more than any other divine, deviates from the original Anglican position. On this question of course he does; but Taylor is a difficult thinker to pin down. One might say that this insistence upon strict succession is founded upon the assumption that all ministerial power and authority goes back to Christ's commission to His Apostles when He was on earth. When He was personally present He authorized the Apostles to succeed Him and to minister in His name; then He withdrew His personal presence and ever since then the authorization, and the power to fulfil it, could only be received from those who already had it. Christ's ascension means withdrawal, separation from the Church. One might, I say, accuse Taylor of following strictly this line of thought, and to a large extent he does. But what is one to make of the following?

"If Christ be here in person, what need he to have sent his vicar, his Holy Spirit, in substitution? Especially since by this doctrine, he is more now with his church, than he was in the days of the conversion in Palestine; for then he was but in one assembly at once; now he is in thousands every day."1

Or of this?

"Christ, our head, keeps the spiritual regality and the jurisdiction in his own hands, but sends us to minister it according to his laws."2

Taylor is not easily pigeon-holed. He obviously is aware that Christ is still present to some extent supervising the affairs of His Church. He makes it clear in many places that the ordinances of the Church are effective only by the working of the Holy Spirit. If we have doubts about his position it is partly because he is not consistent, and partly because of what he writes about the Christian life.

His inconsistency manifests itself not in an open denial of Christ's ever-present sway over the Church, but in a more subtle taming of the Holy Spirit. His hard and fast doctrine of success is dependent upon such a taming; and the subsequent undermining of Christ's sovereignty leaves the Church ultimately on its own.

How apparent this is in Taylor's endless discussion of the holy life. His understanding of Justification, of Baptism, and of the work of the Holy Spirit, is of such a nature that the individual is left on his own with his conscience in relation to the various laws that impinge upon him: the laws of nature, of the Gospel, of the Church, and of the State.3 If Taylor emphasizes the "help" of grace it is but a power provided for man's assistance, and, in

spite of certain references to the contrary, it is necessary to say that for Taylor grace is never Christ Himself graciously reaching out to men and taking them into communion with Himself. Taylor cannot break out of the confines of the Law; he maintains that the difference between our righteousness and that of the Pharisees rests chiefly in the fact that Christians obey not only externally but also internally, not just with the body but also with the heart. But whatever Taylor says about man's change of heart it is still man by himself. Even when he says that Christians must be

"united to God by a new nature, and made alive by a new birth, and fulfill all righteousness; to be humble and meek as Christ to be merciful as our heavenly Father is, to be pure as God is pure, to be partakers of the Divine nature, to be wholly renewed in the frame and temper of our mind, to become people of a new heart, a direct new creation."

the Christian is nothing more than an individual who acts, or is acted upon, in a certain way. He is still alone, self-contained. For all his insistence upon Christians being obedient to Christ, Taylor leaves the Christian man separated from Christ, at the mercy of his own sin. When he counsels people to accept the help and grace of Jesus Christ he never tries to make it clear that to receive grace is to receive the One who destroys not only our self-will but also our isolation. His writings are in the end little more than a counsel of desperation. Where in Taylor is to be found anything comparable to these words of Jewel's?

"Let him that standeth take heed that he fall not. But God hath loved me, and hath chosen me to salvation. His mercy shall go before me, and his mercy shall follow in me. His mercy shall guide my feet, and stay me from falling. If I stay by myself, I stay by nothing, I must needs come to ground. Although all the world should be drowned with the waves of

---

"ungodliness, yet will I hold by the boat of his mercy, which shall safely preserve me. If all the world be set on fire with the flame of wickedness, yet will I creep into the bosom of the protection of my Lord; so shall no flame hurt me. He hath loved me, he hath chosen me, he will keep me."!

If the individual Christian is alone, then the Church too is alone. Taylor, it is true, does not suggest that the individual is not under authority; on the contrary, he emphasizes little else. The authority of the moral law and of Christ's law, and the necessity for keeping them are his main themes; he would never claim that the Church is exempt from authority. Christ is over the Church in the same way that He is over the individual Christian. But the Church is alone for all that. Her role is to administer His ordinances, and to rule over the people, in Christ's name. However, Taylor's unconscious assumption that Christ's gifts can be separated from the Giver of them leaves the Church essentially on her own.

One can be fair to Taylor, however, only when something of the complexity of his thought is represented. The following piece from his Rule of Conscience will serve to show that there are many sides to his theology, and it will also lead us to the final issue to be discussed in this chapter. Taylor is maintaining that the task of a king is to preserve the people in "all godliness and honesty, in peace and tranquillity", but he insists that this cannot be done "without the supreme care and government of religion. And it is only right for the king to exercise such a government because kings

"are vice-gerents of Christ, who is Head of the Church, and Heir of all things; he ruleth with a rod of iron; he is Prince of the kings of the earth; the only Potentate, King of kings and Lord of lords; to him is given all power in heaven and earth, and by him kings reign .. The consequence of this consideration is this, If Christ as the supreme Kir does rule his church, and in his kingdom hath deputed the kings of the earth, and his vices they are, then they are

1. Commentary on II Thessalonians, 2:13f.
immediately under him in the government of Christ's church. For Christ, in heaven, is both King and Priest. As King, he reigns over all the world for the glory of his Father and the good of his elect; as Priest, he intercedes for all mankind, and particularly 'for them who shall be heirs of salvation'. Now, in both these relations, he hath on earth deputed certain persons to administer and to imitate his kingdom and priesthood respectively. For he governs all the world, but he does it by his angel-ministers, and by kings his deputies. He officiates in his priesthood himself, and in this he hath no deputy ... The sum is this, If Christ by his kingly power governs his church, and christian kings are his deputies, then they also are supreme, under Christ, of the whole government of the church".

There is nothing new in the conception of human kingship here outlined; we have heard it all before. All the same it is worth noting that Taylor, for one, never allocates to the king the kind of unlimited prerogative that James and Charles I claimed for themselves, or that men like Mocket and Maynwaring attributed to kings. The chief figures in the Church party are more restrained in their pronouncements than some of their counterparts were in the reigns of James and the first Charles. There is some truth in R. S. Bosher's interpretation of the impact Charles II's defection to the Presbyterians made on the Church Party. In 1650, but the year following his Father's execution, Charles, in an attempt to regain the throne, went to Scotland and took the Covenant. This was almost a death-blow to Anglicanism and had Charles' negotiations come to a successful conclusion it is nearly certain that the Anglicans would not have survived. But the venture failed and Charles returned to France in October, 1651, with a dislike of Presbyterians that was to last a lifetime. Bosher's comment on this incident deserves to be quoted in full.

"We may observe in passing that Charles's brief excursion into Presbyterianism had served to underline a significant development in Anglican theology. In the century of its independent existence, Anglicanism had become something much more
"than the religion of the King of England. Under the Tudor monarchs the doctrine of the royal supremacy had been not merely a convenient administrative device; it had been a corner-stone of the theological structure of the Church, and an evident spiritual reality to Christians of the Reformation period. A change in the religious viewpoint of the Crown had involved Archbishop Cranmer in an acute problem of conscience, and other such changes had been genuinely held to justify the Vicar of Bray attitude adopted by most English clergy in these years. But the rise of the High Church school at the beginning of the seventeenth century caused a radical alteration in the doctrine. The royal prerogative in matters ecclesiastical was asserted to be merely the duty of defending the Faith and enforcing its acceptance; only a divinely instituted episcopate was empowered to define the truths of religion. The implications of this new teaching were for a time obscured by the agreeably Anglican policy of the first two Stuarts; but the Puritans were alert to the new note, and charged the 'Arminians' with intent to usurp the power of the Crown and nullify the royal supremacy.

"It is no matter of surprise then, that when Charles took the Covenant in 1650, his act caused little searching of conscience among his Anglican followers. There is no suggestion in the correspondence of that year that the apostasy of the King could affect the theological position of the Church of England.""1

To this one would have to say first that Anglicanism had never been simply the religion of the King of England, and secondly, that the early 17th century Anglicans certainly did not assert that the royal prerogative was merely the duty of defending what was defined by the divinely instituted episcopate. Nevertheless, Bosher has exposed very neatly something of what has been taking place. The work of the High Church Party has in fact made the Faith and Order of the Church of England more independent of the King than it had previously been. They continue to see in the King Christ's vicar, and they assert that he can not be disobeyed in any regard. Yet it is natural that after so many years of defending the Church of England as a reality set up and sustained by God Himself, a

1. Ibid., pp. 72f
reality that is in itself conformable to the Word of Holy Scripture, the Early Carolinians should, at least unconsciously, come to see that the Faith and Order of the English Church ought not to hang upon the opinion or action of the prince. If it was unconscious it must have come to consciousness with Charles's apostasy.

We repeat, however, that Early Carolina doctrine left the king in absolute control. He was beyond check. As Christ's vicar he could not be challenged.

Yet Thorndike in his book *The Right of the Church in a Christian State*, published as early as 1649, qualifies the king's power in an important way. He speaks of the will of God being that "civil societies, and the powers of them, should maintain Christianity by their sword". He also discusses the king's sway over the Church which is so complete that councils of the Church must be able to persuade the prince that their resolutions "are most agreeable to that which is determined by Divine right, as well as to the peace of the state, otherwise he has the right to reject them." But then Thorndike goes on to say that if a sovereign who professes Christianity should forbid the profession of that faith and "the exercise of those ordinances which God hath required to be served with", then those who hold lawful power in the Church must not only disobey the king but provide the subsistence of the Church without the assistance of the secular powers. He also says that if bishops and presbyters become corrupt the only way they can be restrained is by the civil power who under God is required to uphold the true faith. Either way it is obvious that Thorndike believes the people as such must

have no hand in resisting the lawful powers in Church or State, whatever the provocation. Nevertheless his limitation of the royal prerogative is important.

As we move on into the Restoration period we find it becomes fairly common for Anglican writers to define, in very general terms of course, the limits of the king's authority. In 1679 we hear William Falkner define the royal supremacy in relation to ecclesiastical affairs, and assume as axiomatic that the sovereign's power, while supreme in temporal affairs, must be exercised within the limits of the law of nature.

"Man hath not a less but a greater government over himself when he guideth himself by the Rules of Reason, nor is it therefore any diminution of the power of a governor when the exercise thereof is and ought to be managed by rules of common equity." 1 Falkner rejects the contention of certain Puritans that the direct authority of Christ given to ministers of the Church places them outside the sphere of subjection to civil magistrates or kings, but he claims that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the monarch can only be exercised within certain limits. The king's power cannot alter matters of faith, order and worship in the Church.

"The spiritual authority of the ecclesiastical officers is of a distinct nature from the secular power, and is in no way pre-judicial to royal supremacy." 2 Since spiritual authority is not derived from any temporal power, neither can it be taken away or abolished by this power. 3 Hawkins says that this point was of great importance in the stand taken by the Nonjuring bishops against the deprivation order made by William in 1689-90. He suggests that the underlying conception, of the

1. Christian Loyalty, 1679, p. 11; as found in Hawkins, Op cit, p.8
2. Op cit. p. 27.
3. Ibid, p. 17
Church as a spiritual society with a life of its own apart from that of the state, was the basis upon which they founded their claim to continued existence as the true original Anglican Church. It is also true that others, who shared the same conception, supported William's authority partly because they were convinced that James II, if he were to return, would eventually try to use his prerogative to alter the faith, order, and worship of the Church of England.

We could, and perhaps should, consider the way others like Bramhall, Sanderson, Sherlock, and Barrow handle this question, but nothing original is to be found in their works. It is to Beveridge that we must turn for a fresh and penetrating treatment of the whole matter.

Beveridge states that the king as supreme magistrate receives his commission directly from God and is therefore accountable to none but God for the execution of it. He summarily rejects the idea that the king receives his power from the people and is accountable to them, and he looks with horror to the time when Englishmen rose against their king and finally shed his blood, calling that action "the greatest blow that was ever given either to the Protestant religion in particular, or the Christian in general". But then he acknowledges that

"if any earthly prince command that which is contrary to the laws of God, the universal monarch of the world, in that case we must rather obey God than man".

So in his sermon on "The Obligations of Superiors to Promote Religion" (how many Anglicans in the early period of the Century ever spoke about the king's obligations?) he states flatly that if

laws are made in any kingdom that are contrary to any of those that
the "King of kings" has made for all mankind, then the people "are so
far from being obliged to observe such laws, that they are obliged
not to observe them". However, Beveridge praises God that in Eng-
land they do not have to worry about that, for as things now stand
nothing is passed into law unless it has been agreed upon, and con-
sented to, not only by the temporal lords and commons but also by
the bishops, "who ought, in reason and justice, be supposed to under-
stand the laws of God better than any private man can do". He
concludes that everybody may rest assured that whatever laws are now
in force are not repugnant to the Word of God, for if they were they
would have been abrogated before now. Who can miss the change of
emphasis here? Beveridge's final appeal is not for a blind sub-
mission to authority but for a reasonable acceptance of the fact
that the established system guarantees the passing of right and
proper laws.

He does, however, urge "superiors" to consider how grave a
responsibility they have in being absolutely sure that nothing is
set out as law that is contrary to what is enacted in Heaven.
For that would be to defy the Sovereign of the whole world, the
highest affront and dishonour that any creature could cast upon Him,
and those guilty of such an action will be accordingly punished
"one time or other, as they will find to their cost".

Beveridge continues with a comment upon the relation of Church
and State, a comment that in itself is not at all original. He
says that though the Church is a "distinct body of itself, under

Christ the Head", yet Christ has so ordered it that whole kingdoms should receive the Faith and that the Church should therefore be taken under the protection of these kingdoms. The Church in each state is of the same extent as the state itself, and being established by its laws is made a national Church.

"under the same king by whom the whole nation is governed; who is the supreme head upon earth of that particular Church, under Christ the Head of all the churches in the world; which taken all together, make up that which we call the Catholic or Universal Church". 1

This is not, I repeat, an original statement, but it is exceedingly important because it follows upon his words concerning the responsibility of kings and magistrates. Beveridge is certainly not the first man to acknowledge the King to be, under Christ, the supreme head on earth of the Church of England, and he is not the first man to write about the limits of the king's prerogative. But here is a man of great theological stature, as loyal to the Church as he is to the Crown, setting out in clear cut terms the responsibilities of the king as a minister of Jesus Christ, and stating that if these responsibilities are not met, then disobedience must ultimately be rendered by his subjects. We have already seen that Beveridge is confident that there is no real danger in England because the whole political structure leads almost inevitably to the passing of laws conformable to God's commands. And we can find many places where Beveridge emphatically, in the name of God, exhorts his people to obedience. Be that as it may, we have in Beveridge at long last a man who brings explicitly together the two concepts that have, since the Reformation, normally been kept apart. We have become

accustomed to have divines on the one hand writing about the authority of Christ over the Church and claiming that the Church can enter into her proper heritage under the lordship of Christ only by conforming to the Word of Holy Scripture, and on the other writing about the authority of the prince over the Church, claiming that the Church must submit completely to the command of the King as vicar or vice-gerent of Christ. That the latter authority might sometimes be contrary to the former is acknowledged occasionally, but it is never at any time faced squarely. Beveridge does face it squarely. Kings are bound under Christ to be sure that their authority is properly exercised; as ministers of God they must have the "service" of God uppermost in their eye.\(^1\) In drawing up any human laws they must keep as close as possible to the laws of God, taking great care to avoid all appearance of contradicting them, acknowledging His supreme authority over the world; thereby they will "serve the Lord with fear" as they are commanded.\(^2\) And in order to carry out their commission properly they will consult those who understand the original languages of the Scriptures. For Christ promised His Apostles that He would be with them unto the end of the world, and that the Holy Spirit would lead them into all truth. It is natural then that ministers of the Church should be consulted. Beveridge claims that this is certainly done in all the Christian kingdoms of the present day in "cases relating to religion and the laws of God", particularly in England.\(^3\)

One cannot help but wonder how many of Beveridge's hearers

---

would have shared his boundless confidence that all the laws of England are right and proper, or that the English political structure practically guarantees good legislation. However, this is beyond our present concern.

We cannot leave the issue of Church and State, however, without stating explicitly that we have been saying more or less implicitly in the last few pages: namely, that the days when King and Church were an inseparable unit are now virtually over. An important bond still continues to exist between Crown and Church, but it is certainly not of the same intimate character as in the reigns of the Tudors and the first two Stuarts. In spite of Beveridge's commendable exposition of the role of the King in Church and State, he is writing of a situation that in a way no longer exists. He may be perfectly right in reaffirming the old claim that the King is Christ's own appointed vicar over the Church as well as the commonwealth, but simply by saying this he does not reproduce the old conditions. Obviously the relation of Charles II to the Church is quite different from that which existed between his father and the Church. The Church of England has not, of course, suddenly become independent; even in the 20th century she cannot claim complete independence of the State, as the last attempt at Prayer Book revision proved. But we can discern in the Later Caroline period definite signs of a growth toward independence, a growth accelerated by the reign of James II and its aftermath. Christ's "vicar" never again recovers the intimate personal jurisdiction that had been exercised in the hundred years before the Long Parliament.

The growth of independence is very interesting and of great
importance. Far more serious, however, is the theological movement referred to earlier, whereby Christ Himself is relegated to the role of comparative impotence in relation to His people. The theology of Cosin, Pearson, and Beveridge does not carry the day; the victory goes rather to the proponents of religion, of natural law, of the holy life: to those who are able to speak of a covenant between God and man as though that covenant hangs upon the measure of success attained by man in keeping the conditions of it: to those who can not keep God and His salvation in the centre of things, but allow man in his struggle against sin to dominate the scene: to those who are not able to understand the sovereignty of grace: to those therefore who do not grasp the fact of the lordship of Jesus Christ over all things: to those who fail to comprehend that Christ's rule has not been withdrawn but is yet exercised in sovereign fashion by the work of the Holy Spirit. Because these men are victorious, the Church of England drifts away from the reformed Anglican faith that Beveridge in particular so passionately upholds. It is well on its way to becoming little more than what might be called "England's institution of religion", that body which leads the nation in the knowledge of natural and divine law, which encourages virtue and condemns vice, which advocates the pursuit of the spiritual life, and which provides the opportunity for the latter in the services of the Church.

If it is true, as I have implied in this dissertation, that the reformed Anglican Faith was, and is, the Catholic Faith, then the drift in the Later Caroline period is away from the Catholic Faith. And to neglect the Catholic Faith is to neglect the protection and
the authority, and therefore the salvation, of Christ the King.
If, through the years, the Church of England has been perpetually reminded of that King, it is, humanly speaking, chiefly because of her steadfast adherence to The Prayer Book, which was prepared by who men—for the most part knew what they were doing.
CONCLUSION

I.

What has been discovered in this investigation? What is the distinctive Caroline doctrine of the Church? In presenting my conclusions I must begin, as I have throughout this thesis, with the Reformers. Here then, briefly, are the most important points in the Reformers' doctrine of the Church.

(i) The early Anglicans see the Church as the company of God's people living between the first and second Advent. They differ from the Romanists chiefly in the fact that they insist that Christ is personally related to the Church solely through Word and Spirit. And they claim that no doctrine of the Church, or of the ordinances in the Church, should run counter to the fundamental truth, that Christ is ascended to heaven and will not appear to the Church in body until the Second Advent.

(ii) They criticise Roman eucharistic doctrine on the ground that it is not consistent with belief in the Ascension; for it claims that in the Mass Christ's body is present really and substantially. It is true that in giving the sacraments to the Church Christ has provided a way by which a bodily communion is maintained between Him and His people. But this bodily communion is nevertheless of a sacramental nature - i.e. in the nature of a mystery. The sacraments effect this mysterious "bodily" union with Christ only as instruments of the Holy Spirit. The presence of the sacraments in the Church does not alter the fact that the bond between Christ and His Church is still a spiritual bond, that is, a sacramental bond that exists through Christ's Holy Spirit. By affirming Transub-
Transubstantiation Roman doctrine, according to the Anglicans, tries to make the relationship a substantial one. It is not content to have Christ's body and blood present by grace, as Ridley always puts it; it wants to have it in glory.

(iii) The bond between Christ and His Church is maintained through and in the Holy Spirit. That means that it is maintained from the side of Christ and not from the side of the Church, which is important when we try to understand the ordinances of the Church. The reformed Anglicans, we notice, consistently speak of these ordinances as belonging first of all not to the Church but to the Lord of the Church; they are the Church's only as they are His. When the Anglicans repudiate the Roman doctrine of _ex opere operato_, they are denying that the Church has the sacraments at her disposal. The Church baptizes and celebrates the Lord's Supper in the assurance that Christ is present through the Holy Spirit making the sacraments effective. The union of the sign and the thing signified is effected by the power of Christ, not by the power of the priest. "For unto the faithful Christ is at his own holy table present, with his mighty Spirit and grace, and is of them more fruitfully received, than if corporally they should receive him bodily present." ¹

(iv) We have said that the Anglicans affirm that Christ is personally related to the Church through Word and Spirit. The reader of 16th century anglican theology quickly discovers a very strong emphasis upon the preaching of the gospel. And more careful examination reveals that when they stress the necessity of the

¹ Cramer, _Lord's Supper_, p. 219
preaching of the Gospel, or the preaching of God's Word, the reforming Anglicans are not simply using a formula that has only emotional content. They mean specifically the proclamation of the biblical message, especially that of the New Testament. A quotation from Jewel will focus our attention upon the real issue here.

"When this word is read, princes and emperors stand up, and lay down their sword, and uncover their head, and bow their body, and do reverence; because they know it is the word of God, which God himself uttered, that it should be as the dew of heaven to moisten our souls, as a well of water springing up to everlasting life, as a savour of life unto life, and the very power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Without this word we can receive no comfort, we cannot see the light, nor grow in faith, nor abide in the church of God. It is the word of reconciliation. By it God maketh atonement between himself and the sons of men."  

This is an extraordinary claim indeed: by the Word God makes atonement between Himself and the sons of men. Has Jewel not slipped into heresy of the most crude sort? Surely atonement is made in and through Jesus Christ. But that is what Jewel means: for to him the Word is Christ. In the Gospel is contained, so to speak, the whole work of Christ, in which is bound up our completed salvation, our atonement. To preach the Word is to preach Christ, Christ clothed in His Gospel. Christ comes upon men through the attestation of the New Testament message. The same Christ is given in the Word as is given in the Sacrament; it is not as though He is only spoken about in the former and actually communicated in the latter: Jewel's assertion that God makes atonement by the Word undermines that idea.

(v) Discussing the relation of the Word to the Church naturally raises the matter of the authority of Scripture. By acknowledging the authority of the Bible the early Anglicans believe that they are

submitting themselves and the whole Church in England to the
authority of Jesus Christ; they think that when the Church listens
to the Bible it is listening to the Word of God. The "unwritten
verities", for which the papists claim so much, must not be allowed
to intrude upon the sole authority of Scripture. These verities
are in the control of the Church, and are the instrument of "covetys
and pride" whereby the Church seeks to maintain its "honour, power,
jurisdiction, and riches". Supposing that the Church listens to the
Bible, it is listening to the Doctor of God, "unwritten
verities", for which the papists claim so much, must not be allowed
to intrude upon the sole authority of Scripture.

We should rather stand fast and stay our faith "upon the strong rock of God's word, written and contained within the old testament and the new". The authority of Scripture must be supreme because it alone is God's Word. Yet the early anglican divines do not think of this in a mechanical way, as many have supposed. God's Word has not "passed over" to the Bible so that the Bible, so to speak, possesses it. Here we return to the fact that, according to anglican doctrine, Christ is related to the Church through Word and Spirit. Jewel puts it this way:

"As the scriptures were written by the Spirit of God, so must they be expounded by the same ... It is that Spirit that openeth, and no man shutteth: the same shutteth, and no man openeth ... In respect of this Spirit the prophet Esay saith 'They shall be all taught of God'."

But then to guard against the reply of the papists that their doctrine has developed under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, Jewel adds the words from Chrysostom: "If any thing be brought unto us under the name of the Holy Ghost besides the gospel, let us not believe it. For, as Christ is the fulfilling of the law and the prophets, so is the Holy Ghost the fulfilling of the gospel."

(vi) We miss the point therefore if we think that the Reformers

1. Cranmer, Lord's Supper, p. 515
2. Ibid, p. 67
4. Loc. cit.
simply substitute an infallible Bible in favor of an infallible pope. The Reformers in maintaining that the Bible should be the sole norm of the faith and order, the life and work, of the Church are in effect saying that Christ should be sole norm. They believe that the content of Scripture is Jesus Christ, the Word of God. In their opinion the issue between them and the Roman Church is not "the pope versus the Bible" but "the pope versus Jesus Christ". For the Roman Church to resist the preaching of the Gospel is to resist the work of Christ Himself.

(vii) Christ, say the Reformers, is related to the Church solely through Word and Spirit, that is through Gospel and Spirit. Both preaching and sacraments convey the Gospel; they convey to the Church the whole of Christ's completed work. By them Christ comes to His people clothed in His Gospel. This takes place because Christ has not left the Church desolate, but by the Holy Spirit effects and maintains this miraculous union between Himself and the Church through Word and Sacraments.

(viii) We are now in a position to make a final point that is sometimes ignored: the Anglicans assert that Christ is ascended and is therefore related to the Church solely through Word and Spirit, but this never leads them to think of Christ as being absent. The accusation made by some, that the Reformers promulgate a doctrine of the "Real Absence" in the Eucharist, is wide of the mark. From what has been said above it is clear that the very opposite is true. And the reader of 16th century anglican literature cannot but see how acutely aware the early Anglicans are of being caught
up in a movement that was initiated, and is being sustained, by Christ Himself. Their ministry stands under and within His. He is closer to them than hands and feet, and without Him they could do nothing.

II.

"It was a 'Romish' state of things rather than Roman theory against which the Reformation was a revolt", so Douglas MacLeane suggests in his book on Andrewes.¹ If in the above paragraphs I have faithfully interpreted the early Anglican position, it is clear that MacLeane has missed the point of the Reformation. Since he goes on to claim that Andrewes was also concerned only with the "Romish" state of things, he has, surely, missed the important point in Andrewes as well. For it is interesting that, though the material in the preceding section was taken from the 16th century divines, the theological outline given there applies more closely to Andrewes' thought than to that of any single Anglican of the 16th century. Because none of the Edwardians or Elizabethans writes systematic theology, it is necessary in order to discover their basic theological viewpoint, to work partly from definite statements scattered throughout their writings, and partly from inference. With Andrewes it is different. Though he does not write systematic theology either, each of his sermons could with some justice be termed a balanced, theological treatise. Fortunately over half of his sermons are on the central themes of the Faith, Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, and the giving of the Spirit from these it is easy to discover his fundamental theological

¹ Lancelot Andrewes and the Reaction, 1910, p. 13.
principles. And it is clear that he not only affirms reformed anglican theology but gives it a fulness, a consistency, and a positive character that none of the 16th century divines was able to manage. He is not unlike Hooker, in many respects, but Hooker moves away at certain points from Reformation theology in a way that Andrewes does not.

There is in Andrewes, then, no real change of theological perspective, only a change of emphasis in certain places, and a subsequent strengthening of the whole anglican theological position. In this respect there are two important characteristics of Andrewes' thought to be noted: (1) his emphasis upon sacramental union with Christ; and (2) his imaginative, compelling discussions of the great facts of the Gospel — the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ as the objective ground upon which our salvation rests and therefore the objective ground of the life of the church. We shall take the second first.

There is no actual difference here between Andrewes and the Reformers, for the latter also laid great stress upon the objective work of Christ. Their doctrine of justification by faith alone was built precisely on the fact that Christ has accomplished all things on our behalf.¹ But in Andrewes' hands the great themes relating to Christ's Person and Work suddenly stand out so strongly that all else is seen to hinge upon them. In the Incarnation God assumed our nature in such a remarkable and permanent fashion that His nature and ours "are grown into one person, never to be severed or taken in sunder any more".² In the Cross, God, as this person Jesus Christ,

---

² Sermons, I, p. 39.
suffered for us that which we deserved to suffer, and He procured for us what we could never deserve to receive. In the Resurrection the work of Adam is reversed: no longer do all in Adam die; now all in Christ are made alive. For the nature in which Christ died is the same in which He rises from the dead; and "if He rose as man, then man also may rise; if one be risen, there is hope for others; if the nature be risen, the persons in it may". In the Ascension it is revealed that Christ has not only the keys of hell and death but also "the keys of Heaven-gates also, which He would now unlock, and so set open the kingdom of Heaven to all believers". Though by the Ascension we are now separated from Christ, "He in Heaven, and we in earth ... it shall not alway so be. Beside this day (Christmas) Immanuel hath another day, and that day will come; and when it doth come, He will come and take us to Himself. That as He hath been our Immanuel upon earth, so He may be our Immanuel in Heaven; He with us, and we with Him, there for ever". For Andrewes these are the controlling theological themes. He does not pay lip service to them and then leave them behind for more pressing issues, as we see many of the later Carolines doing. He keeps his eyes fixed upon God's work in Jesus Christ, and in his sermons he patiently and painstakingly expounds the meaning of this work. He has no doctrine of the Church apart from His doctrine of Christ. Of all the Anglican theologians of the 16th and 17th centuries Andrewes lays the greatest stress upon the Church as the body of Christ; yet what distinguishes him from the others, perhaps more

than anything else, is the fact that for him it is always the body of Christ. The true life of the Church is to be found only in Christ; it is necessary to look to the Head in order to see and understand the Body. It is God's finished work in Christ that is the foundation of the Church. Nothing that the Church does can add to or take away from this finished work: the Church had her beginning, she continues to live, and she will have her consummation, only in that which Christ has done, is doing, and will do. This Andrewes makes plain in his own inimitable way, especially in the sermons preached on the high days of the Christian Year. Professor Torrance in his recent book containing the catechisms of the Reformed Church has a comment on the theology of the Reformed Church that applies so directly to Andrewes, it might have been written about him:

"The Reformed Church interpreted the Totus Christus to refer to Christ who refuses to be without His Church but who in His sovereign grace assumes it into union and communion with Himself, as His servant, and as His body, and so gives the Church its life and place in history in the mission of the Gospel, that is, in the Communion of Grace reaching out to the Communion of Glory. The Church is in no sense an extension of the Incarnation, and is not therefore the continuation of the redemptive acts of God. The Church exists throughout history only through Communion with Christ bestowed upon it by the Spirit. The redemptive acts of God have been completely fulfilled in Christ, but Christ and His finished work, Christ clothed with His saving acts, remains enduring and everlasting reality, continuously and really present in the Church as its Lord and Master, giving it to participate in the fulfilled efficacy of His atoning reconciliation."

This leads us to the other emphasis that distinguishes Andrewes from his predecessors: his stressing of the sacramental union between Christ and His Church. I do not mean that Andrewes

1. The School of Faith, 1959
2. pp. lviif.
says a great deal on this theme that cannot be found in, say, Jewel's, but the subject takes a more prominent place in his writings than it does in Jewel's. This is partly due to the fact that Jewel always has a polemical eye turned toward Rome whereas Andrewes' desire is often to counter the tendency in some (though not all) puritan circles to deprecate the importance of the sacraments; but it is chiefly due to the simple fact of Andrewes' own insight into the marvellous character of the means Christ has provided for His union with us.

We should remember, of course, that this conjunction is created and maintained by the Holy Spirit. Whatever else Andrewes suggests about the character of this union he never tried to by-pass the doctrine of the Ascension and of the Holy Spirit. The basic affirmation of the Reformers is upheld: the present relationship between Christ and His Church is solely through Word and Spirit. By means of the Word, the Sacraments, and Prayer the Holy Spirit couples the Church in a miraculous manner with Christ and all His benefits. The distance between Heaven and earth is overcome and the Church lives in wonderful communion with Christ who is now with the Father. There are four comments that should be made upon Andrewes' thought concerning this communion.

(1) Unlike the Reformers Andrewes does not have to guard himself continually against a "papist" interpretation of the Eucharist, and he stresses heavily the presence of the body in the Sacrament. He is concerned in both Sacraments, in fact, to bring to light the bodily attachment to Christ that these ordinances make possible. There can be no doubt that Andrewes wants us to look upon the bond between the Church and Christ ontologically,
even though (or rather precisely because) it takes place in the character of a mystery.¹

(ii) It cannot be denied that one or two of the Reformers urge a spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist that is really no better than the papists' carnal interpretation, for in both Christ Himself seems to be absent. Andrewes' spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist is absolutely always given in terms of the Holy Spirit.

And he is able to claim so strongly that Christ's body is given in the Sacrament just because He believes the ordinance is a vehicle of the Spirit. For who can give such a gift but God Himself?

(iii) Andrewes always means, when he refers to our union with Christ in the Sacrament, that we are united with Christ and all His work. In the same way that in the Word the whole Gospel is communicated to the Church, so in the Sacraments when we are united with Christ we are involved in Christ's completed work. We are not "simply" baptized into Christ, but baptized into His death.² There is in the Eucharist a "recapitulation of all in Christ",³ meaning here, it seems, a kind of "repeating". All that Christ is and has done is present in the Eucharist and the Church is enabled to become involved in Christ's Person and Work.

For "we are in this action not only carried up to Christ, (Sursum corda) but we are also carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering. So, and no otherwise, doth this text teach. So, and no otherwise, do we represent Him. By the incomprehensible power of His eternal Spirit, not He alone, but He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ offered is it, - thither we must look".⁴

---

¹ Sermons, I, p. 43  
² Sermons, III, p. 247.  
³ Sermons, I, p. 281  
⁴ Sermons, II, pp. 301f
(iv) Since Andrewes explicitly denies Transubstantiation in his argument with Bellarmine it is impossible for anyone to claim that he holds this doctrine. But some might suggest that because he places such weight upon the reality of what is given by the sacraments he is obviously moving away from Reformation eucharistic theology in the direction of Roman doctrine. And they could cite the very debate with Bellarmine in which Andrewes denies that there is a change of substance, though he admits that the elements are changed (transmutari). However, when we place the Bellarmine debate in the setting of Andrewes' whole theology it is obvious that his doctrine of the eucharistic presence stands on a different level altogether from medieval Roman doctrine. He thinks it out in terms of his doctrine of Christ, of the Word, and of the Holy Spirit. He can tell Bellarmine

"At the coming of the almighty power of the Word, the nature is changed so that what before was the mere element now becomes a divine Sacrament, the substance nevertheless remaining what it was before ... There is that kind of union between the visible Sacrament and the invisible reality (rem) of the Sacrament, which there is between the manhood and the Godhead of Christ, where unless you want to smack of Eutyches, the manhood is not transubstantiated into the Godhead".

This means that the creaturely substance and character of the vessels which God chooses to use to bear His gifts are not transubstantiated or "divinised". This applies not only to the Sacrament, but also to the Bible, the ministry, and to the whole Church; all remain human and creaturely, the earthen vessels in which and through which the inestimable treasure is given. The vessel does not change into the treasure, in the same way that the manhood does not change into the Godhead. The connecting link between the two natures in Christ is entirely beyond the ken of man; it is a mystery in

an absolute sense, a mystery that goes to the very heart of God Himself: the link is none other than the Holy Spirit. He, Andrewes tells us, is the "love-knot" between the Father and the Son in the Holy Trinity, and the "love-knot" between the two natures of Christ. So He is the bond between Christ and His Church: He is the connective between the Word of God and the words of Scripture; He is the link between the ministry and that which is ministered; He is the tie between the sign and the thing signified in the Sacrament. Without Him nothing is done for us or by us.¹

¹ Sermons, III, pp. 113, 147, 170, 238, etc. etc.
III.

Instead of concentrating upon the Carolines I have so far directed my attention to the Reformers and to Andrewes. The reason for this is my conviction that in them is to be found classical Anglican theology. Not in the Reformers alone for they lack the fulness and the positiveness that characterizes Andrewes' thought; not Andrewes alone, for he does not always explicitly display the dynamic, evangelical character of Reformation thought. The rest of the Carolines should be seen to a large extent in the light of this classical standard.

In this dissertation I think that I have shown, beyond any doubt, that most of the early Carolines are to be identified with the theology of the Reformers and of Andrewes. Field, Overall, Carleton, Ussher, Davenant, Laud, Hall, and White, whom we might consider to be the period's major theological figures, all work generally with reformed Anglican principles. None of them is a theologian of Andrewes' calibre, but their theological outlook is much the same as his. It might be asked, however, if this is entirely true in the light of the Calvinist-Arminian controversy. This question is worth raising here because the controversy was an important sign of the times. It is well known that Carleton, Davenant, and Hall represented the Church of England at the Synod of Dort and supported the orthodox against the Arminians. It is also known that Andrewes, Laud, and others were not entirely

1. Hooker too should be included here, but for the sake of brevity I have been content to leave him in the background as an assumed quantity. And perhaps this is just as well; Hooker should not be treated as the key figure in an interpretation of early Anglican theology. He ought to be read in terms of the Reformers and Andrewes, never vice versa.
in sympathy with the orthodox. The details of the discussion cannot be gone over here, but we must recognize that not all those who questioned the current Calvinism embraced Arminianism. Not all those who doubted the frightful doctrine of Predestination advocated by many early 17th century Englishmen, both Puritans and Anglicans, held weak doctrines of election. Some believed, as did Andrewes, that predestination and reprobation are in God's eternal decrees but the one is propter Christum and the other propter peccatum. Few of them, it must be admitted, saw this very

1. See Crakenthorpe's A Sermon of Predestination, 1623
2. See his "Judgment upon the Lambeth Articles", in Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine, pp. 294-300. The christological character of Andrewes' doctrine of election may be seen in part of his comment on Article 2. (Article 2 read: "Causa efficient praedestinationis non est praesvisio fidei, aut perseverantiae, aut bonorum operum, aut illius rei quae insit personis praedestinationis, sed sola et absoluta et simplex voluntas Dei"). He says: "Verissimum Dei per prophetam verbum est, 'Tantummodo in me auxilium tuum', id est, nec a quocumque auxilium nisi a me, nec a me quicquam nisi auxilium: verissimum et apostoli, 'Quis discernit? id est, a Deo solo habere nos quo a reliquis discerniur.

Sed tamen de particula illa ('sola voluntas beneplaciti') quaerit potest,
Primo, includat Christum, an secludat; id est, sitne actus praedestinantici actus absolutus, an relatum?

Quod ad me, existimo relatum esse: nec aliam esse Dei evudokian en anapimai id est, 'voluntatem quâ beneplacitum sit ei in hominibus', nisi in Filio in quo evudokias, nec valante vel sine intuitu Christi praedestinari quengam; sed (ut habent sacrarum scripturarum) Christum primo proetynwosou, 'praescitum'; I Peter 1:2, deinde in eo nos, Rom. 8:29; Christum primo oipostetna 'praedestinatum'; Rom. 1:4, deinde per eum nos, Eph. 1:5; non autem priore loco nos (ut nonnullis videtur), posteriore illum, et propter nos: neque enim praedestinari posse nos evi odoetoiax, 'ad adoptionem filiorum', nisi in Filio naturali, neque praedestinari non posse ut conformes situs imaginis Filii, nisi Filii primo statuatur eijus imaginis conformemur. "Quare et huic quoque articulo cuperam addi, 'beneplacitum Dei in Christo';" (pp 295f) See also Davenant's important discussion of the issue in his "Dissertation on the Death of Christ," bound with Vol. II, of his Commentary on Colossians.
clearly and their doctrine lacked the dynamic quality that it would have had if it had been bound closely to their doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ. Arminianism, in its various forms and derivations, was not an unnatural reaction to the form the doctrine of predestination must take when it becomes cut off from Christ and the Holy Spirit. For our purposes, however, it is important to notice that the doctrine of election was sufficiently maintained in the thought of the early Carolines to act as an effective barrier and prevent the weight being shifted from God's decision and action to man's. Because they retained this doctrine, and that of justification by grace alone, the early Carolines acknowledged as their forbears had done, that the whole economy of salvation rests absolutely upon God. They too acknowledged that the life of the Church, and the life of the individual Christian, is to be found only in the past, present, and future activity of God in Jesus Christ.

It is this understanding that breaks down among so many of the later Carolines. The barrier is gone and the weight shifts from God's election to man's faith, from God's saving work to man's responsibility in the face of God's will and commandments, from God's righteousness to man's endeavor to attain unto holiness, from God's victory to man's effort to gain the ultimate prize. That the weight has completely shifted I do not suggest. The later Carolines are not far removed in years from Andrewes and Davenant, and there are certain men among them trying to show them a far better way. Cosin, and Pearson, and a little later
later Beveridge, give creative expression to reformed anglican theology.¹

No, the weight has not completely shifted. Thorndike, for example, wrestles seriously with the whole problem in terms of the Covenant, and tries to give both partners, God and man, their proper place. He has no desire to minimise God's part in the economy of salvation. Yet the result of his work is to turn our gaze chiefly towards man's responsibility as a partner of the Covenant. Thorndike claims that the concept which bred the sects of the Church is the one that denies that the covenant of grace has conditions attached to it. The covenant, he maintains, presupposes terms which a man is called upon to accept and perform. Man must have the freedom of will to accept the conditions of his release from sin, and Thorndike remarks that man is justified by his acceptance, of, and obedience to, the conditions of the covenant. Christ secures the conditions of release but man by grace fulfills these conditions.² Thorndike is very much opposed to Puritan antinomianism, or to what he thinks is antinomianism at any rate. He objects to the doctrine of predestination to glory because it secures the believer in Christ to the fulfillment of grace without man fulfilling any condition at all; and it binds God: He must fulfill the conditions without any consideration to man's will.³

1. This is not less true because Beveridge insists repeatedly to whatever congregation he is preaching, that no one present is excluded from the grace of Jesus Christ: all should believe and trust in Jesus Christ because the call of God in Him is offered to all.
3. *Ibid*, p. 531
of antinomianism are surely legitimate; but at the same time it must be said that he leaves Reformation theology far behind. To him anything that by-passes the conditions of the covenant laid upon man must be wrong. This, however, is precisely where the Reformation understanding of Substitution comes in; Christ has not abolished the law but fulfilled it. And He has fulfilled it absolutely! Men are therefore justified by faith alone, i.e. by the completed work of Jesus Christ. It is upon this that they must entirely rely. The Reformers refused to allow man and his sin to qualify the completed act of redemption in Christ. Thorndike does not understand this. He sees the work of man fulfilling the conditions of salvation. It is not salvation that is free; rather the conditions of salvation and the helps of grace to perform these conditions - only they are free.

I have cited Thorndike as a representative figure; we can see in him what has happened to Anglican thought generally in the later Caroline period. He, in fact, possesses a strength not to be found in many of his colleagues.

There is another important feature of the theology of the later Carolines that we must comment upon; their feeble doctrine of the Holy Spirit. This is a natural part of the change from emphasizing God's work to emphasizing man's, but whether one of the causes or one of the symptoms is difficult to say. Not only do the later Carolines fail to see the overwhelming significance of the finished work of Christ, they fail to perceive the meaning of Christ's sovereign presence through the Holy Spirit. When one leaves
Andrewes to read Taylor, Hammond, Thorndike, and Sherlock one cannot but notice that the Holy Spirit has been depersonalized. These men seldom speak of the Spirit as though He were the living God Himself at work; the terms they use reveal that they think of Him as though He were an impersonal power, given by God and yet detached from Him. The word grace is used in exactly the same way. Because these realities are detached from God they are in the end quite tame, easily incorporated into the life of the Church as helps given to Christian people to enable them to keep the conditions of the Covenant; and the ordinances of the Church are there to mediate these helps, and to excite the members of the Church to do what, in their Baptism, they have engaged to do.

To be just, the Eucharist is the one thing that keeps the later Carolines from going further than they do towards the complete depersonalization of the concepts of grace and the Spirit. For they know that in the Sacrament Christ Himself is given. The memorial conception of the Sacrament alone they are never content with; Christ's body and blood are given there, which means that Christ Himself establishes contact with His Church. When they are discussing the Eucharist the later Carolines are most at one with the true anglican tradition.
The hundred years or more that carry us from Jewel to Sherlock and Beveridge bring with them a marked change in anglican thought about the ministry. Jewel says that the power was not in the Apostles but in the Word they preached; he is therefore supremely concerned about the content of that Word or Gospel. Sherlock and Beveridge say that a man's ministerial power is dependent upon his relation to the historic continuity of the episcopal office; they are therefore extremely (I shall not say supremely!) concerned about "successive ordinations". It is, ironically enough, largely due to the work of the Puritans that this change comes about. Because the Puritans (some of them at least) advocate replacing episcopacy with some other form of government, the Churchmen are forced to defend it. Because many of the Puritans refuse to acknowledge episcopal authority, some of them breaking off entirely into independent congregations, others forming classes through which they order their affairs outside the jurisdiction of the bishop, the Churchmen are forced to assert the rightness and necessity of that authority. The difficult and somewhat chaotic years of the 1640's and 50's only serve to convince the Anglicans that the triumph of Puritanism could only result in the total ruin of the Church, and they determine to do all they can to ensure the ultimate defeat of the Puritan cause.

It is an extremely difficult situation the Anglicans are called to face. Nevertheless, there are certain questions that must be asked about these men: Do they go astray in their doctrine of the ministry? What does their peculiar emphasis upon Succession
We must acknowledge at the outset that while generalisations must be made, the men obviously do not all think alike. There is not even a consistent development (retrogression?) from the early to later years of the 17th century. However, there are certain characteristics of thought which arise in the period bounded by Hooker and Beveridge. These characteristics are much more evident in the latter part of the period, and the criticisms that are offered in the following paragraphs apply chiefly to the later Carolines, and especially to Jeremy Taylor.

(1) The New Testament doctrine of the living Lord Jesus Christ who not only was, but now is, and one day shall be, is re-appropriated at the Reformation. All other doctrines, including that of the ministry, are accordingly affected. The Anglican Fathers believe that the ministry of the Church is performed between the time when Christ lived among us and the time when He will return to us. But as we have already said, they do not believe that Christ has left His Church or His ministers alone. They are keenly aware of Christ's present care and ministry in the Church and fully recognize that only within His ministry through the Spirit can the Church's ministry be effectually performed. The excitement that takes possession of the Reformers arises from the conviction that Christ is taking action on behalf of the Church to deliver her from her bondage, and that they have the unspeakable privilege of being His ministers and therefore His instruments in this work. But they are His ministers only as they minister His Word, which is not
spoken directly, but through Holy Scripture. There is, then, the three-fold reference in their understanding of the ministry: the Church carries out her ministry under Christ's present lordship by appropriating and proclaiming His past completed work on our behalf as it is witnessed to in the Scriptures, and by waiting and praying for the consummation of His work in the future, when He will come bringing the New Heaven and the New Earth. The validity of the ministry is to be understood on this basis.

The Anglican Reformers recognize that the Church must regulate her affairs so that everything may be done decently and in order. They acknowledge the need for the Church to regulate the ministry so that only those minister who have been ordained to it by lawful authority. But it is obvious from their writings that they think the real criterion of a valid ministry is not the lawfulness of the ordination, but the content of that which is ministered. They further believe that the Church must recognize that Christ in His present sovereignty over the Church can and does raise up men to minister His Gospel, without the normal channels of authorisation.

What happens in the 17th century, especially with the later Carolines, is that Christ's lordship over the Church comes to be thought of as an "absentee-lordship"; and once this happens the ministry of the Church no longer represents Christ but replaces Him. Because Christ is no longer present, the ministry has to do His work for Him, and the question arises at once whether Christ has authorized any particular men to take His place? The Carolines answer that the Apostles were so authorized. Christ sent the
Apostles as God the Father had sent Him. Thus the Carolines see in the apostolic college the uniquely authorized group that was to replace Christ on earth and carry out the commission that He left with them. He performed His own unique task which was to offer Himself as the once for all sacrifice for the sins of the world. To the Apostles was given the commission to preach the good news, and to baptize, and to rule over the Church that came into being as a result of their labors.

However, not only did they need a special commission, but also a special power. They were not called to perform this work in their own strength, but were given a special power from the Lord Himself. Matthew 28:20, and John 20:22 are cited by the Carolines as testimonies to the gift the Apostles received to enable them to fulfill their commission. But what happens to the later Carolines is that they lose sight of the fact that the Lord is still personally present with the Church through His Spirit. Not only do the 17th century Anglicans come to look upon the ministry as a replacement of Christ, they look upon ministerial power entirely in reference to the gift once given to the Apostles while Christ was yet on earth. Jesus' words in Matthew 28:20 and John 20:22 are interpreted as the giving of the "power of order" that Jesus "left" with them just before He ascended into Heaven. Even the words in Matthew, though they promise the presence of Christ Himself, are interpreted to mean a certain permanent "presence" with the ministerial office that guarantees its efficacy, which "presence" is generally identified with the "power of order". The Giver and the Gift¹ are thus

---

severed from each other; they assume that the latter can remain even though the former is absent, and if the Giver is no longer present to give again then we are forced to look entirely to the original dispensation. Since we can no longer receive the Gift from Christ, we must receive it from somebody who did receive it from Him. Strict historical succession is therefore indispensable.

It is important to note that Andrews is the man who has the most mature understanding of the eschatological dimension of the Church's life, not only in reference to her origination in the past but also in reference to her present and future. It is he who preserves the true Biblical and Anglican understanding of the ministry. He does not depreciate the reality or the necessity of the Gift, but he never wrests it out of the hands of the Giver. He knows the importance of historical continuity but he does not divorce it from the sovereign judgment under which the Church stands and will stand at the Last Day. Pearson, on the other hand, though manifesting in his work on the Creed what appears to be a genuine sense of the three-fold dimension of the Church's life in Christ, nevertheless flatly holds out for strict historical succession of ordinations from Jesus' time as the indispensable prerequisite to a valid ministry. If there is an explanation for this inconsistency, it is not easy to find. It is true, however, that Pearson's exposition of the Creed is rather externalized—that is, we might justly call it "orthodoxy"—and he, therefore, may have found it not too difficult to reconcile the doctrine of succession propounded by so many of his colleagues (a doctrine so
useful against the Puritans) with the theological position articulated there. Beveridge, like Pearson, combines a very high doctrine of the eschatological dimension of the Church's life, with a strict conception of the necessity of unbroken episcopal succession; but his doctrine of succession is split at the seams by his full New Testament doctrine of Christ's sovereign work through His Spirit.

(2) The 17th century divines generally emphasize that Christ's commission, His promise to be present till the end of the world, and His gift of the Holy Spirit, were made to the Apostles alone, and not to the Seventy Disciples or the Church as a whole. However, since the commission to preach and baptize did not cease with the death of the Apostles, and since the promise had reference to the end of the world, Jesus must have referred both, plus the gift of the Holy Spirit, not to the Apostles in their unique capacity as foundation builders of the Church, but to the ordinary apostolic office as such. All those who succeed to the office inherit the Commission and the Gift. As we have seen, very few of the 17th century Anglicans are willing to claim that this office was inherited exclusively by bishops. Some of them do, of course, but most of them believe that both presbyters and bishops succeed to the apostolic office. But they are all generally agreed in this, that the successors of the Apostles are a college of men distinct from the rest of the Church. This college possesses within itself all that is necessary for the administration
of those ordinances that are necessary for the life of the Church. Through the powers of ordination and/or consecration it also possesses the power to perpetuate itself. It is, therefore, a self-perpetuating and self-sufficient institution upon which the Church is fully dependent for its life.

The Word and Sacraments are the means of grace, the life-line of the Church, but their validity or efficacy is dependent upon the ordering powers given to the apostolic college, and nobody belongs to the college unless he has been ordained by one who does. This is surely one of the chief reasons for the refusal of the 17th century Anglicans to countenance lay-elders, particularly if they attempted to "meddle" with ordination. It might be possible for a mere presbyter to propagate the presbyteral office by passing on the ministerial power that he has; but it is certainly not possible that it should be performed by a layman who has not got the office in the first place. The isolation of the ministry from the corporate body of the Church is thus virtually complete. Practically no recognition is given in the Church of England to what Luther, rightly or wrongly, called the "priesthood of all believers". With the loss of the proper doctrine of Christ's session at God's right hand and the pouring out of the Spirit on the one hand, and of the corporate priesthood of the Church on the other, the ministry is left isolated and autonomous.

(3) Finally we must note briefly that none of the 17th century divines, except Andrewes, make a serious attempt to relate the doctrine of the Church's ministry to the doctrine of the Person
and Work of Christ. Field, Pearson, and Beveridge, to name only three, make brief beginnings in that direction but they come to nothing.  

To claim that all the strength rests with the Reformers and the early Carolines, and all the weakness with the later Carolines, would not be true even if Cosin, Pearson, and Beveridge were excluded from the latter group. Yet I believe that the theological drift of the late 17th century involves a fairly decisive abandoning of some of the most important elements of Christian theology. The Church of England has been suffering under this legacy ever since. Woodhouse is right: she should look to the rock whence she was hewn. Nothing but good could come from that.

"So come we about, and return again, to the first point we begin with, that is, to the blessed Trinity. From Them are these (gifts); and if from Them, for Them: if from Their grace, for Their glory – the glory of Them that gave, ordered, and wrought; gave the gifts to us, ordered the places for us, wrought the works in us. If we the profit, They the praise; the rather, for that even that praise shall redound to our profit also, the highest profit of all, the gaining of our souls, and the gaining of them a rest in the Heavenly kingdom with all the Three Persons".
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