

## ARTICLE XXIII.

*Of Ministering in the Congregation.*

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

*De Vocatione Ministrorum.*

Non licet cuiquam sumere sibi munus publice prædicandi, aut administrandi sacramenta in Ecclesia, nisi prius fuerit ad hæc obeunda legitime vocatus et missus. Atque illos legitime vocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas vocandi ministros, atque mittendi in Vineam Domini, publice concessa est in Ecclesia, cooptati fuerint, et asciti in hoc opus.

### SECTION I. — HISTORY.

**A**FTER the Articles concerning the Church comes naturally this concerning the ministry.

The wording of the Article demands some attention. The first sentence is derived from the fourteenth Article of the Confession of Augsburg, as drawn up in 1531. That article runs: "De ordine Ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in Ecclesia publice docere, aut Sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus."<sup>1</sup>

In the XIII. Articles, supposed to have been agreed upon between the English and German divines, (A. D. 1538,) the Xth Article is: "De ministris Ecclesiæ docemus, quod nemo debeat publice docere, aut sacramenta ministrare, nisi rite vocatus, et quidem ab his, penes quos in ecclesia, juxta verbum Dei et leges ac consuetudines uniuscujusque regionis, jus est vocandi et admit-tendi."<sup>2</sup>

The twenty-fourth of the XLII. Articles of 1552, is worded exactly as our present twenty-third, and evidently only slightly changed from the above-cited Article of 1538.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Sylloge*, p. 127. In 1540 we find the following clause added: "Sicut et Paulus præcipit Tito ut in civitatibus presbyteros constituat." — *Syll.* p. 174.

<sup>2</sup> Then follows a declaration, that no bishop should intrude on another diocese, and that the wickedness of ministers hin-

ders not the grace of the Sacraments. — Jenkyns's *Cranmer*, iv. Appendix, p. 286.

<sup>3</sup> The heading of the Articles both in those of 1552 and in those of 1662 is, *Nemo in Ecclesia ministret nisi vocatus.*

As it now stands, it contains two parts :—

I. That no one may assume the office of the ministry without a lawful call and mission.

II. That calling and mission can only be given by certain authorities, who are the ministers of ordination.

The latter portion of the Article is somewhat vaguely worded: the reason for which is easily traced to the probable fact, that the original draught of the Article was agreed on in a conference between the Anglican and Lutheran divines. It would have been painful to the latter, if a strong assertion of the need of episcopal ordination had been inserted, when they were debarred from episcopal regimen. Hence it is but generally asserted, that lawful calling can only be given by those, “who have public authority in the Church to send labourers into the Vineyard.” But then we may observe, that the authority of the English Ordinal is expressly made the subject of Article XXXVI.; and to see the force of the latter on our present Article, we must have recourse to the Ordinal, as expressing the mind of the reformers on this subject.

One expression in this Article requires to be especially observed.

In the Confession of Augsburg, the XIII. Articles of 1538, and the Latin Articles of 1552, 1562, 1571, the word *Ecclesia* occurs twice. But in the English translations this word is rendered *Congregation*. To a modern reader, used to the language of Congregational dissenters, this translation has a different sound to that, which it must have had at the time of the Reformation. The ancient Church of the Jews is called “the Congregation of the Lord.” The XIXth Article defines the Church as a “Congregation of faithful men,” &c. Accordingly, the word *Ecclesia*, instead of being rendered *Church*, is rendered *Congregation*, meaning the whole Congregation of Christ’s people, *i. e.* the Church or Body of Christ. The more modern idea of a Congregational election of ministers had evidently not suggested itself, or the word would have been avoided.

We may now proceed to our history.

I. No one can question, that very early in the Church there existed a distinction widely marked between the Clergy (*κλήρος*, *κληρικοί*, *Clerici*) and the *Laiety* (*λαός*, *Laiici*). The only doubt which can be raised, is, whether such a distinction was quite primitive, or came in, in the second and third centuries, through the ambition of ecclesiastics.

It is a most happy circumstance, that the very earliest of the

Christian fathers, *Clemens Romanus*, the companion of St. Paul, has left us clear testimony on this head. Giving instructions concerning the duty of Christians towards those who minister to God, he first adduces the examples of the Jewish economy, in which the chief priest, and the Levite, have all their proper ministries, "and the layman is confined within the bounds of what is commanded to laymen."<sup>1</sup> He then goes on to say, "The Apostles have preached to us from our Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ from God. Christ therefore was sent by God, the Apostles by Christ; so both were orderly sent according to the will of God . . . . Having received their commands . . . . and preaching through countries and cities, they appointed the first-fruits of their conversions to be bishops and deacons over such as should afterwards believe, having first proved them by the Spirit."<sup>2</sup> Then again, referring to the election of the seed of Aaron to the priesthood, in order to avoid contention,<sup>3</sup> he continues: "So likewise our Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there should contentions arise upon account of the ministry; And therefore, having a perfect foreknowledge of this, they appointed persons, as we have said before, and then gave direction, how, when they should die, other chosen and approved men should succeed in their ministry. Wherefore we cannot think that those may justly be thrown out of their ministry who were appointed by them, or afterwards chosen by other eminent men, with the consent of the whole Church . . . . Blessed are those presbyters who, having finished their course before those times, have obtained a faithful and perfect dissolution; for they have no fear, lest any one should turn them out of the place which is now appointed for them."<sup>4</sup>

Here, in the very earliest of the fathers, we have plainly the distinction of clergy and laity, the clergy spoken of at one time as presbyters, at another as bishops and deacons; their mode of appointment in succession from the Apostles, and the duty of the people to be submissive and affectionate to them.

Ignatius speaks in language so strong, of the necessity of obedience to bishops, presbyters, and deacons, that the very strength of the expressions has been the chief reason for doubting the genuineness of his epistles. The seven shorter epistles, since Bishop Pearson's able defence of them, have generally been admitted to be genuine. The late discovery of a Syriac translation of three of them has again opened the question; their learned editor and

<sup>1</sup> ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προσταγασιν δέδεται. —Clem. R. 1 *In Corinthi* c. 40.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* c. 42.

<sup>3</sup> c. 43.

<sup>4</sup> c. 44.

translator contending that the Syriac represents the true text, and that even the shorter Greek epistles, which are longer than the Syriac, have suffered from interpolation. This is no place to enter into a controversy of such extent; it is, however, satisfactory to find, that the short Syriac epistles, as they contain the most important testimonies to the great doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation,<sup>1</sup> so do they contain most strong and unmistakable language on the ministry and the three orders of the ministry: "Give heed to the bishop, that God also may give heed to you. My soul be for those<sup>2</sup> who are subject to the bishop, presbyters, and deacons: may I have my portion with them in God."<sup>3</sup>

Irenæus speaks distinctly of successions of presbyters in the Church from the time of the Apostles;<sup>4</sup> says, that he was able to reckon up those who had been made bishops by the Apostles, and their successors even to his own time;<sup>5</sup> and recounts the succession of bishops at Rome from St. Peter and St. Paul, and at Smyrna from St. Polycarp;<sup>6</sup> to which successions he attaches deep importance.

Clement of Alexandria distinguishes the presbyter and deacon from the layman,<sup>7</sup> and the lay from the priestly.<sup>8</sup> He uses the term κληρος, clergy;<sup>9</sup> and speaks of the three degrees in the Church militant, of bishops, presbyters, and deacons,<sup>10</sup> which he compares to the angelic orders in Heaven.<sup>11</sup>

Tertullian bears testimony to the existence of a distinction between clergy and laity in his day; and charges the heretics with confounding the offices of layman and cleric.<sup>12</sup> The three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, are enumerated together;<sup>13</sup> and he tells us that the chief priest, *i. e.* the bishop, had the right to baptize, as also had presbyters and deacons, but not without the authority of the bishop.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Ignatius *Ad Ephes.* c. 1, 9, 18 (19 in the Greek), *Ad Polyc.* c. 3, where the Syriac has all the same remarkable expressions as the Greek. See especially in the first passage, *Ephes.* c. 1, ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι Θεοῦ  
ܐܘܨܬܐ ܕܥܝܘܒܐ.

<sup>2</sup> Ἀντίψυχον ἐγὼ τῶν ὑποτασσομένων, κ. τ. λ.

<sup>3</sup> Ignat. *Ad Polyc.* c. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Adv. Her.* III. 2.

<sup>5</sup> "Habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos." — III. 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> κὰν πρεσβύτερος ἢ, κὰν δίακονος, κὰν λαϊκός. — *Stromat.* Lib. III. p. 652.

<sup>8</sup> *Stromata*, Lib. v. pp. 665, 666; where λαϊκῆς ἀπιστίας is opposed to ἱερατικῆ ἁγία.

<sup>9</sup> "Quis dives salvetur," p. 959.

<sup>10</sup> *Stromat.* Lib. VI. p. 798.

<sup>11</sup> See Bp. Kaye's *Clement of Alexandria*, p. 463.

<sup>12</sup> "Alius hodie episcopus, cras alius: hodie diaconus qui cras lector; hodie presbyter, qui cras laicus. Nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt." — *De Præscript.* c. 41.

<sup>13</sup> See the last passage; also *De Fugâ*, c. 11.

<sup>14</sup> "Dandi (baptismum) quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesie honorem." — *De Baptismo*, c. 17.

He speaks of receiving the Eucharist only from the presbyters.<sup>1</sup> The office of the bishop was, according to him, of apostolic institution; and in the Catholic Church the successions of the bishops could be traced to the Apostles, as the succession at Smyrna from Polycarp, placed there by St. John, that at Rome from Clemens, placed there by St. Peter.<sup>2</sup>

It is true that Tertullian claims for all Christians, that they are priests, and contends that, in places where there are no clergy, laymen may exercise the priestly offices, may baptize, and even celebrate the Eucharist. But this is only in case of extreme necessity; his strong assertion of this is in a tract, written after he had seceded from the Church; and, even allowing the utmost possible weight to the passage, it does not prove the non-existence of a distinct order of the clergy, but only that, in case of absolute necessity, that distinction was not to be observed.<sup>3</sup>

Origen is very express on the office of the clergy,<sup>4</sup> on the power of the keys as committed to them,<sup>5</sup> on the duty of obedience to them.<sup>6</sup>

We are now arrived at the Cyprianic age, when no one doubts that the distinction between lay and cleric was strongly marked and much insisted on. Some have contended, that the distinction was not from the first; but none can deny, that by this time it was universally accepted. Hilary the deacon, whose commentaries on St. Paul's epistles are appended to the works of St. Ambrose, is indeed cited as saying that, in the beginning, in order to increase the Church, the power to preach and baptize was given to all, but that, when the Church spread abroad, a more regular constitution was ordained, so that none of the clergy were permitted to intrude into offices not committed to themselves.<sup>7</sup> But this does not prove even that Hilary thought the distinction of lay and cleric not to be Apostolical. It is most probable from the context, that by the word *all, omnibus*, he means not all the *faithful*, but all the *clergy*;

<sup>1</sup> "Eucharistiæ sacramentum non de aliorum manu quam præsentium sumimus." — *De Corona*, 3.

<sup>2</sup> *De Præscript.* c. 32.

<sup>3</sup> *De Exhort. Castitat.* c. 7. See also *De Baptismo*, c. 17. And consult Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 224; and Bingham, *E. A. Bk.* 1. ch. v. sect. 4.

<sup>4</sup> See *Homil.* 11. in *Numer.*; *Homil.* XIII. in *Lucam*.

<sup>5</sup> *In Matt.* Tom. XII. num. 14.

<sup>6</sup> *Homil.* xx. in *Lucam*. "Si Jesus Filius Dei subicitur Joseph et Mariæ, ego non subicitur episcopo, qui mihi a

Deo ordinatus est pater? Non subicitur presbytero qui mihi Domini dignatione præpositus est?"

<sup>7</sup> "Ut cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare et baptizare et Scripturas in ecclesia explanare. At ubi autem omnia loca circumplexa est ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt, et rectores et cætera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium, quod sciret non sibi creditum." — Hilar. *Diac. In Epist. Eph.* c. iv. v. 12.

who at first performed all sacred functions indiscriminately, but afterwards were limited according to their distinctions of bishop, presbyter, and deacon. And even if he meant that all the faithful had at first a ministerial commission; yet still he clearly intended to fix the more regular constitution of the Church to the Apostolic age, before the close of which the Church might be said to have spread itself everywhere, and therefore needed regular establishment.<sup>1</sup> So that this passage makes nothing against the Apostolical origin of the order of clergy, and their distinction from the laity.<sup>2</sup>

So necessary did the fathers consider the office of the ministry, that St. Jerome tells us, "There is no Church where there are not priests."<sup>3</sup> And St. Chrysostom says, "Since the Sacraments are necessary to salvation, and all these things are performed by the hands of the priesthood, how, without them, shall any man be able to avoid the fire of hell, or to obtain the promised crown?"<sup>4</sup>

The opinions of Christians of all ages, and almost all sects, have been in favour of the necessity of a distinct call to the ministry, and of an order regularly set apart for the executing of that office. Luther condemns it as an error invented by the devil, that men should say that they have a talent from the Lord, and therefore must of necessity assume the office of preaching. They should wait, till they are called to the ministry. If their Master wants them, He will call them; "If they teach uncalled, it will not be without injury to themselves and their hearers; for Christ will not be with them."<sup>5</sup> The Confession of Augsburg speaks of the ministry of the word and Sacraments as divinely instituted; condemns the Anabaptists, who teach that men can receive the Spirit, without the external word; and says, that none may minister the word and Sacraments, not rightly called to it.<sup>6</sup> The Helvetic Confession of the Zuinglians declares the office of minister to be "ancient and ordained of God; not of recent, or of human ordination."<sup>7</sup> Calvin says, that "no one must be accounted a minister

<sup>1</sup> See Bingham, Book I. c. v. § 4, and Mr. Morrison's note to his translation of Neander's *Church History*, I. p. 252.

<sup>2</sup> St. Jerome tells us the reason of the name κληρος, clerici, "Propterea vocantur clerici, vel quia de sorte sunt Domini, vel quia Dominus sors, id est pars, clericorum est." — *Ad Nepotian. De Vita Clericorum*, Tom. IV. Part II. p. 259.

<sup>3</sup> "Ecclesia non est, quæ non habet sacerdotes." — *Dial. c. Lucifer*. c. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Ἐὶ γὰρ οὐ δύναται τις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐὰν μὴ δι' ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος ἀναγεννηθῆ, καὶ ὁ μὴ τρώγων τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ πίνων,

ἐκβέβληται τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, πάντα δὲ ταῦτα δι' ἑτέρου non ὀδενός, μόνον δὲ διὰ τῶν ἀγίων ἐκείνων ἐπιτελεῖται χειρῶν, τῶν τοῦ ἱερέως λέγω, πῶς ἂν τις τούτων ἐκτός, ἢ τὸ τῆς γεννητῆς ἐκφυγεῖν δυνήσεται πῦρ, ἢ τῶν ἀποκειμένων σφεδάνων τυχεῖν; — Chrysost. *De Sacerdot.* Lib. III.

<sup>5</sup> "Qui non vocatus docet, non sine damno, et suo, et auditorum, docet, quod Christus non sit cum eo." — Luther, *In Galat.* I. 1, Tom. V. p. 215.

<sup>6</sup> *Confess. August.* pars I. Art. V. *Syllog.* p. 24, Art. XIV. p. 127.

<sup>7</sup> *Confess. Helvet.* c. XVIII.; *Syllog.* p. 65.

of Christ, except he be regularly called. . . . If so great a minister as St. Paul dares not arrogate to himself to be heard in the Church, but because he has been ordained to this office by the Lord's command, and faithfully discharges his duty, how great would be his impudence who should seek this honour destitute of both these qualifications!"<sup>1</sup>

The Church of England especially expresses her opinions in the Ordinal, where, besides the language of the Preface and the words of the Services themselves, it is ordered, that "There shall be a sermon declaring . . . how *necessary* the order of priests is in the Church of Christ."

Since the Reformation, sects have arisen which underrate the necessity of the ministry and of a call to it. The Anabaptists appear to have done this. The latter Remonstrants, as represented by Episcopius, seem to have thought a fluency of speech and acceptableness to the congregation a sufficient mission.<sup>2</sup> The Quakers, and several fanatical sects, investing all Christians with ministerial authority, have abrogated all distinction of lay and clerical. But these are not much to be considered in a history of religious opinions.

II. The Article next speaks of those ministers being lawfully called and sent, who derive their calling and mission from certain persons having public authority in the Church to call and to send.

It is necessary then to consider, whether there have always been certain persons invested with such public authority; who such persons were; and who are recognized as such by the English Church.

It is the plain record of all antiquity, that ordination was anciently conferred by the highest order of the ministry. This will probably be questioned by no one. We have seen that St. Clement, the earliest Christian writer except those of the new Testament, speaks of the Apostles as having appointed successors to themselves in the ministry and government of the Church. We have seen that Irenæus speaks of a regular succession from the Apostles in the Churches, and that he counts up the succession in the Churches of Rome and of Smyrna. A like testimony we have brought from Tertullian. The farther we proceed, the clearer the evidence becomes, that no ordinations took place, except by those

<sup>1</sup> Calvin, *Institut.* iv. iii. 10. See Palmer, *On the Church*, pt. 1. ch. viii. *Remons. Conf.* c. 22, § 1; Ford, *On the Articles*, Art. xxiii.

<sup>2</sup> See *Episcop. Disp.* 76, Thes. 4, 5;

who thus succeeded to the ministry of the Apostles, deriving their orders in direct descent from them.

The only difficulty which seems to occur is this. In the new Testament, it is conceded that *Bishop* (ἐπίσκοπος) and *Presbyter* (πρεσβύτερος) were synonymous and convertible terms. In after-ages we find them distinguished; the title *Bishop* being tied to the first, the title *Presbyter* to the second order of the ministry. Theodoret<sup>1</sup> and Hilary the deacon<sup>2</sup> tell us, that “the same persons were originally called indiscriminately bishops and presbyters, whilst those who are now called bishops, were called Apostles. But afterwards, the name *Apostle* was appropriated to such only as were Apostles indeed, and then the name *Bishop* was given to those who were before called Apostles.”<sup>3</sup> The question is, Was this really the state of the case from the first, or is it the invention of a later age? Were there always three orders of ministers? or originally but two, the aristocratical by degrees changing into a ‘monarchical government? There have been many (such as Blondel, Daillé, Lord King, &c.) who have asserted, that there were but two orders, *presbyters* and *deacons*; that by degrees, where there were several presbyters, one was elected to preside over the rest; but that he was no more distinct from them, than the dean of a cathedral is from the rest of the chapter, or than the rector or vicar of a large parish is from the assistant curates and ministers of the various chapelries connected with it, — in short a ruling or presiding elder, but not a bishop. By degrees, they say, these ruling elders arrogated to themselves to be a superior order to their brethren, and claimed exclusively that authority to ordain and to execute discipline, which had before been vested in the whole body of the presbytery.

It is quite certain, that in the beginning of the third century, *i. e.* one hundred years after the Apostles, there existed in the Church the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Thenceforward, in every part of the world whither Christianity had spread, no Church was to be found where bishops did not preside and ordain. They are well-known rules, that “what has been religiously observed by the Apostolical Churches, must appear to have been handed down from the Apostles themselves.”<sup>4</sup> And that, “what is held by the Universal Church, and not ordained by any council, but has always been retained in the Church, is to be

<sup>1</sup> *Comm. in 1 Tim.* iii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Hilary. *Diac. In Ephes.* iv.

<sup>3</sup> See Bingham, *E. A.* Book II. ch. II.

<sup>4</sup> “Constabit id esse ab Apostolis traditum, quod apud ecclesias apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum.” — Tertull. *C. Marcion.* Lib. IV. c. 5; cf. *De Pæscript.* c. 17.



believed to have come down from Apostolical authority.”<sup>1</sup> So then the burden of proof must lie with those who contend that a custom universally prevailing at a very early period was an innovation, and not a tradition.

Let us, however, see whether the chain of evidence is not complete even from the Apostles.

Clemens Romanus, it is true, mentions only bishops and deacons, and afterwards presbyters; from which it has been inferred that bishops and presbyters were still used indiscriminately for the same office, as in the new Testament. Yet his epistle contains at least inferential proof of the existence of three orders at the time he wrote. In the first place, he himself evidently writes with authority, as representing the whole Church in the great city of Rome. “The Church of God, which is at Rome, to the Church of God which is at Corinth.”<sup>2</sup> This exactly corresponds with what we are told by Irenæus and all subsequent testimonies, that Clement was bishop of Rome. Then, in speaking of the ministry as ordained by the Apostles, when they themselves were about to depart, and enjoining the laity to be observant of it, he specially compares the Christian clergy to the three orders of the Levitical priesthood. “The same care must be had of the persons that minister unto Him: for the chief priest has his proper services; and to the priests their proper place is appointed; and to the Levites appertain their proper ministries: and the layman is confined within the bounds of what is commanded to laymen.”<sup>3</sup> This, be it observed, is exactly the language of later fathers. In allusion to this resemblance the presbyters are constantly called *sacerdotes*; the bishop, *summus sacerdos*; the deacons, *Levitæ*. And it will facilitate our understanding of the whole question, if we bear in mind, that, as the high priest was still a priest, and only distinguished from the other priests by one or two points of official preëminence, so the fathers constantly speak of the bishop as still a presbyter (*συμπρεσβύτερος*, 1 Pet. v. 1), but as distinguished from the other presbyters by the power of ordination and jurisdiction.

If we believe the seven shorter epistles of Ignatius to be genuine, they abound in passages concerning the three orders of the ministry, so plain that no language can be stronger or more signif-

<sup>1</sup> “Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum, non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur.” — Augustin.

*Adv. Donatist.* Lib. iv. c. 24, Tom. ix. p. 139.

<sup>2</sup> Clem. 1 *Ad Cor* c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> c. 40.

icant.<sup>1</sup> If, on the contrary, we incline to receive the epistles of the Syriac version, not as abbreviated, but as the genuine epistles, we have already seen, that they contain a passage in which subjection to the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and especially to the bishop, is most earnestly and solemnly enjoined.<sup>2</sup>

In the account of the martyrdom of Ignatius, we are told that the cities and Churches of Asia sent their bishops, presbyters, and deacons to meet him.<sup>3</sup>

Hegesippus (ab. A. D. 158) relates of himself, that, as he was travelling to Rome, he communicated with many bishops, and especially speaks of having intercourse with Primus, the Bishop of Corinth. He also relates the succession of certain bishops of Rome. And speaks of Simon, the son of Cleopas, as second Bishop of Jerusalem.<sup>4</sup> Here we find the three great cities, Jerusalem, Rome, and Corinth, in each of which there must have been several presbyters, yet still each presided over by a single bishop.

Irenæus undoubtedly calls the same persons by the name of bishops and presbyters; but we should be misled by the mere indiscriminate use of names, if we concluded that therefore there was in his day no such thing as a church-officer superior to the general body of presbyters. On the contrary, we have already seen that he lays great stress on the power of tracing up the succession of ministers in the Churches unbroken to the Apostles; and this succession he traces, not by the whole body of presbyters in each, but by the single individuals at the head. Thus, he says, the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul gave the bishopric of Rome to Linus, to him succeeded Anacletus, to Anacletus Clemens, to Clemens Evarestus, to him Alexander, then Sixtus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter, Eleutherius. In the like manner he speaks of a regular descent of the heads of the Church of Smyrna from Polycarp.<sup>5</sup> Here it is evident, that the regular ordination and succession of doctrine in the Church is maintained, not by parity of presbyters, but by successive ordination of chief pastors, who in their turn had power to ordain others.

It has been already mentioned, that Clement of Alexandria considers “the degrees (αἱ προκοπαὶ) in the Church on earth of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, to be imitations of the angelic glory, and of that dispensation which is said to await those who live in right-

<sup>1</sup> See Ign. *Ad Ephes.* 3, 4, 5, 6; *Magnes.* 2, 6, 13; *Trall.* 2, 7; *Philadelph.* 1, 4, 7, 10; *Smyrn.* 8, 12; *Polyc.* 6.  
<sup>2</sup> *Epist. ad Polycarp.* c. 6, cited above.

<sup>3</sup> *Martyr. Ignatii, Cotelier.* II. p. 174

<sup>4</sup> Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* IV. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Irenæ. *Lib.* III. c. 3.

eousness according to the Gospel. These, according to the Apostle, being raised into the clouds, will first minister (*διακονεῖν*), then, receiving an advancement in glory, be enrolled in the presbytery until they come to the perfect man."<sup>1</sup> Here it is evident that Clement alludes to the existence of three orders in the ministry, which might successively be passed through, and which he fancifully considers like the progressive degrees of glory hereafter. Elsewhere also he speaks of presbyters, bishops, and deacons, saying that there are various precepts or suggestions in the Scriptures pertaining to particular persons, "some for presbyters, some for bishops, some for deacons,"<sup>2</sup> &c.

The testimony of Tertullian has already been sufficiently adduced, when we were on the subject of the distinction of clergy and laity. He, more than once, enumerates the three orders.<sup>3</sup> In one instance he asserts that presbyters and deacons could not baptize without the authority of the bishop;<sup>4</sup> challenges heretics to trace, as the Catholics could, the succession of their bishops to the Apostles;<sup>5</sup> and complains that among heretics the offices of bishops, deacons, presbyters, and laics, were all confounded.<sup>6</sup>

Origen continually distinguishes between bishops, priests, and deacons. Bishop Pearson<sup>7</sup> has quoted ten passages from his writings, in seven of which the distinction is plainly marked, and the three orders are expressly enumerated.

All these writers lived within a hundred years of the Apostles. St. John is said to have died A. D. 100, and Origen to have been born A. D. 186. From the time of Origen the case admits of no question. The first fifty of the canons of the apostles use the word *bishop* thirty-six times, in appropriation to him, that is the ruler or president of the church, above the clergy and laity; twenty-four times the bishop is expressly distinguished from the presbyter; and fourteen times indicated as having particular care for government, jurisdiction, censures, and ordinations committed to him.<sup>8</sup> The first canon expressly enjoins, that a bishop be consecrated by

<sup>1</sup> *Stromat.* vi. p. 793. See also, Bp. Kaye's *Clem. Alex.* p. 463.

<sup>2</sup> *αὶ μὲν πρεσβυτέρους, αἱ δ' ἐπισκόπους· αἱ δὲ διακόνους, κ. τ. λ.* — *Pædag.* III. p. 309.

<sup>3</sup> *De Baptismo*, c. 17, *De Fugâ*, c. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* c. 17, cited above.\*

<sup>5</sup> *De Præscrip. Hæretic.* c. 32.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* c. 41, cited above.

<sup>7</sup> *Vindiciæ Ignat.* ap. Coteler. Tom. II pt. II. p. 320.

<sup>8</sup> See Bp. Taylor's *Episcopacy Asserted*, Sect. XXIV.

All this occurs in the first fifty Can-

ons, which are received as authentic, being quoted by the Council of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Antioch, and Carthage. They were undoubtedly not apostolical, but are generally referred to the middle of the third century. Bp. Beveridge thinks they were collected by Clement of Alexandria. They seem to be appealed to as authority by Tertullian, Cyprian, Constantine the Great, Alexander of Alexandria, and Athanasius. See *Codex Canonum Eccles. Prim.* ill. a. Gul. Beveridge.

two or three bishops. The second, that a presbyter or deacon be ordained by one bishop. The thirty-fifth forbids bishops to ordain out of their own dioceses. The thirty-seventh decrees synods of bishops. The thirty-eighth enjoins bishops to have the superintendence of all ecclesiastical affairs; and the thirty-ninth forbids presbyters and deacons to do anything without the knowledge of their bishop.<sup>1</sup>

Having now reached the age of Cyprian, when the existence of a regular diocesan episcopacy is not questioned by the most skeptical; if we look back on the testimonies above cited, it is surely not too much to assert, that for scarcely any of the undoubted events of ancient history does there exist anything like the weight of contemporary evidence that we have from the first, that, in the first century after the Apostolic age, there was a marked distinction between bishops, presbyters, and deacons; or that, if the *names* of bishops and presbyters were not always distinguished, there was still clearly a separation between the functions of the ordinary presbyter and those of the president, chief priest, or bishop of the Church. There is nothing like such evidence for the existence of the laws of Draco, or the usurpation of Pisistratus, of the kingdom of Cræsus, or the battle of Marathon, for the wars of Carthage, or the very being of such persons as Brennus, or Pyrrhus, or Hannibal.

In the age of Cyprian (*i. e.* about A. D. 250), we have abundant evidence as to the state of the Church. We know, for instance, that Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, had forty-four presbyters under him;<sup>2</sup> that Cyprian himself, in like manner, presided over a considerable body of presbyters. The latter never hesitates to claim supreme authority, under God, over his presbyters and deacons; and complains bitterly, if any of the presbytery give not due honour to him as their bishop.<sup>3</sup> The privileges of the presbytery were indeed carefully preserved to them; and we have no reason to believe that, at this early period, nearly so great an imparity prevailed, as we afterwards meet with. The dioceses were very small compared with their extent in modern times. One bishop generally had the care of one large town and its immediate suburbs: whence the original name of a diocese was not *δικησίου*

<sup>1</sup> Beveregii *Synodicon*, Tom. i. pp. 1, 24-27.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. vi. 43.

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, *Epistol.* xvi. "Quod enim non periculum metuere debemus de offensa Domini quando aliqui de Pres-

byteris nec Evangelii nec loci sui memores, sed neque futurum Domini iudicium, neque nunc sibi propositum episcopum cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est, cum contumelia præpositi totum sibi vendicant?"

(*diocese*), but *παροικία* (*parochia*), a word not expressing, as of late times, a single congregation or parish, but implying the whole town and its immediate neighborhood; that is, such a precinct or district as a single bishop could govern with the assistance of his presbyters.<sup>1</sup> The power of bishops too over their presbyters was, in early times, limited in many ways. The Council of Carthage (A. D. 348) ordained, that three bishops should judge a deacon, and not less than six should censure a presbyter.<sup>2</sup> Presbyters were always looked on as assessors and counsellors to their bishop.<sup>3</sup> Bishops weighed all things by common advice, and did nothing but after deliberation, and with consent of their clergy.<sup>4</sup> Presbyters were considered as, equally with the bishops, invested with the dignity of the priestly office;<sup>5</sup> and in the African Churches and the Latin, though not in the East, all the presbyters present assisted the bishop in the ordination of a presbyter, by laying their hands on his head.<sup>6</sup>

Yet there is no example of ordination ever being intrusted to presbyters only. On one occasion, a presbyter of Alexandria, named Colluthus, pretended to act as a bishop, but a council of bishops, assembled at Alexandria under Hosius (A. D. 324), declared his ordinations null and void.<sup>7</sup>

Those who advocate the parity of bishops and presbyters, appeal to the language of St Chrysostom and St. Jerome; who undoubtedly maintained with great earnestness the dignity of the office of presbyter, and esteemed it very little inferior to the episcopate. Yet their very words distinctly show, that in one point, and that the point now in question, the bishop had a power not intrusted to the presbyter. St. Chrysostom says, that "bishops excel presbyters *only in the power of ordination.*"<sup>8</sup> And St. Jerome asks, "what does a bishop which a presbyter does not, *except*

<sup>1</sup> See Suicer, s. v. *παροικία*; and Bingham, *E. A.* Bk. ix. c. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Concil. Carthag.* I. Can. 11; see Bingham, Bk. II. ch. III. sect. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Σύμβουλοι τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, συνέδριον καὶ βουλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. — *Constit. Apostol. Lib.* II. c. 28.

<sup>4</sup> "Quando a primordio episcopatus mei staturerim, nihil sine consilio vestro, et sine consensu plebis, mea privata sententia gerere." — Cyprian, *Epist.* xiv.; *Op. Cyp. Epist.* p. 38.

"Omni actu ad me perlato placuit contrahi presbyterium, qui et hodie presentes fuerunt, ut firmato consilio, quid circa personam eorum observari deberet, consensu omnium statureretur." — Cornelius

Cypriano, *Epist.* XLIX.; *Op. Cyp. Epist.* p. 92. See Bingham, Bk. II. ch. XIX. sect. 8.

<sup>5</sup> "Qui cum Episcopo Presbyteri sacerdotali honore conjuncti." — Cyprian. *Ad Lucian. Epist.* LXI. See Bingham, II. xix. 14.

<sup>6</sup> It was so ordained by the fourth Council of Carthage, and there is a rule to the same purpose in the constitutions of the Church of Alexandria. See Bingham, II. xix. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Athanas. *Opp.* I. p. 732, Colon. See Bingham, II. iii. 6; Palmer, *On the Church*, pt. VI. ch. IV.

<sup>8</sup> *χευρονομία μόνη.* — *Hom.* IX. in 1 ad Tim.

*ordaining?*"<sup>1</sup> It is true that St. Jerome, arguing from the language of St. Paul to Timothy, contends that *Episcopus* and *Presbyter* originally designated the same office, and thinks that one was afterwards placed above the rest, to avoid schism in the Church. This, however, is evidently only his own private inference from Scripture. He relates indeed, that at Alexandria, from the time of St. Mark to Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters used to elect one from among themselves, and, having placed him aloft (*in exceliori gradu*), saluted him *Episcopus*; as if an army should make a general (*imperator*), or a body of deacons an archdeacon.<sup>2</sup> But we cannot infer from this, that St. Jerome means to say that there was no distinct consecration of the bishop so elected; for it is merely of the election, not of the ordination of their bishop, that he speaks; and he simply adduces this as an instance of what he believed to be one of the ancient forms of episcopacy; namely, the appointment by the presbyters of one from among themselves to preside over them.<sup>3</sup>

Hilary the deacon says, that "the ordination of bishop and presbyters is the same, for both are priests; but the bishop is first; for every bishop is a presbyter, not every presbyter a bishop."<sup>4</sup> All this is true, except inasmuch as he says there is no difference between the ordination of a bishop and a presbyter; and this is evidently the private opinion (deduced from the language of St. Paul) of a person not much to be relied on, and who afterwards joined the Luciferian schism. What he says in another place,<sup>5</sup> that "in Egypt, even to his days, presbyters *sealed* (consignant), in the absence of the bishop," does not mean that they *ordained*, but that they *confirmed*; and, no doubt, in the early ages, presbyters were sometimes permitted to confirm, by delegation of the episcopal power.<sup>6</sup>

The only decided opponent of episcopacy in primitive times was Aerius, a presbyter of the Church of Sebaste, in Armenia, of the fourth century. He had a quarrel with his bishop, Eustathius, and was thence led, among other errors, to declare that bishops and presbyters were altogether equal, and that a presbyter could ordain, as well as a bishop. Epiphanius says, he was altogether an

<sup>1</sup> "Quid enim facit, *excepta ordinatione*, episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?" — *Epist. ad Evangelium*, Ep. 101; *Op. Tom. iv. pars II. p. 802.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> See Bishop Hall, *Episcopacy of Divine Right*, Pt. II. Sect. 15; Bp. J. Taylor, *On Episcopacy*, Sect. 32; Bingham,

II. iii. 5; Palmer, *On the Church*, pt. VI. ch. IV.

<sup>4</sup> *In I Tim. iii. in Oper. Ambros.*

<sup>5</sup> *In Ephes. iv.* "Denique apud Ægyptum presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit episcopus."

<sup>6</sup> See Bingham, Bk. XII. ch. II. sect. 2, 4; Palmer, pt. VI. ch. I. VI.

Arian heretic (*Ἀρειανὸς μὲν τὸ πᾶν*). His sentiments were wholly rejected by the Catholics, and his sect driven from all quarters of the Church; <sup>1</sup> it being a settled doctrine at that day, that the order of bishops excelled the order of presbyters, “inasmuch as the order of bishops can beget fathers to the Church by ordination, but the order of presbyters can but beget sons by baptism.” <sup>2</sup>

The review, then, which has been taken of the primitive testimony, proves this: that, in the earliest ages, in every quarter of the world whither the Church had penetrated, whilst all Churches had their regular ministers of the two orders of presbyters and deacons, yet in every city there was one chief presbyter, presiding over the clergy of that city and its suburb (*παροικία*), and that to him was committed the power of ordination, or, in the language of the Article, he had “public authority given him in the Church, to call and send ministers into the Lord’s Vineyard.” Whether he was to be esteemed of a different order, or of the same order, differing only in degree; <sup>3</sup> in any case, by universal consent, he was the minister of ordination. Other presbyters, equally with him, received authority to teach, to baptize, to minister the Eucharist; but he only had authority to ordain. Such authority was believed to have been derived to bishops from the Apostles. And the principle on which their ordinations were deemed valid, was, not merely that they themselves had the priestly office, but that they had received authority (authority by regular episcopal descent) to give ordination and mission to others.

Those who maintain the validity of presbyterian orders, do so on the ground that bishops were themselves but presbyters. Those who maintain that episcopal ordination is necessary, reply that even though bishops be themselves presbyters, yet they only, and not all presbyters alike, had the authority to ordain; and therefore that without them ordination could not take place. This was the constant creed of the fathers, and of the schoolmen after them.

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 75; August, *Hæres.* 54.

<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius, *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> The fathers, the schoolmen, and divines, both of the Roman and reformed episcopal churches, have seemed doubtful whether bishops and presbyters were of different degrees in the same order, or of different orders. The distinction between presbyter and deacon has always been esteemed as greater than that between bishop and presbyter; the eminence of the bishop over the presbyter consisting chiefly in the power of ordina-

tion. Mr. Palmer enumerates as advocates for identity of order, but inferiority of degree, Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, Irenæus, Clemens Alexand., Tertullian, Firmilian, Jerome, Hilary the deacon, Chrysostom, Augustine, Theodoret, Sedulius, Primasius, Isidore Hispalensis, Bede, Alcuin, the Synod of Aix, in 819, Amalarius, Hugo S. Victor, Peter Lombard, Alexander Alensis, Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Scotus, Cajetan, Durandus, the Council of Trent, and many reformers of the 16th century. Palmer, pt. iv. ch. i.

The Council of Trent, and the later writers in the Church of Rome, have not greatly insisted on the three orders, but have generally classed together the first and second, bishops and presbyters, under the common name of *sacerdotes, priests*; influenced herein by the high importance which they attached to the priesthood, and by the disposition to reserve supreme episcopal authority to the pope.<sup>1</sup> Yet they have never thought of permitting any but the bishop to administer ordination, which is by them esteemed a Sacrament of the Church; but have ever held bishops to be successors of the Apostles, superior to presbyters, and qualified, which the other clergy were not, to confirm and to ordain.<sup>2</sup>

At the time of the Reformation, the Lutherans, meeting with nothing but opposition from the bishops, were constrained to act without them. Yet Luther and his followers constantly acted under appeal to a general council. The Confession of Augsburg fully conceded to bishops the power of the keys, *i. e.* of preaching the Gospel, of remitting and retaining sins, and of administering the Sacraments; <sup>3</sup> and declared, that bishops should retain all their legitimate authority, if only they would not urge such traditions as could not be kept with a good conscience.<sup>4</sup> The Lutherans earnestly protested, that they much wished to retain episcopacy, but that the bishops forced them to reject sound doctrine, and therefore they were unable to preserve their allegiance to them; and they “openly testified to the world, that they would willingly continue the canonical government, if only the bishops would cease to exercise cruelty upon the Churches.”<sup>5</sup>

The Calvinists, though in like manner rejecting their bishops, who would have bound them to Rome, declared themselves ready to submit to a lawful hierarchy. Calvin said that those who would not submit themselves to such, were deserving of any ana-

<sup>1</sup> The Council of Trent, Sess. xxiii. cap. 2, reckons seven orders of ministers, sacerdotes, diaconi, subdiaconi, acolythi, exorcistæ, lectores, ostiarii. The Council of Nice itself (Can. 3) had given the name of κληρος to others besides bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and the third Council of Carthage made a Canon (Can. 23) on purpose to confirm the title to them. (Bingham, i. v. 7.)

<sup>2</sup> Vid. *Concil. Trident.* Sess. xxiii. cap. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Confess. August. *De Potestate Ecclesiastica*, *Sylloge*, pp. 151, 225.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 157, 231.

<sup>5</sup> “Episcopi sacerdotes nostros aut cogunt hoc doctrinæ genus, quod confessio sumus, abjicere et damnare, aut nova et

inaudita crudelitate miseros et innocentes occidunt. Hæ causæ impediunt quo minus agnoscat hos episcopos nostri sacerdotes. Ita sævitia episcoporum in causa est, quare alicubi dissolvitur illa canonica politia, quam nos magnopere cupiebamus conservare. Ipsi videriint quomodo rationem Deo reddituri sint, quod dissipant ecclesiam. Porro hic iterum volumus testatum, nos libenter conservaturos esse ecclesiasticam et canonicam politiam, si modo episcopi desinant in nostras ecclesias sævire.” — *Apologia Confessionis*, Art. vii. § 24. See Bp. Hall’s *Episcopacy*, Int. Sect. 3. The above passage is given at greater length in Dr. Wordsworth’s *Theophilus Anglicanus*, ch. xi.



thema.<sup>1</sup> Even Beza thought it insane to reject all episcopacy; and wished that the Church of England might continue to enjoy forever that singular bounty of God.<sup>2</sup>

John Knox himself was not a favourer of that parity of ministers which Andrew Melvill afterwards introduced into the Kirk of Scotland, but may be considered as, more or less, a witness for the distinction of bishops and presbyters.<sup>3</sup>

In the English Church, the primitive rule of episcopal ordination and apostolical descent has never been infringed. The Article under consideration is the only authorized formulary, which seems in the least degree ambiguous. The ambiguity, however, is not real but apparent only; as it is clearly stated that not all who are themselves ministers can ordain; but only those invested with public authority in the Church to send others into the Vineyard. This is a complete description of a bishop, who is a chief presbyter invested, over and above other presbyters, with the power of sending labourers into the Vineyard.

The first germ of this Article we have already seen, in the Articles agreed on between the Lutheran and Anglican divines, A. D. 1538.<sup>4</sup> About the same year, or soon after, a paper was written by Cranmer, *De Ordine et Ministerio Sacerdotum et Episcoporum*, in which the divine authority of priests and bishops, the superiority of bishops, and their succession from the Apostles, are strongly maintained.<sup>5</sup> The same kind of language is used in the *Institution of a Christian Man*, set forth nearly at the same time, or somewhat earlier.<sup>6</sup> In the year 1540, Henry VIIIth, in regard of a more exact review of the *Institution of a Christian Man*, appointed several learned men to deliberate about sundry points of religion, and to give in their sentiments distinctly. Seventeen questions were proposed to them concerning the Sacraments and ordination.<sup>7</sup> All agreed, except one, that bishops had the authority to make presbyters; and almost all agreed, that none besides had this power. Their general opinion was, that a bishop further required consecration, though Cox thought institution with imposition of hands sufficient.

<sup>1</sup> "Talem nobis hierarchiam si exhibent in qua sic emineant episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent, ut ab Illo tanquam ab unico Capite pendeant et ad Ipsum referantur: . . . tum vero nullo non anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt, qui non eam reverentur, summaque obedientia observant." — Calvin. *De Necessitate Reform. Eccl.s.* See also *Institut.* iv. c. 10. See Hall, as above.

<sup>2</sup> 'Fruatur sane ista singulari Dei

beneficentia, quæ utinam illi sit perpetua." — Beza ad Sarav. apud Hall, *Episcopacy*, Sect. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Harington's *Notes on the Church of Scotland*. ch. III.

<sup>4</sup> Cranmer's *Works*, by Jenkyns, iv. p. 286.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 300.

<sup>6</sup> *Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII.* p. 101.

<sup>7</sup> *Trype's Cranmer*, p. 110.

But at this time Cranmer appears to have been much wavering on the subject of ordination. He had imbibed a very high notion of the Divine prerogative of Christian princes; and some of his answers indicate a belief, that Christian kings, as well as bishops, had power to ordain ministers. Still he adds, as if doubtful of the soundness of his position, "This is mine opinion and sentence at this present, which nevertheless I do not temerarily define, but refer the judgment thereof wholly to your majesty."<sup>1</sup> Several of the other divines had afterwards a hand in drawing up the Liturgy and the Ordinal; and all had expressed opinions diametrically opposite to the Archbishop. But the Archbishop's own appears to have been only a theory hastily taken up, and as speedily relinquished, at a period when all opinions were undergoing a great revolution, and when the reformers were generally inclined to overrate the regal, and underrate the episcopal authority; since kings in most parts of Europe fostered, and bishops checked the progress of the Reformation. It is to be observed that the *Necessary Doctrine*, which was the result of this review of the *Institution of a Christian Man*, contains the strongest language concerning "order," as "the gift or grace of ministration in Christ's Church, given of God to Christian men by the consecration and imposition of the bishop's hands," and concerning a continual succession even to the end of the world.<sup>2</sup> This was set forth A. D. 1543. In 1548, Cranmer himself put out what is called Cranmer's Catechism, which, though not written by him, was translated and published by his authority. In this the Apostolical descent, Episcopal ordination, and the power of the Keys, are strongly enforced and greatly enlarged upon.<sup>3</sup> Bishop Burnet remarks on it, that "it is plain that Cranmer had now quite laid aside those singular opinions which he formerly held of the ecclesiastical functions; for now, in a work which was wholly his own, without the concurrence of any other, he fully sets forth their divine institution."<sup>4</sup> In 1549, Cranmer and twelve other divines drew up the *Ordinal*, where it is declared that, "from the Apostles' times, there hath been three orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;" it is said that none were admitted to them but "by public prayer, with imposition of hands;" and it is enjoined that hereafter all persons to be ordained shall be

<sup>1</sup> See Jenkyns's *Cranmer*, II. p. 98, where Cranmer's answers are given. All the replies are to be found in the Appendix to Burnet *On the Reformation*, and Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*. See also Jenkyns's preface to his edition of *Cranmer*, I. p. xxxii. &c.

<sup>2</sup> See at length *Formularies of Faith*, p. 277.

<sup>3</sup> See Cranmer's *Catechism*, p. 198, &c. Oxford, 1829.

<sup>4</sup> Burnet, *History of Reformation*, II pt. 2.

admitted according to the form laid down in the Ordinal, which is nearly the same as that still used in the Church of England. In 1552, the *Reformatio Legum* was published, the chief writer of which was the Archbishop. In this again the three orders, of bishop, presbyter, and deacon, are distinctly treated of. For bishops are claimed the powers of jurisdiction and ordination, and all three orders are spoken of as evidently holding their offices on Scriptural authority and by Divine appointment.<sup>1</sup> Cranmer therefore could only have entertained for a short time the peculiar opinions which in 1540 he unhappily expressed.<sup>2</sup> It is only necessary to add, that the Ordinal is expressly sanctioned and authorized, not only as part of the Book of Common Prayer, but by the XXXVIth Article;<sup>3</sup> and we may observe, that, not only is episcopal ordination enjoined by it, but in its present form it forbids that any shall hereafter be "accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon in the United Church of England or Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination."<sup>4</sup>

---

## SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

WE may proceed, as in the last section, to show that, —

I. There is a regular order of ministers in the Christian Church set apart for sacred offices, and that no one may assume their functions, except he be lawfully called and sent.

<sup>1</sup> *Reform. Leg. Tit. De Ecclesia et Ministris Ejus*, capp. 3, 4, 10–12.

<sup>2</sup> The question concerning Archbishop Cranmer's remarkable expressions in 1540, and subsequent change of opinion, is ably disposed of by Chancellor Harington, *Succession of Bishops in the Church of England*. See also his *Two Ordination Sermons*. Exeter, 1845.

<sup>3</sup> The Church of England has always acted on the principles laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal, although many of her writers have shown consideration for the difficulties of the Continental Protestants. It has been asserted by Mr. Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, i. p. 75, that "in the year 1603 the province of Canterbury" (*i. e.* in Canon 55) "solemnly recognized the Church of Scotland, a Church in which episcopal ordination was unknown, as a branch of the holy Catholic Church of Christ." This state-

ment has been clearly disproved by Chancellor Harington, who has demonstrated that at least a titular episcopacy then existed in Scotland, and that there was "a full determination to restore a regularly consecrated episcopacy." See a *Letter on the LVth Canon and the Kirk of Scotland*, by E. C. Harington, M. A. Rivingtons, 1851.

<sup>4</sup> The following writers may be consulted by the student, both as containing the arguments for episcopacy and the succession of ministers, and as showing the judgment of the great Anglican divines on the subject. Hooker, Bk. vii.; Hall, *Episcopacy of Divine Right*; Taylor, *On Episcopacy*; Chillingworth, *Divine Institution of Episcopacy*; Leslie, *On the Qualifications to administer the Sacraments*; Potter, *On Church Government*; Bingham, *E. A.* Bk. ii.; Palmer, *On the Church*, Part vi.

II. There are regular ministers of ordination, to whom public authority is given to send labourers into the Vineyard.

I. The example of the old Testament priesthood is clearly to the point. One out of the twelve tribes was set apart for sacred offices in general, and of that tribe one whole family for special priestly ministration.

It is said truly, that the priesthood, and especially the high priesthood, was typical of Christ. He is the great High Priest over the House of God. Therefore, it is argued, all other priesthood has ceased. It is however equally true, that the kings and prophets of old were as much types of Christ as were the high priests. Christ is our Prophet, Priest, and King. Yet still it is lawful that there should be kings and prophets under the Gospel, for we read of many prophets in the Church (Acts ii. 17; xi. 27; xiii. 1; xv. 32; xxi. 9, 10. 1 Cor. xii. 28. Eph. iv. 11); and we are specially enjoined to "honour the king" (1 Pet. ii. 17).

In one sense, doubtless, there are no such prophets, kings, or priests now, as there were under the Law. Kings were then rulers of the theocracy, vicegerents of God in governing the Church of God. Prophets were sent to prepare the way of Him who was to come. Priests offered up daily sacrifice of propitiation, in type of the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world. So, in such a sense, are there now neither prophets, priests, nor kings. But as the coming of *the* King and Prophet has not abolished the kingly or prophetic office, so the coming of the Great High Priest has not of necessity done away with all priestly functions in the Church, but only with such as of their own nature belonged to the typical and ceremonial dispensation. Nay! we may fairly argue, that as sacred things in the old Testament needed the ministry of consecrated officers, so the still more sacred things of the new Testament would be likely to need the attendance of those specially set apart. And, without controversy, the Gospel and the Sacraments are greater and more sacred than the Law and the sacrifices; and hence, "if the ministration of death . . . was glorious," we could easily imagine, that the "ministration of the Spirit would be rather glorious;" that "if the ministration of condemnation was glory, much more would the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory" (2 Cor. iii. 7, 8, 9). In the old Testament the priests were appointed, first to minister in the sacrifices, and then to teach the people (Lev. x. 11. Deut. xxxiii. 10. Hagg. ii. 11. Mal. ii. 7). We still need the ministration, not of sacrifices, but

of Sacraments; and the instruction of the Church is at least as necessary as the instruction of the Jews.

It is said, however, that all Christians are priests, and that a distinct ministry is therefore needless and inconsistent (see 1 Pet. ii. 9; Rev. i. 6; v. 10). But it is to be observed, that wherever Christians are said to be *priests*, they are also said to be *kings*. We know that the kingly character, which Christ bestows on His people, has not abolished monarchy; why should their priestly character have abolished ministry? Besides which, the very passages in the new Testament in which Christians are called a "royal priesthood," "kings and priests," are absolute quotations from the old Testament, where the very same titles are given to all the people of the Jews. "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of *priests*, a holy nation" (Exod. xix. 6). The Septuagint Version of Exodus and the Greek of St. Peter are almost the same. The one did not forbid a special priesthood in Israel; the other therefore cannot disprove a ministry in the Church. It was indeed argued on one occasion, that the sanctity of the whole congregation made it useless to have priests at all.<sup>1</sup> But how far the argument was safe the sequel showed, when the earth swallowed up Korah and his company, and fourteen thousand of the people died of the plague, because they had listened to his reasoning (Num. xvi. 32, 33, 45-49). It is difficult to see, where the difference lies between this statement of Korah and the modern denial of a Christian ministry, on the ground that all the Christian Church is a holy and spiritual priesthood; and it is difficult to understand what can be, if this be not, the "gainsaying of Core," so strongly rebuked by St. Jude (ver. 11).

Now it was foretold by Isaiah (lxvi. 21) that, when the Gentiles were brought in, that is in the days of the Church of Christ, some among them should be taken "for priests and for Levites." This looks much like a prophecy of a ministry to be established under the Gospel, with some analogy to that under the Law. Accordingly, our blessed Lord, even during His own personal ministry, whilst the Great High Priest was bodily ministering on earth, appointed two distinct orders of ministers under Himself, first, Apostles (Matt. x. 1), secondly, the seventy disciples (Luke x. 1); and this with evident reference to the twelve tribes of Israel, and the seventy elders among the Jews. He gave them power to preach

<sup>1</sup> Numb. xvi. 3: "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the LORD is among them; wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the LORD?"

the Gospel (Matt. x. 7. Luke x. 9), to bless those that received them (Matt. x. 12, 13. Luke x. 5, 6), to denounce God's judgments on those that rejected them (Matt. x. 14. Luke x. 10, 11). He assured them, that he that received them received Him, that he that despised them despised Him (Matt. x. 40. Luke x. 16). And He further endued them with miraculous powers, because of the peculiar exigencies of their ministration. Moreover, He promised to give them the keys of the kingdom, that they might bind and loose; *i. e.* excommunicate offenders and absolve the penitent (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18). All this was whilst He Himself went in and out among them, as the chief minister of His own Church. When He was about to suffer, He instituted one of the Sacraments of His Church, and gave especial authority to the Apostles to minister it (Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25; compare 1 Cor. x. 16); it being apparent from the statement of St. John, that they had before received authority, not only to preach, but to baptize (John iv. 2). At last, when He had risen from the dead, He gave fuller commission to those who were now to be the chief ministers in his kingdom, to go forth with His authority to preach and to baptize (Matt. xxviii. 19). He said unto them, "Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And He breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost:<sup>1</sup> whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John xx. 21, 22, 23). He enjoined them to feed His sheep (John xxi. 15, 17). Lastly, He promised to be "with them alway, even to the end of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20). Then He left the Church, thus organized with Apostles and elders; and ten days afterwards sent down the miraculous, enlightening gifts of the Spirit, the more fully to qualify His chosen ministers for the work which lay upon them. Accordingly, the Apostle says, "When He ascended up on high, He gave gifts unto men, . . . . He gave some (as) Apostles, and some (as) prophets, and some, evangelists, and some, pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ" (Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12, &c.).

The ministry so constituted continued to work. The college of Apostles was perfected by the addition of Matthias (Acts. i.

<sup>1</sup> "The Holy Ghost," for the work of the ministry, the ordaining influences of the Spirit. It could not have been the ordinary operations of the Spirit, for they had been long living under them; nor

was it the miraculous baptism of the Church with the Holy Ghost, which did not come upon them till the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 1.

26). The Apostles preached, baptized, broke bread, (*i. e.* ministered the Holy Communion,) and governed the Church: Afterwards, believers multiplying, and the Apostles and elders not having leisure to attend to the secular affairs of the Church, they ordained the third order of deacons, whose ordination was performed by laying on of hands; and so they also were then empowered to preach and to baptize (Acts viii. 5, 12, 13, 38,), though not to perform some functions peculiar to the Apostles (Acts viii. 15–17).

Thenceforward we find baptism, breaking of bread, and preaching, ever performed by regular ministers, Apostles, elders, deacons. The Apostles, as they go on their missionary journeys, “ordain them elders in every Church” (Acts xiv. 23). The “elders” meet with the Apostles in solemn council about the affairs of the Church (Acts xv. 2). When St. Paul takes leave of the Churches, he sends to the “elders” and addresses them with the exhortation, “Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which He hath purchased with His own Blood” (Acts xx. 17, 28). We find from the inscriptions of the Epistles, that the settled Churches had “bishops and deacons” (Phil. i. 1). St. Peter exhorts the “elders” of the Church to “feed the flock of God” (1 Pet. v. 1, 2). St. James bids the sick to send for the “elders of the Church to pray over them” (James v. 14). St. Paul speaks of himself and other Christian pastors, as “ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God” (1 Cor. iv. 1). He exhorts Archippus to take heed to the ministry, which he had received of the Lord, to fulfil it (Col. iv. 17). Especially, we find in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus, that towards the end of his own Apostleship he appointed others, who had previously received the gift of God by the laying on of hands (1 Tim. iv. 14. 2 Tim. i. 6), that they might, as the Apostles had hitherto done, “ordain elders in every city” (Tit. i. 5. 1 Tim. i. 3; v. 21, 22, &c.) Directions are given for proving, examining, and commissioning elders, presbyters or bishops, and deacons, which was to be done by the laying on of the hands of those chief ministers, themselves thus apostolically sent. (See 1 Tim. iii. 1–13; v. 21, 22. Tit. i. 5–7, &c.) The elders so ordained were esteemed worthy of double honour, especially if they ruled well and laboured in the word and doctrine (1 Tim. v. 17). And the Church is exhorted to obey those who had thus “the rule over them, and who watched for their souls, as they that must give account” (Heb. xiii. 17). Thus we find, that a regular ministry was established, ordained after a set form,

by laying on of the hands of Apostles or other chief ministers empowered by them ; that they preached and administered the Sacraments ; that they were called ministers and stewards of God's mysteries ; that they were urged faithfully to fulfil their ministry, and that the people were urged to attend to them and respect them. Those who sent them forth were exhorted to be careful and circumspect how they ordained them.

Now, all this proves, that this public office not only existed, but was not to be undertaken except by persons lawfully called and sent. St. Paul reasons, that the Jewish priesthood could not be undertaken except by him "that is called of God, as was Aaron" (Heb. v. 4). He even adds, that "Christ also glorified not Himself to be made an High Priest" (ver. 5). But the Gospel ministry was more glorious than that of the Law ; "for if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory" (2 Cor. iii. 9). Hence we reasonably should conclude, that it too could not be self-assumed. And we find accordingly, that the Apostles ask, "How shall they preach except they be sent?" (Rom. x. 15) ; that they highly estimate the importance and difficulty of the office, saying, "Who is sufficient for these things?" (2 Cor. ii. 16) ; that they dissuade people from rashly seeking to intrude into it (James iii. 1) ; and that, so far from considering all Christians as equally ministers of Christ, they ask, "Are all Apostles, are all prophets, are all teachers?" (1 Cor. xii. 29). On the contrary, they plainly teach us, that the Church is a body, in which God ordains different stations for different members, some to be eyes, others ears, some hands, others feet ; all necessary, all to be honoured, but some in more honourable place than the rest.

II. The new Testament contains evidence, that, besides the ordinary ministers, namely, presbyters and deacons, there were always certain chief presbyters who were ministers of ordination, having authority to send labourers into the Vineyard.

Under the Law, besides the ordinary priests and Levites, there was always the high priest, and therefore three orders or degrees of ministry. When our blessed Lord Himself was upon earth, He ordained two orders of ministers under Himself, the Apostles and the seventy disciples. Here again was a threefold cord, Christ answering to the high priest, the Apostles to the priests, the seventy to the Levites. But our Lord was to depart from them ; and for the future government of His Church we find a promise, that "in



the regeneration" (*i. e.* in the new state of things under the Gospel of Christ, the renovation of the Church) the twelve Apostles should "sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. xix. 28). "What are the twelve tribes of Israel, but the whole Church of God? For whereof did the first Christian Church consist, but of converted Jews? And whither did our Saviour bend all His allusions, but to them? They had their twelve *princes of the tribes of their fathers* (Numb. i. 16). They had their seventy elders, to bear the burden of the people (Numb. xi. 16, 17). The Son of God affects to imitate His former polity, and therefore chooses His twelve and seventy disciples to sway His evangelical Church.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, when the Saviour in body departed from them, He left behind Him twelve Apostles to sit on the thrones or seats of government in the Church, and under them seventy elders to act with them, as their fellow-labourers and assessors. (See Acts xv. 22, &c.) Soon after the ascension, the Apostles were moved to appoint a third order, the order of deacons. And thus once more the number was complete, resembling the number of the Aaronic ministry, and embracing, 1, Apostles; 2, elders; 3, deacons. The former two were appointed and ordained by the Lord, the third was from the Apostles.<sup>2</sup>

Whilst the Lord Jesus was present with them, He alone ordained. (See Matt. x. Luke x. John xx. &c.). After His ascension (except in the cases of St. Matthias and St. Paul, who were constituted to the Apostleship by Christ Himself) the Apostles acted as the ministers of ordination. (See Acts vi. 3, 6; xiv. 23. 2 Tim. i. 6. Tit. i. 5). Under them, we find continual mention of two orders of ministers, presbyters or elders, (who are also called bishops,) and deacons. (Acts xx. 17. Phil. i. 1, &c.). The Apostles in all things undertook the government of, and authority over the Churches, giving directions to the inferior ministers, and

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Hall's *Episcopacy*, Sect. 2.

<sup>2</sup> [The statements of this paragraph must, I think, be taken with some modification. There is no evidence in the New Testament that the *seventy* of the Gospels became, *ipso facto*, the presbyters or elders of the Apostolic Church. That these elders may have been selected from that body, is highly probable. There is patristic authority to prove it. But the same authority asserts that the seven deacons were also selected from the seventy; a thing which would be inexplicable, had the seventy been made presbyters by our Lord. (See the pas-

sages cited in Archbishop Potter *On Church Government*, p. 48, Am. ed.)

What is certain is, that Paul and Barnabas "ordained them elders in every Church" which they founded in their first missionary journey (Acts xiv. 23); following, herein the example of the mother Church of Jerusalem (Acts xi. 30), and furnishing a pattern for all Churches. The institution of the order is not recorded, as that of deacons is. Its existence, however, is certain, and so the main argument remains untouched. — J. W.]

superintending them. (See Acts xv. ; xix. 1-5 ; xx. 17-35. 1 Cor. iv. 16-21 ; v. 3-5. 2 Cor. ii. 9, 10 ; x. 1-14 ; xii. 20, 21, &c.) It is very true that the Apostles speak, when addressing the elders, with brotherly kindness, calling themselves *fellows-elders* (*συμπρεσβύτεροι*, 1 Pet. v. 1) ; but no one can question their own superiority to them ; and when they are mentioned together, they are distinguished as “the Apostles and elders,” — a phrase occurring three times in Acts xv. But the time was to come, when the Apostles should be taken from the Church, as their Lord had left it before. Did they then make provision for its government after their departure, and for a succession to themselves, as ministers of ordination ? The Epistles to Timothy and Titus plainly answer this question. Timothy and Titus had themselves been presbyters, ordained by (2 Tim. i. 6), and companions of St. Paul. Towards the end of his own ministry, and when his own apostolical cares had largely increased, he appointed them to take the oversight of two large districts, the one of Ephesus (where we know there were several elders or presbyters, Acts xx. 17), the other of Crete, famous for its hundred cities. In these respective districts, he authorized them to execute full apostolical authority, the same kind of authority which he himself had exercised in his own larger sphere of labour. They were to regulate the public services of the Church (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, &c.), — to ordain presbyters and deacons by the laying on their hands (1 Tim. iii. 1-14 ; v. 22. Tit. i. 5), — to provide that sound doctrine should be taught (1 Tim. i. 3 ; iii. 15 ; iv. 6, 16. 2 Tim. i. 13 ; ii. 14. Tit. i. 13), — committing carefully to faithful men the office of teaching, which they had themselves received from the Apostles (2 Tim. ii. 2), — to execute discipline, honouring the diligent (1 Tim. v. 17), — hearing complaints and judging those complained of (1 Tim. v. 19, 20, 21, 24), — admonishing those that erred (Tit. i. 13), but excommunicating those that were heretical (Tit. iii. 10). All this power is committed to them, as a solemn charge, to be accounted for before God, and as a commandment to be kept without spot, unrebukable, to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Tim. i. 18 ; v. 21 ; vi. 13. 2 Tim. iv. 1) ; and grace for this ministry is specially said to have been given them by the putting on of the hands of the Apostles (2 Tim. i. 6).

Now, here is the case of two persons placed in a position previously occupied by none but the Apostles, with special power of jurisdiction and ordination. Before this, we find no such powers in any but the Apostles. Now we find them committed to Timothy

and Titus. Is it not plain that, as our Lord left the Apostles with chief authority over His Church, having elders and deacons under them, so now the Apostles, themselves about to depart, leave Timothy and Titus, and others like them, with the same authority which they themselves had received from Christ?

It is only necessary, in order to complete the chain of evidence, that we observe what we meet with in the Revelation of St. John. There, seven great Churches are written to; one of which is the Church of Ephesus, of which we know that there were many elders there, and that afterwards Timothy was appointed as chief minister over them all. Each of these Churches is addressed through one presiding minister, who is called *Angel*, a name of the same import as *Apostle*. And these angels are compared to stars, placed to give light to the Churches (Rev. i. 20). Can we doubt then, that there was in each of these Churches one person, whose ministry was superior to the rest, as Timothy's had been to that of the presbyters and deacons under him?

The evidence therefore of the new Testament seems clear and uniform, that there ever existed three orders of ministers: *First*, (1) Our Lord, (2) the Apostles, (3) the seventy. *Secondly*, (1) the Apostles, (2) the elders, (3) the deacons. *Thirdly*, (1) Persons like Timothy and Titus, called *angels* by St. John, (2) the elders, presbyters, or bishops, (3) the deacons. Moreover we find that, in all these cases, ordinations were performed by the first order of these ministers, by the laying on of hands; except where our Lord Himself ordained, when He did not lay on His hands, but breathed on His disciples (John xx. 22).

The only arguments of any weight, which are urged against the above, appear to be the following:

1. *Bishops* and *presbyters* are in Scripture convertible terms, which shows that their subsequent distinction was an invention of the priesthood.

The answer to this has been already given in the words of Theodoret. The second order of ministers, whose general and proper designation was elders or presbyters, are in a few instances called by St. Paul *Episcopi*, bishops, or overlookers. The first order were called Apostles, and, by St. John, Angels. There are obvious reasons why these two latter names should have been afterwards considered too venerable to be given to ordinary ministers; and hence the name *bishop*, originally used to designate the overlookers of a flock, was afterwards appropriated to those who were overlookers of the pastors. But the bishops of after-times "never

thought themselves and their order to succeed the Scripture, Ἐπίσκοποι, but the Scripture Ἀπόστολοι. They were διάδοχοι τῶν Ἀποστόλων, the *successors of the Apostles.*"<sup>1</sup>

2. A second argument is, that, in Acts xiii. 1–3, Barnabas and Saul are said to have been ordained by some who were not Apostles.

This was no ordination, but merely a setting apart for a special labour; which was done, according to the pious custom of early days, with fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands. (Comp. Acts xiv. 23.) That it was no ordination, appears from the fact, that St. Paul was made an Apostle by our Lord, at the very time of his conversion. See Acts xxvi. 17, where our Lord constitutes him an Apostle to the Gentiles. The words are, εἰς οὓς ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἅποστολέω. And St. Paul himself always declares, that he had his ministry, "not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father" (Gal. i. 1).

3. It is said again, Timothy was ordained "with the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery*" (1 Tim. iv. 14).

It is certain, however, that bishops and presbyters are not so different, but that a bishop is still a presbyter, though all presbyters are not bishops. So Apostles were still presbyters, (1 Pet. v. 1); though all presbyters were not Apostles. Hence, the presbytery may have in this case consisted only of those of the first order. At all events, St. Paul took part in Timothy's ordination, for, in 2 Tim. i. 6, he speaks of the grace of ordination as given to Timothy, "by the putting on of his (St. Paul's) hands." Hence, Timothy was certainly not ordained by *presbyters only*, without the presence, and laying on of hands of an Apostle. It may have been thus early permitted to presbyters to join with Apostles in laying on of their hands at the ordinations of other presbyters, as it has since been in the Western Church; but this at least gives no sanction to mere presbyterian ordination.

We must conclude then with Hooker, "If anything in the Church's government, surely the first institution of bishops was from Heaven, even of God."<sup>2</sup> And with Bp. Hall, "What inevitable necessity may do, we now dispute not," yet "for the main substance," episcopacy "is utterly indispensable, and must so continue to the world's end."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bentley, *On Freethinking*, p. 136, quoted by Wordsworth, *Theoph. Anglic.*

<sup>3</sup> Bp. Hall's *Episcopacy*, Pt. II. Sect. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker, vii. v. 10.

## ARTICLE XXIV.

*Of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth.*      *De loquendo in Ecclesia lingua quam populos intelligit.*

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church to have Publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.

LINGUA populo non intellecta, publicas in Ecclesia preces peragere, aut Sacramenta administrare, Verbo Dei, et primitivæ Ecclesiæ consuetudini plane repugnat.

### SECTION I.—HISTORY.

THE Article itself appeals to the custom of the primitive Church. The testimony of the fathers we must naturally expect to find only incidentally; for, unless the custom of praying in a strange tongue had prevailed in early times, the idea would probably never have occurred to them, and so they would not be likely to say anything against it. There are however several important proofs to be found, that such a custom did not prevail, but that prayers were offered up in the churches in the vernacular tongue.

Greek, Latin, and Syriac were languages spoken by the great bulk of the nations first converted to Christianity; and therefore the earliest liturgies and translations of the Scriptures were sure to be in these tongues. But moreover, the Egyptians, Ethiopians or Abyssinians, Muscovites, Armenians and others, had liturgies in the vernacular.<sup>1</sup>

The sacred Scriptures were early rendered into the tongues of the nations which had been converted to the faith. Even before the coming of Christ, we know that the Scriptures were translated into Greek for the Alexandrian Jews, and into Chaldee for the Jews of Palestine, to whom their original Hebrew had become obsolete. Under the Gospel the Syriac translation of the new Testament is by many ascribed to the age of the Apostles; at all events, it is a very early work. Latin versions were scarcely, if

<sup>1</sup> See Usher, *Historia Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis*, cap. viii. sect. v., where he proves this from the confession of eminent Romanist divines

at all, posterior to the Syriac. Thus the numerous tribes which spoke Greek, Latin, or Syriac, had from the beginning the Scriptures, as well as the common Prayer of the Church, in languages understood by them. Moreover, there were very early versions into the Coptic, Sahidic, Ethiopic, Arabic, Armenian, Gothic, Sclavonic, and Anglo-Saxon; a fact too well known to require proof.<sup>1</sup>

Again, we have evidence from the writings of the fathers, that the custom of the primitive Christians was, that the whole congregation should join in the responses and in the singing of psalms and hymns; a custom which proves that both the psalms and the liturgies must have been in intelligible dialects.<sup>2</sup> For instance, St. Cyril writes, "When the priest says, "Lift up your hearts," the people answer, "We lift them up unto the Lord;" then the priest says, "Let us give thanks unto the Lord," and the people say, "It is meet and right."<sup>3</sup> St. Chrysostom says, that "Though all utter the response, yet the voice is wafted as from one mouth."<sup>4</sup> And St. Hilary speaks of people standing without the Church, and yet able to hear the voice of the congregation within, offering up prayer and praise.<sup>5</sup> So the emperor Justinian in one of his laws especially enjoins bishops and presbyters, in public prayers and Sacraments, to speak, not secretly, but with such a voice as may be well heard by the people.<sup>6</sup>

But, beyond all this, we have plain testimonies of the fathers, that both the Scriptures were read and the prayers offered in a tongue intelligible to the assembled multitude. Justin Martyr says, that, among the early Christians, "the commentaries of the Apostles and writings of the prophets were first read; and then, when the reader had ceased, the president made an oration exhorting the people to remember and imitate the things which they had heard."<sup>7</sup> Such an exhortation would have been useless, if the language in which the writings of the Prophets and Apostles were read had not been a language familiar to the congregation. There is a well-known passage in Origen,<sup>8</sup> where he asserts, that, "the Greeks used Greek in their prayers, the Romans Latin, and so

<sup>1</sup> See Bingham, *E. A.* Bk. XIII. ch. iv. § 5; Horne, *Introduction to Scriptures*, II. pt. I. ch. II.

<sup>2</sup> See Usher, as above, cap. VIII. sect. iv; Bingham, *E. A.* Bk. XIII. ch. iv. sect. II.

<sup>3</sup> *Catech. Mystagog.* v.

<sup>4</sup> *Homil. in 1 Cor. xiv.*; *Homil. xxxvi. incerta fin.*

<sup>5</sup> "Audiat orantis populi, consistens

quis extra ecclesiam, vocem; spectet celebres hymnorum sonitus; et inter divinorum quoque sacramentorum officia, responsonem devotæ confessionis accipiat." — Hilar. *In Psalm. lxxv.*; Usher, *ubi supra.*

<sup>6</sup> Justinian, *Novell. 137.* See Usher, as above.

<sup>7</sup> *Apolog.* I. p. 98.

<sup>8</sup> Origen *C. Celsum*, VIII. 37.

every one in his own language prays to God, and gives thanks, as he is able : and the God of all languages hears them that pray in all dialects, even as if all spake with but one voice." From Jerome we learn, that sometimes more than one language was used in the same service, because of the presence of men from different nations. He says, that, "at the funeral of Paula, the Psalms were sung in Greek, Latin, and Syriac, because men of each of those languages were there."<sup>1</sup> Indeed, eminent schoolmen and Roman Catholic divines, as Lyra, Thomas Aquinas and Harding, have fully allowed that in the primitive Church prayers were offered up in the vulgar tongue, that the people might be the better instructed.<sup>2</sup>

The way in which the use of a dead language for public worship came in, is pretty obvious. The Romans, as masters of the western world, strove to impose their own language on their colonial subjects. Thus the common tongue of Europe was Latin. The ecclesiastics were in constant connection with Rome, the centre of civilization, the chief city of Christian Europe. Thus the language most generally understood became too the language of liturgical worship. By degrees, out of the ancient Latin grew the French, the Italian, the Spanish, and other dialects. Still the old Latin liturgies were preserved, and for a long time were, with no great difficulty, understood. By this time the clergy throughout the western Church had become still more closely united to Rome. More too of mystery had grown over men's minds with regard to the Church's sacred ordinances. Hence all things conspired to make the clergy willing to leave in the language of the central city the prayers of the distant provinces. And thus the change, which became needful when men's languages had changed, was never effected. A feeling too that, as the Church was one and yet universal, so there should be but one universal tongue in which her prayers and praises should go up to God, lent a colouring of piety and poetry to the old custom of having Latin liturgies. And so till the Reformation, no efficient attempt was made to reform what many must have deemed an error, and to make the worship of God, to people as well as priests, a reasonable service.

When this question came to be discussed in the Council of Trent, it was forbidden by an anathema to say that the mass should

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. *Ad Eustochium, Epitaphium Paulæ Matris, juxta fin.* Tom. iv. Part II. p. 687.

<sup>2</sup> Lyra, in 1 *Cor.* xiv. 17; Aquinas *In* 1 *Cor.* xiv. Vol. xvi. fol. 84; Harding,

*Contra Juellum*, Art. 8, sect. 28. See Usher, as above; Jer. Taylor, *Dissuasive*, pt. I. ch. I. sect. 7; Bingham, **3k**. XIII. ch. IV.

not be celebrated in any but the vulgar tongue, or the consecration not performed in a low voice.<sup>1</sup> And though in modern times some prayers are offered in the churches of the Roman communion in tongues understood of the people, yet the mass is never celebrated except in Latin, both to avoid profanation, and lest the very words which are supposed to have been used from the beginning should lose any of their force or sacredness by translation.

---

## SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

IT is not likely that there should be very much said in Scripture on this subject. The Bible seldom suggests, even to condemn, errors into which men had never fallen. Certainly, however, we can find no trace among the Jews of the use of prayers in an unknown tongue, nor yet among the Apostolic Christians.

The only case in point appears to be that of the exercise of the gift of tongues among the Corinthian Christians. The purpose for which that miraculous power was conferred, was evidently, that the Gospel might be preached by unlearned men to all nations, peoples, and languages. Some of the Corinthian converts, having received the gift by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles, used it to ostentation, not to edification, speaking in the congregations in languages not understood by those who were present. St. Paul rebukes this in the xivth chapter of his first Epistle; and there incidentally shows, that prayer in a tongue not intelligible to the congregation is contrary to the due order of the Church and the will of God. This is especially observable in verses 14–17: “If I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also. Else, when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing that he understandeth not what thou sayest?” So again ver. 19: “In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.” And ver. 28: “If there be no interpreter, let him” (*i. e.* the person who can speak only in a tongue unknown

<sup>1</sup> *CONS.* XXII. Can. 9. See also Sarpi, *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, p. 540.



to the hearers) “keep silence in the Church; and let him speak to himself and to God.”

All these arguments seem as clearly against having liturgies in a dead language, as against the custom which had grown up in the Church of Corinth, of using the gift of tongues when there was none to interpret them. Prayer is to be with the understanding, not with the spirit only. Prayer and thanksgiving are not to be offered publicly in words, to which the unlearned cannot say Amen. A man may pray in such words in private to God, but not publicly in the Church. The reason assigned is, “God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints” (ver. 33). And the general rule laid down is, “Let all things be done to edifying” (ver. 26).

No arguments from expediency seem fit to be set against such decisions of the Apostles. Now the only arguments of any weight for retaining Latin in the Liturgies are arguments from expediency. For instance, it is said, Latin is a general language, and so, well for the whole Church to use. But it is more true to say, that it is generally unknown, than that it is generally known; for it is only the learned in all lands that understand it; the masses of the people (who have souls to be saved as well as the more instructed) do not understand it anywhere. It is said, that the holy services are kept from profanation by being veiled in the mystery of a difficult tongue. But it is surely more profanation, when people mutter sacred things, or listen to them being muttered, without understanding them, than when they reverently and intelligently join with heart and mind in solemnizing them. It is said again, that the use of the dead language fixes and preserves the sacred services; so that words used from Apostolic times are still used by the Church; and the mass is celebrated in the same syllables in which it was said by the primitive bishops. This, if extended to the whole service of the mass, is not strictly true; for the Roman missal does not actually agree with the various primitive liturgies, which primitive liturgies have considerable varieties among themselves. If the statement be confined to the very words of consecration; then surely we ought to use, not Latin, but Greek, in which these words are to be found in the new Testament. If these be any virtue in the very words themselves, we are no nearer the original, if we say, *Hoc est Corpus Meum*, than if we say, *This is My Body*.

In short, the custom of having prayers in an unknown tongue appears to have originated in a kind of accident, but to have been

perpetuated by design. It originated in the Latin becoming obsolete in Europe, and the prayers not being translated, as the various European dialects grew up. It was then found to be a means of keeping up mystery, and so priestly power; and therefore it was preserved. But it is evidently without authority from Scripture, or from the primitive Church

## ARTICLE XXV.

### *Of the Sacraments.*

SACRAMENTS ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in Him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.

### *De Sacramentis.*

SACRAMENTA a Christo instituta, non tantum sunt notæ professionis Christianorum, sed certa quædam potius testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiæ atque bonæ in nos voluntatis Dei, per quæ invisibiliter Ipse in nos operatur, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

Duo a Christo Domino nostro in Evangelio instituta sunt sacramenta, scilicet, Baptismus et Cœna Domini.

Quinque illa vulgo nominata Sacramenta; scilicet, Confirmatio, pœnitentia, ordo, matrimonium, et extrema unctio, pro sacramentis evangelicis habenda non sunt, ut quæ partim a prava apostolorum imitatione profluxerunt, partim vitæ status sunt in scripturis quidem probati, sed sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Cœna Domini rationem non habentes, ut quæ signum aliquod visibile, ceu cæremoniã a Deo institutam non habeant.

Sacramenta non in hoc instituta sunt a Christo, ut spectarentur aut circumferrentur; sed ut rite illis uteremur, et in his duntaxat, qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum: Qui vero indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

THE main substance of this Article is taken from the XIIIth Article of the Confession of Augsburg, the very words of which are adopted in the first part of it.<sup>1</sup> The Articles agreed on between the Anglican and Lutheran reformers, in 1538, had one Article (the IXth) to the same purport; though that went on to speak of Infant Baptism.<sup>2</sup> The XXVth Article of 1552 contained nearly the same statements as the present XXVth; but had

<sup>1</sup> "De usu Sacramentorum docent; quod Sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his qui utuntur . . . . proposita, &c." — *Confess. August. Art. XIII.*

<sup>2</sup> Cranmer's Works by Jenkyns, iv.; Appendix, p. 285.

no reference to the seven Sacraments. It asserted that the wholesome effect of the Sacraments was not *ex opere operato*, “*of work wrought.*” Moreover, there was the following sentence in it by way of introduction, which is almost in the words of St. Augustine: “Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit together a company of new people with the Sacraments, most few in number, most easy to be kept, most excellent in signification, as is Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.”<sup>1</sup>

We may divide the Article, as it now stands, into four heads.

I. Concerning the number of the Sacraments of the Gospel.

II. Concerning their efficacy.

III. Concerning their proper use.

IV. Concerning their worthy reception.

The whole Article is introductory to the six next in order after it, and is rather concerned with definitions than ought else. And as such I purpose to consider it.

I. The word Sacrament (*Sacramentum*) is an ecclesiastical, rather than a Scriptural term. It is used indeed in the Latin translations for the Greek word *μυστήριον*, *mystery*. Yet the technical use of both these terms in the Christian Church is rather patristic than Apostolical. The original meaning of the word *Sacramentum* was (1) anything sacred, hence (2) a sacred deposit, a pledge, and (3) most commonly, an oath, especially the military oath, which soldiers took to be faithful to their country, and obey the orders of their general. Whether the first, or the last and ordinary sense of the word was the origin of the ecclesiastical usage of it, may be a question.

The earliest application of the term to anything Christian is to be found in the well-known letter of Pliny the younger to the emperor Trajan; in which he speaks of the Christians as wont to meet together on a certain fixed day, before sunrise, when they chanted hymns to Christ as to God, and *bound themselves by a Sacrament* not to commit any sort of wickedness.<sup>2</sup> It is possible,

<sup>1</sup> The words of St. Augustine are: “Sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatione facillimis, significatione præstantissimis, societatem novi populi collegavit, sicuti est Baptismus Trinitatis nomine consecratus, communicatio Corporis et Sanguinis Ipsius; et si quid aliud in Scripturis Canonicis commendatur.”—*Epistol.* 54, *Op.* Tom. II. p. 124. He uses nearly the same words, *De Doct. Christ.* Lib. III. c. 9, Tom. III. pars 1. p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> “Adfirmabant autem, hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ. vel erroris, quod essent soliti, stato die, ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem; seque *Sacramento* non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent.”—*Plin. Epist.* 97.

that the word *Sacrament* here meant simply *an oath*. Yet since Pliny reported it, as the Christians had told it to him, it is probable enough, that he used the very word which he had heard from them, and that they used it in the Christian and technical sense, howsoever Pliny may have understood it. It is generally supposed that its *application* in this passage was to the Supper of the Lord.<sup>1</sup>

In Tertullian, the earliest of the Latin fathers, we find the notion of the military oath applied to the Christian's baptismal vow, to serve faithfully under the banner of the cross. "We were called to the warfare of the living God, when we made answer according to the words of the Sacrament (*in Sacramenti verba respondimus*). No soldier goes to war with luxuries,"<sup>2</sup> &c.

This, however, is an exception to the rule. The commoner use of the word is either for a sacred rite in general, an outward sign of some more hidden reality — or else for certain particular, more exalted rites of the Gospel and the Church. It has, in short, a more extended, and a more restricted force. In its more extended sense, it signified little more than a religious ordinance or a sacred sign. Thus Tertullian, speaking of the charges of infanticide, brought by the heathens against the Christians, says that Christians were charged with "the Sacrament of infanticide."<sup>3</sup> He calls our Lord's anointing by the Holy Ghost, *Sacramentum unctionis*.<sup>4</sup> St. Cyprian speaks of the many Sacraments contained in the Lord's Prayer.<sup>5</sup> He calls the three hours of prayer, "a Sacrament of the Trinity."<sup>6</sup> He says, the manna was "a Sacrament of the equality with which Christ diffuses His gifts of light and grace upon His Church; and that the Red Sea was a Sacrament (*i. e.* a divinely ordained figure) of baptism."<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, we hear some of the ancients speaking of the two great ordinances of Baptism and the Eucharist, not as each but one Sacrament, but as *each containing two Sacraments*. In Baptism, the two Sacraments were the water, and the chrism which was anciently used after it.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, ch. I.

<sup>2</sup> *Ad Mart.* 3; conf. *De Spectaculis*, 24; *De Corona*, 18; *De Idololatria*, 6, &c. Cf. Hieronym. *Epist.* I. *ad Heliodorum*: "Recordare tyrocinii tui diem, quo Christo in baptisate consepultus, in sacramenti verba jurasti." — *On the Baptismal Profession*, see Bingham, xi. vii. 6.

<sup>3</sup> "Dicimur sceleratissimi, de sacramento infanticidii." — *Apolog.* 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Adv. Præzeam*, 28; see Bp. Kaye, *Tertullian*, p. 358.

<sup>5</sup> "Qualia autem sunt, fratres dilectissimi, orationis Dominicæ sacramenta, quam multa, quam magna breviter in sermone collecta." — Cypr. *De Oratione Dominica*, T. 142. Oxford, 1682.

<sup>6</sup> "Horam tertiam, sextam, nonam, sacramento scilicet Trinitatis." — *Ibid.* E. 154.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* *Epistol.* 69, al. 76, E. 187.

<sup>8</sup> Immediately after baptism in the early ages, followed the unction or chrism, and confirmation, or the laying on of hands. So Tertullian: "Exinde

In the Eucharist, the two Sacraments were the bread and the wine. Thus St. Cyprian twice speaks of regeneration as to be obtained by the reception of both Sacraments; where the context shows, that the two Sacraments mean the washing of water and the imposition of hands, considered as parts of the one ordinance of Baptism.<sup>1</sup> And so Isidore speaks of four great Sacraments, namely, Baptism and Chrism, the Body and the Blood of Christ.<sup>2</sup>

The use of the term *Sacrament* then was very different among the fathers from its ordinary use amongst us. Yet there was with them also a more restricted use of the term; and there is abundant proof that the two great Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist were markedly separated from, and preferred before all other sacraments or ordinances. It is observed, that Justin Martyr in his first apology, (see pp. 93, 97,) when giving an account of the Christian religion and of its rites, mentions only Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Tertullian uses the word *Sacramentum* with the common laxity of the early writers, yet he specially applies it to Baptism, which he calls *Sacramentum Fidei*,<sup>3</sup> *Aquæ*,<sup>4</sup> *Lavacri*,<sup>5</sup> and to the Eucharist, which he calls *Sacramentum Eucharisticæ*.<sup>6</sup> He does not seem to have applied it to any of the five Romish Sacraments, except to marriage, concerning which he specially alludes to the Latin translation of Eph. v. 32, where μέγα μυστήριον is rendered *magnum Sacramentum*.<sup>7</sup> The same is the case

egressi de lavacro perungimur benedicta unctione." — *De Baptismo*, 7. "Dehinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem invocans, et invitans Spiritum Sanctum." — c. 8. Confirmation was anciently considered part of baptism, and followed on it immediately. See Bingham, xii. 3; Suicer, s. v. *χρίσμα*, ii. 1534; *Ελαων*, i. 1077; and Hooker, Bk. v. ch. 66

Confirmation was sometimes delayed from the difficulty of obtaining the presence of a bishop at the time of baptism; but unction seems to have been always administered with baptism. "Ungi quoque necesse est eum, qui baptizatus sit, ut accepto Chrismate, id est, unctione, esse unctus Dei, et habere in se gratiam Christi possit." — *Cypr. Epist. lxx. E. 190.*

The custom of anointing after baptism was retained by our reformers in the first Service Book, though omitted in the second. The following was the form prescribed. "Then the priest shall anoint the infant upon the head, saying, Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath regenerate thee

by water and the Holy Ghost, and hath given thee remission of all thy sins, He vouchsafeth to anoint thee with the unction of His Holy Spirit, and bring thee to the inheritance of everlasting life. Amen." — *Two Liturgies of Edw. VI. Oxf. 1838, p. 334.*

Confirmation was not considered essential to the receiving of the Holy Ghost in baptism, but was "only a sacramental complement." — See Hooker, v. ch. lxxvi. § 6, and St. Jerome, as cited there.

<sup>1</sup> "Tunc demum plene sanctificari, et esse Filii Dei possunt, si sacramento utroque nascantur," &c. — *Epist. lxxii. E. 196, Cf. Ep. lxxiii. p. 207.* See also Bingham, xii. i. 4.

<sup>2</sup> "Sunt autem sacramenta, baptismus et chrisma; corpus et sanguis Christi." — *Isidor. Origin. Lib. v. c. xix. apud Bingham, ubi supr.s.*

<sup>3</sup> *De Anima*, i.

<sup>4</sup> *De Baptismo*, 1, 12.

<sup>5</sup> *De Virgin. Veland.* 2.

<sup>6</sup> *De Corona*, 3.

<sup>7</sup> *De Jejuniiis*, 3. See Bishop Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 358.

with the later Latin fathers. St. Augustine, when contrasting the Sacraments of the Law with those of the Gospel, speaks of the former as many, but the latter as very few, and then enumerates only Baptism and the Communion: in one passage adding, "and if there be any other commended to us in the Canonical Scriptures:" but in another, instancing only Baptism and the Lord's Supper.<sup>1</sup> In like manner, speaking of Adam and Eve as types of Christ and the Church, he says that, "As from the side of Adam when sleeping sprang Eve, so from the side of Christ sleeping on the Cross flowed the Sacraments of the Church" (*Sacramenta Ecclesie profuxerunt*), i. e. the two Sacraments typified by the water and the blood.<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere he says, "The water and the blood which flowed from the side, were the twin Sacraments of the Church (*Ecclesie gemina Sacramenta*), the water in which the bride is purified, the blood with which she is endowed."<sup>3</sup>

The same thing is observable among the Greeks. Though they use the word *mystery*, as the Latins do *Sacrament*, for any sacred sign; yet baptism and the Eucharist are markedly distinguished from all other ordinances. Ignatius speaks of them as the two rites, which may not be celebrated without the bishop's authority.<sup>4</sup> St. Cyril couples "the holy mysteries of baptism," and the "spiritual and heavenly mysteries" "of the Holy Altar," as those things for which the catechumens were trained.<sup>5</sup> St. Chrysostom joins together Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as the two ordinances necessary to salvation. "If none can enter into the kingdom of Heaven except he be born again of water and the Spirit, and if he who eateth not the Flesh of the Lord nor drinketh His blood is cast out of life eternal, and if these things are performed by the hands of the priests,"<sup>6</sup> &c. So he speaks, almost in the same terms with St. Augustine, of the blood and water from our Saviour's side, as typifying the two mysteries or Sacraments

<sup>1</sup> In the one passage, *Epist.* 54, given above, he says: "Sicuti est baptismus Trinitatis nomine consecratus, communicatio corporis et sanguinis ipsius, et si quid aliud in Scripturis Canonicis commendatur."

In the other passage, *De Doctrina Christiana*, Lib. III. c. 9, he says simply: "Sicuti est baptismus et celebratio Corporis et Sanguinis Domini."

<sup>2</sup> In *Johann. Evang.* cap. iv. tract. xv. Tom. III. pars 2, p. 409.

<sup>3</sup> "Percussum est enim latus Ejus, ut evangelium loquitur, et statim manavit sanguis et aqua, quæ sunt Ecclesie gem-

ina sacramenta; aqua ex qua est sponsa purificata, sanguis ex quo invenitur esse dotata." — *De Symb. ad Catech.* 15, Tom. VI. p. 562.

This latter book is not certainly Augustine's; though the Benedictine editors consider this genuine, and the three tracts which follow it spurious. The like sentiments occur often in St. Augustine. See *Serm.* cccix. c. 14; In *Vigiliis Paschæ*, quoted under Art. XIX. Sect. I.

<sup>4</sup> *Smyrn.* VIII.

<sup>5</sup> *Cateches.* XVIII. 14.

<sup>6</sup> *De Sacerdot.* III.

by which the Church is constituted.<sup>1</sup> In which expressions he is followed, nearly word for word, by Theophylact.<sup>2</sup>

With whatever latitude therefore the word *mystery* and *Sacrament* are used in their general acceptation by the fathers, there is still a higher and more special signification, in which they are applied to the two great ordinances of the Gospel, instituted by Christ Himself.<sup>3</sup>

As for the number *seven* insisted on by the Church of Rome, we cannot find it in the writings of the fathers. Peter Lombard is said to have first devised it in the twelfth century, and from him it was adopted generally by the Schoolmen.<sup>4</sup> It was laid down with authority in a decree to the Armenians, sent from the Council of Florence 1439, which runs only in the name of Pope Eugenius.<sup>5</sup> It was then confirmed by the provincial Council of Sens, otherwise called the Council of Paris, A. D. 1528;<sup>6</sup> after that, by the Council of Trent, A. D. 1547.<sup>7</sup> It finally stands as part of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.<sup>8</sup>

The confessions of all the reformed Churches speak of but *two* Sacraments of the Gospel.<sup>9</sup> In England, the *Articles about Religion* and the *Necessary Doctrine*, put forth in Henry VIIIth's reign, in 1536 and 1543 respectively, retain the notion of seven Sacraments. Even the first book of Homilies, A. D. 1547, speaks of "the Sacrament of matrimony," and that, immediately after speaking of the "Sacrament of baptism."<sup>10</sup> Cranmer's Catechism speaks of three Sacraments as instituted by Christ, baptism, absolution, the Lord's Supper.<sup>11</sup> But the final judgment of the reformed Church of England appears first in this Article; secondly, in the language of the Catechism, where Sacraments are defined as outward signs of inward grace, "ordained by Christ Himself," and are said to be

<sup>1</sup> ἐξῆλθε δὲ γὰρ ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα. οὐκ ἀπλῶς, οὐδὲ ὡς ἐτυχεν. αὐταὶ ἐξῆλθον αἱ πηγαὶ ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἐξ ἑμφοτέρων τούτων ἡ ἐκκλησία συνέστηκε· καὶ ἴσασιν οἱ μυσταγωγούμενοι δι' ὕδατος μὲν ἀναγεννώμενοι, δι' αἵματος δὲ καὶ σαρκὸς τρεφόμενοι. ἐντεῦθεν ὡρχήν λαμβάνει τὰ μυστήρια. — *Homil. in Johann.* 85, Tom. II. p. 915.

Elsewhere he speaks of the blood and water being *eis τύπον τῶν μυστηρίων*, for a type of the Sacraments. — Tom. V. *Homil.* CXVIII.

<sup>2</sup> Οὐχ ἀπλῶς ταῦτα γίνεται, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡ ζωὴ διὰ τούτων τῶν δύο γίνεται καὶ συνίσταται, δι' ὕδατος μὲν γεννάμεθα, δι' αἵματος καὶ σώματος τρεφόμεθα. — *Theophyl. In Johann.*, cap. XIX. See Suicer, s. v. μυστῆρ.

<sup>3</sup> It should be added that both *mys-*

*tery* and *Sacrament* were κατ' ἐξοχὴν applied to the Eucharist. See Suicer, as above, and Waterland, *On the Eucharist*, ch. I.

<sup>4</sup> Lombard *Sentent.* Liv. IV. dist. II. § 1.  
<sup>5</sup> *Decret. Eugen. Papæ IV. ad Armenos ap. Labb. Concil.* Tom. XIII. p. 534.

<sup>6</sup> Can. X.; *Labb. Concil.* Tom. XIV. p. 454.

<sup>7</sup> Sess. VII. Can. I. See Archbishop Bramhall, *Answer to M. De la Milletière*, Bramhall's *Works*, I. p. 55. Oxf. 1842.

<sup>8</sup> See *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 4.

<sup>9</sup> See Luther's *Catechismus Major, Opera*, Tom. V. p. 636; *Sylloge Confessionum*, pp. 75, 127, 277, 349, 376.

<sup>10</sup> *First Part of the Sermon of Swearing.*

<sup>11</sup> Cranmer's *Catechism*, p. 183. On the effect of Absolution, see p. 202.



“two only as generally necessary to salvation;” and thirdly, in the second book of Homilies, the words of which are so much to the purpose that we may well refer to them here: “As for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for the visible signs, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sins, and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two: namely, baptism and the Supper of the Lord. For, although absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin; yet by the express word of the new Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign (I mean laying on of hands) is not expressly commanded in the new Testament to be used in absolution, as the visible signs in baptism and the Lord’s Supper are: and therefore absolution is not such Sacrament as baptism and the communion are. And though the ordering of ministers hath His visible sign and promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of sins, as all other Sacraments except the two above-named do. Therefore neither it, nor any other Sacrament else, be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are. But in general acceptation the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything, whereby an holy thing is signified. In which understanding of the word the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five, commonly of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven Sacraments; but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby to repute them as Sacraments in the same signification that the two fore-named Sacraments are. *Dionysius, Bernard, de Coena Domini, et Ablut. pedum.*”<sup>1</sup>

In this passage we see clearly our own Church’s definition of a Sacrament, and the points of difference between ourselves and the Romish divines. The Homily defines a Sacrament of the Gospel to be “a visible sign expressly commended to us in the new Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sins, and of our holiness and joining in Christ.” This closely corresponds with the words of the Catechism: “An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same” spiritual grace, “and a pledge to assure us thereof.” And again, the definition of this XXVth Article is of similar significance: “Sacraments *ordained of Christ be . . . certain sure witnesses,*

<sup>1</sup> *Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments.*

and effectual (*efficacia*) signs of grace, and God's good-will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us."

Now this definition does not exclude matrimony, confirmation, absolution, and orders, from being *in some sense* Sacraments; but it excludes them from being "*such* Sacraments as baptism and the Communion." No other ordinances but baptism and Communion have an express sign ordained by Christ Himself, and annexed thereto the promise of free forgiveness of sins," and "of inward and spiritual grace given to us." Therefore these have clearly a preëminence over all other ordinances, and may therefore *κατ' ἔξοχὴν* be called Sacraments of the Gospel: being also the only ordinances which are "generally necessary to salvation."

It seems hardly needful to enter on a full consideration of each of the five Romish Sacraments here. Four out of the five the Church of England admits, at least in a modified form. This Article declares them to be "such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly to be states of life allowed in the Scriptures." Matrimony is especially to be called a "state of life allowed in the Scriptures." It is possible, that orders and confirmation may be so called also. Yet orders, confirmation, and penance or absolution, as the Roman Church administers them, are mixed with some superstitious ceremonies. Hence perhaps they, as well as extreme unction, may be considered in the Article, to have "grown" (in their Roman Catholic or mediæval form) "of the corrupt following of the Apostles."

1. *Confirmation*, in the primitive Church, followed immediately on baptism, and, as above noted, was made ordinarily a part of baptism. Tertullian and Cyril of Jerusalem both speak of the catechumens as first receiving baptism, and then immediately on their coming out of the water, receiving chrism and imposition of hands.<sup>1</sup> The separation of confirmation from baptism arose, sometimes from the difficulty of obtaining the presence of a bishop, sometimes from the reconciling of heretics, who were confirmed but not rebaptized, and latterly from the deferring the confirmation of infants; it being thought good that, though baptized, they should delay their confirmation till they were trained and seasoned for serving as soldiers in the army of Christ.<sup>2</sup> The result has been that, after the first ages, confirmation became a separate rite from

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 7, 8, quoted above. Cyril. *Catech. Myst.* III. 1, Ὑμῶν ὁμοίως ἀναβεβηκόσιν ἀπὸ τῆς κολυμβήθρας ὡν ἱερῶν ναμάτων ἐδόθη χρίσμα. — See

Bingham, XII. i. 1; Suicer, s. vv. *σφραγίς, χρίσμα.*

<sup>2</sup> See Hooker, Bk. v. lxvi. 7.

baptism, and we still continue it as such, believing that so it is more fit for edifying.

2. *Ordination* we esteem, scarcely less than does the Church of Rome, as an appointment of Christ Himself. We believe that God gives grace for the office of the ministry to those who receive it aright. We observe that, though our Lord commanded no particular sign, yet the Apostles always used the laying on of hands. But with regard to the inward grace, we read not that forgiveness of sins or personal sanctification were promised to its right reception, but rather the Holy Ghost for the work of the ministry. Therefore, although we retain it as essential for the maintenance of a rightly constituted ministry in the Church, yet we place it not on a par with the two Sacraments of baptism and Communion: which are the means of obtaining and increasing spiritual life to our souls, and of binding together the company of God's people in one.<sup>1</sup>

3. *Matrimony* is not so much a Sacrament of the Gospel as "an honourable estate, instituted of God in the time of man's innocency;" it is neither a badge, "by which Christian men are discerned from others, which be not christened;" nor is it a means, whereby pardon of sins and inward sanctification are conveyed to us by the Spirit of God. Hence again, though, like other sacred ceremonies, it may be called a Sacrament, and anciently was so called, it comes not under our definition of a Sacrament of the Gospel. In the Epistle to the Ephesians (v. 32), St. Paul does indeed say concerning it, "This is a great mystery;" or rather (Τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν), "This mystery is great." The Latins have translated his words *magnum est Sacramentum*; and so it has been argued, that matrimony is specially called a Sacrament. It is plain, however, that St. Paul's meaning is merely this. The marriage of Adam and Eve (and indeed marriage in the general) was esteemed by the Jews, and is constantly spoken of in the new Testament, as a figure, type or *mystery* of the union and marriage betwixt Christ and his Church. The fathers all seem to understand it so. Tertullian says, that Adam's calling Eve "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh," was a great Sacrament concerning Christ and His Church.<sup>2</sup> St. Chrysostom understands it that marriage was an allegory of Christ's union to His Bride, the Church. "That it was something great and wonderful, Moses, or rather

<sup>1</sup> "In nullum nomen religionis sive veræ sive falsæ coagulari homines possunt, nisi aliquo signaculorum vel sacramentorum visibilibus consortio colligantur."—August. *C. Fovstum*, XIX. 11. See Wordsworth, *Theophil. Anglic.* ch. VIIII.

<sup>2</sup> "Nam etsi Adam statim prophetavit, magnum illud sacramentum in Christum et Ecclesiam: *Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis*," &c.—*De Anima*, c. 11. See also *De Exhort. Castitut.* c. 5.

God, intimated. For the present, however, saith he, I speak concerning Christ, both that He left the Father, and came down, came to the Bride, and became one Spirit. *For he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit.* And he says well, *It is a great mystery.* And then as though he were to say, nevertheless the allegory does not destroy affection, he adds, *Let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself.*"<sup>1</sup> So too Theodoret and Theophylact<sup>2</sup> explain it, namely, that the Apostle speaks of marriage as a mystery or allegory of Christ and the Church.

4. *Penance* in the Church of Rome consists of three parts: confession, absolution, and satisfaction. The origin of it was in the early penitential discipline of the Church. In the primitive ages, when baptized Christians had committed grievous sins, they were placed for a time in the position of penitents. Their discipline consisted of three parts: namely, 1, confession; 2, separation from the Church; 3, absolution.

At first it appears that confession was made publicly by the offender in the face of the Church, and was probably an humble acknowledgment of sins which already had given offence to the company of believers.<sup>3</sup> Yet very early it was commended to penitents to seek out for themselves a wise spiritual adviser, to whom they should confide their more secret offences, that, if he judged it expedient, such offences might afterwards be confessed in the face of the congregation.<sup>4</sup> In process of time the bishops appointed a regular officer or penitentiary, to hear these private confessions, and to judge whether they should be made public or not. Socrates says, this officer was first appointed for the restoration of those who had lapsed in the Decian persecution;<sup>5</sup> though Sozomen thinks such a minister must have been necessary, and so in existence from the first.<sup>6</sup> The duty of this penitentiary was, to inquire into the nature of the penitents' offences, to prescribe to them certain modes of humiliation, and if needful a public acknowledgment of their sins; and then to give them absolution.<sup>7</sup> In course of time, a scandalous offence having been confessed to a presbyter in the

<sup>1</sup> Chrysost. *In Ephes.* v. 32, *Homil.* xx.

<sup>2</sup> Theodoret and Theophylact, *ad hunc locum.* See Suicer, s. v. *μυστήριον.* See also Hammond and Whitby *On Ephes.* v. 33. Macknight has an excellent note on the passage.

<sup>3</sup> See Tertullian, *De Pœnitentia*, c. 9, 10; Augustin. *Homil.* xlix. 3, Tom. v. p. 1054.

<sup>4</sup> So Origen: "Tantummodo circumspice diligentius cui debeas confiteri pec-

catum tuum . . . Si intellexerit et præviderit talem esse languorem tuum qui in conventu totius Ecclesiæ exponi debeat et curari, ex quo fortassis et cæteri ædificari poterunt, et tu ipse facile sanari," &c. — Origen *In Ps.* xxxvii. *Homil.* 2.

<sup>5</sup> Socr. *H. E.* Lib. v. c. 19.

<sup>6</sup> Sozomen, Lib. vii. c. 16.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

Greek Church, which produced a public excitement, Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, was induced to abolish the office of penitentiary.<sup>1</sup> St. Chrysostom was the immediate successor of Nectarius. It appears from his writings, that public confession still continued to be a part of discipline; <sup>2</sup> although we have reason to think that the congregation was not always informed of the exact nature of the crimes for which the penitent was suffering penance and confessing guilt, but only that they knew them to be great and deadly offences.<sup>3</sup> This much, however, we learn from the writings both of St. Chrysostom and of his great contemporary, St. Augustine, that the Church in their days did not consider private confession of private sins essential to salvation, but only the public confession of public scandals necessary to the discipline of the Church. "What have I to do with men," says St. Augustine, "that they should hear my confessions?" <sup>4</sup> "I do not compel you," says St. Chrysostom, "to discover your sins in the presence of men. Unfold your conscience before God, show Him your wounds, and from Him seek healing."<sup>5</sup>

Leo the Great, who was Bishop of Rome, A. D. 440, is said to have been the first innovator on the penitential discipline of the Church; for he forbade sins which had been confessed to the priest to be published in the Church, deciding that private confession was sufficient for the clearing of the conscience of the offenders.<sup>6</sup> Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury in the seventh century, is said to have been the first who altogether abolished public penance for private sins.<sup>7</sup> Redemption of penance also by pecuniary fines became, in process of time, a common practice, which some also refer to Theodore as the originator.<sup>8</sup> Along with private confession grew the custom of private absolution.<sup>9</sup> And afterwards the form itself of absolution became more peremptory and authoritative; <sup>10</sup> till at length auricular confession, followed by absolution and satisfaction, was elevated to the full dignity of a necessary Sacrament.

<sup>1</sup> Socr. Sozom. Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> *Epist. ad Innocent.* Tom. III. p. 517; *In Epist. ad Ephes. Hom.* III. Tom. XI. p. 23; *In Epist. ad Ebræ. Hom.* IV. Tom. XII. pp. 48, 49.

<sup>3</sup> August. *In Symbol. ad Catechumen.* Lib. I. c. 15.

<sup>4</sup> "Quid mihi ergo est cum hominibus, ut audiant confessiones meas, quasi ipsi sanaturi sint omnes languores meos?" — *Confessionum.* Lib. X. c. 3, Tom. I. p. 171.

<sup>5</sup> Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰς θεατρὸν σε ἄγω τῶν συνδούλων τῶν σῶν, οὐδὲ ἐκκάλυψαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀναγκάζω τὰ ἁμαρτήματα· τὸ συνειδὸς ἀνάπτυσον ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ αὐτῷ

δείξον τὰ τραύματα, καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ τὰ φάρμακα αἰτησον. Chrysost. *De Incomprehensibili Dei Natura*, Hom. V. § 7, Tom. I. p. 490.

<sup>6</sup> Leo. *Epist.* 136, *ad Episc. Campan.*

<sup>7</sup> "Theodorus, homo græcus, primus aperte morem sustulit publice de criminibus occultis pœnitendi." — Morinus *De Administ. Pœnitent.* X. 17, 2, quoted by Marshall in *Penitential Discipline*, ch. III. § 1.

<sup>8</sup> Marshall, ch. III. § 2.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. § 3.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. § 4.

The Council of Trent anathematizes all who deny it to be truly and properly a Sacrament, instituted by Christ Himself,<sup>1</sup> and necessary to salvation *jure divino*, or who say that the method of confessing secretly to the priest alone (which the Church Catholic has observed from the beginning) is alien to Christ's institution and of human invention.<sup>2</sup>

The reformed Churches have generally abolished auricular confession, as obligatory and sacramental. The Lutherans indeed still retain it, as a regular part of Church order and discipline. The Augsburg Confession declares concerning confession, that it is right to retain private absolution in the Church, but that it is not necessary in confession to enumerate every individual sin.<sup>3</sup> Calvin also recommended both private confession to a pastor, and private absolution when needed for the remedy of any special infirmity; but he says, it should not be made obligatory upon all, but only commended to such as need it.<sup>4</sup> Our own reformers appear to have taken the same wise and moderate view. Ridley, the greatest light of the English Reformation, writes shortly before his death: "Confession unto the minister, which is able to instruct, correct, comfort, and inform the weak, wounded, and ignorant conscience, indeed I ever thought might do much good in Christ's congregation, and so, I assure you, I think even to this day."<sup>5</sup> So the second part of the Homily of Repentance, after condemning the auricular confession of the Church of Rome, says, "I do not say, but that if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor," &c. The exhortation to the Communion bids those, who cannot quiet their own consciences, come to the curate, "or some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief, that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly council and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." In the service for the Visitation of the Sick, it is enjoined on the minister, that he shall move the sick person "to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter;" and a form of absolution is appointed to be used, after such confession, to those who "humbly and heartily desire it." Thus the Church of England provides for all troubled consciences the power of relieving themselves, by making confession of guilt to their pastor.

<sup>1</sup> Sess. XIV. Can. I.

<sup>2</sup> Can. VI.

<sup>3</sup> *Conf. August.* Art. XII.; *Sylloge*, p.

<sup>4</sup> *Institut.* Lib. III. c. IV. §§ 12, 14.

<sup>5</sup> Letter to West, dated from Bocardo, in Oxford, April 8, 1554; *Letters of the Martyrs*, p. 30. London, 1837.

or “any other discreet and learned minister,” and so gives them comfort and counsel; but does not bind every one of necessity to rehearse all his private sins to man, nor elevate such useful confession into a Sacrament essential to salvation.<sup>1</sup>

The question concerning the power of the keys, as exercised by the ministers of God, may well be reserved to a future Article. It may be sufficient to observe here, that the chief Scripture ground for private confession is to be found in the language of St. James, chap. v. 14–16. There the Apostle counsels the sick to send for the presbyters of the Church who are to pray over them; and it is promised that such prayers shall be especially effectual for the pardon of sins. It is then added, “Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much” (ver. 16). And this is illustrated by the efficacy of the prayers of the prophet Elijah, at whose intercession rain was first withheld, and then given again. The context, in which all this occurs, compared with the promise given by our Lord to His ministers (Matt. xviii. 18. John xx. 23), and with the custom of the Church from the earliest times, has been ever considered as a ground for the practice continued in the Church of England, that the sick should be especially visited by the clergy, should be moved to confession of sins, and should look to the prayers of the minister as means for obtaining from God pardon, grace, and if it be His will, restoration to health and strength.<sup>2</sup>

There can be no doubt, that a distressed conscience may be soothed and guided by confidence in a spiritual adviser. Most people, much in earnest, and much oppressed with a sense of sin, have yearned for such confidence. Hence the Church should always afford to the sin-stricken soul the power of unburdening itself. But, on the other hand, whatever tends to lead people to substitute confession to man for confession to God, and to make the path of repentance less rugged than the Gospel makes it, must be dangerous. Such is the systematic and compulsory confession of the Church of Rome, followed as it is by absolution and penance, which too often seem to speak peace to the soul, perhaps before its peace is sealed in Heaven. The penitent finds it far easier to unburden his soul to the priest, than to seek, day and night, with broken spirit, for pardon from God: and, when he has once confided his griefs to his spiritual guide, he easily substitutes that guide's

<sup>1</sup> The student is especially referred for a history of this subject to Marshall's *Penitential Discipline*, ch. II. 111. <sup>2</sup> See Dr. Hammond on this passage of St James.

counsels for the dictates of his own conscience: and no counsels from without can speak as fearfully as the whispers of remorse within. Hence the danger of healing the wound lightly, — of substituting false peace for that peace which can come only from a true penitence, and from the sense of God's pardoning love through Christ. Confession has been well called "the luxury of repentance."<sup>1</sup> Access to it is not to be denied to the dying, the perplexed, or the broken-hearted; but it is to be feared for the morbid spirit, and still more to be feared, as a mere routine of ordinary life, as a salving over of the conscience stained by sin, and seeking an easy deliverance from its warnings and reproofs.

5. *Extreme Unction* is an ordinance concerning which we differ from the Church of Rome more than on the other four. We admit the proper use of confirmation, confession, orders, and matrimony; but extreme unction we neither esteem to be a Sacrament, nor an ordinance of the Church at all. As used in the modern Church of Rome, it implies unction with olive oil, blessed by the bishop, and applied by the priest to the five senses of the dying man. It is considered as conveying God's pardon and support in the last hour. It is administered when all hope of recovery is gone, and generally no food is permitted to be taken after it.

The Roman Catholic controversialists can find no primitive authority for this ordinance, except that of Pope Innocent the First, in the fifth century.<sup>2</sup> In a letter to Decentius<sup>3</sup> he answers a question, whether the sick might be anointed with oil, and whether the bishop might anoint? He replies that this might be done, arguing from the language of St. James. But, if extreme unction were then a Sacrament of the Church, it is impossible that one bishop should have asked this question of another; or, if he did, that the other should not at once have reminded him that it was a well-known sacrament of immemorial usage.<sup>4</sup> This is the only authority from patristic ages that the Romanist divines can bring.

They insist, therefore, the rather on the authority from Scripture. That authority, however, is but slender. When our Lord sent out His Apostles and gave them power to "heal the sick," "they anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them" (Mark vi. 13). Here unction was evidently an outward sign similar to that used by our Saviour, when He made clay and put it to the blind man's eyes. It was connected with the miraculous power

<sup>1</sup> Taylor's *Notes from Life*.

<sup>3</sup> *Epist. 1. ad Decentium*, c. 8.

<sup>2</sup> See Bellarmine, *De Extrema Unctione*, cap. IV.

<sup>4</sup> See Burnet on this Article.



of healing. That power lasted for some time in the Church. Accordingly, St. James desires the sick to send for the elders of the Church, to whom the miraculous gifts were mostly committed, and enjoins that with prayer for the pardon of sins should be joined anointing with oil, in order to the restoration of health; that as the Apostles used unction upon those whom they healed, so the elders of the Church, who had the gift of healing, should do likewise. "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up" (James v. 14, 15). Here the end of the anointing appears to be that "the Lord should raise him up." Now this exactly corresponds with the miraculous cures of the early ages, but not at all with the extreme unction of late times. Extreme unction is only administered when recovery is hopeless. St. James enjoined unction with the special object of recovery. So long then as miraculous powers remained in the Church, it was reasonable that anointing of the sick should be retained; but, when those powers ceased, it was reasonable that the unction should cease also.

It was very natural, however, that, when the miraculous powers began to decline, the custom of anointing, which at first had reference to bodily diseases, should still be continued with reference to spiritual maladies. Yet we cannot trace clearly the transition. The use of oil, connected with real or supposed miracles, is frequently alluded to; but it is not till late that there occurs any clear reference to it, as a religious or sacramental rite. Innocent III. at the end of the twelfth century, is quoted by Bellarmine next to Innocent I.<sup>1</sup> His witness is, no doubt, plain enough. A still fuller confirmation of extreme unction is given by Pope Eugenius in the Council of Florence; at which, it will be remembered, there was an intention of reconciling the Greek with the Latin Church.<sup>2</sup> The Greeks still practise unction, but do not esteem it a Sacrament. At the Council of Trent there were four canons passed, declaring extreme unction to be a Sacrament, instituted by Christ, conferring good, remitting sins, and comforting the infirm.<sup>3</sup>

The English reformers retained a form of anointing the sick in the first Service Book of Edward VI.; though it does not appear

<sup>1</sup> Bellarmine, *Ibid.* Bellarmine indeed refers to Origen, *Hom. 11. in Levit.*; Chrysostom, *De Sacerdot.* III. &c.; but he acknowledges that he only refers to them as quoting the words of St. James, not as speaking of the Sacrament of ex-

treme unction; of which they certainly do not speak. To anything farther he can call no witness, after Innocent I., before Alcuin.

<sup>2</sup> *Decretum Eugenii ad Armen. ubi supra*

<sup>3</sup> Sess. XIV.

that they attributed any sacramental efficacy to it, but merely allowed it to be used "if the sick person desired it," with a prayer for pardon of sins and restoration of bodily health.<sup>1</sup> Cranmer had long before, A. D. 1540, expressed his opinion, that there was no ground in Scripture or antiquity for considering the number of the Sacraments to be seven; and especially had pronounced, that "Unction of the sick with oil to remit venial sins, as it is now used, is not spoken of in Scripture, nor in any ancient author."<sup>2</sup> The second Service Book entirely omitted all reference to unction in the service for the Visitation of the Sick.

The merits of the question rest entirely on the two following points of inquiry: 1. Is the passage in St. James to be considered as Apostolical authority for the institution of a Sacrament in the Church? or has it reference to the cure of bodily disease? 2. Is the doubtful answer of Pope Innocent I., in the fifth century, sufficient ground for believing that extreme unction had prevailed from the first? or, on the contrary, do the deep silence of his predecessors, and his own hesitating reply, argue plainly, that they "had no such custom, neither the churches of God?" Roman Catholics answer affirmatively to the former of these alternatives. Reformed Churches undoubtingly adopt the latter.

Having thus considered what the Article says (I.) concerning the *number* of the Sacraments, we have paved the way for the rest of its statements. Limiting the name Sacrament to Baptism and the Eucharist, we have merely to consider (II.) what are the benefits we receive by; (III.) what is the right use of these two ordinances; and (IV.) who are their proper recipients?

## II. The efficacy of the Sacraments.

This question must be discussed more particularly in the XXVIIth and XXVIIIth Articles. To speak generally on it now, we may observe, that the doctrine of the fathers on this subject was very clear and strong from the very first. Ignatius speaks of a Christian's baptism as his spiritual armour,<sup>3</sup> and, concerning the Eucharist he writes, "If a man be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God."<sup>4</sup> "I desire the bread of God, which is the Flesh of Christ, and as drink I long for His Blood, which is love incorruptible."<sup>5</sup> The Epistle of Barnabas, which

<sup>1</sup> *Two Liturgies of Edward VI.* p. 866.

<sup>2</sup> See "Questions and Answers on the Sacraments," *Works*, II. pp. 100, 103.

<sup>3</sup> τὸ βάπτισμα ἡμῶν μενέτω ὡς δπλα.

— *Ad Polyc.* VII. This passage is in the Syriac version.

<sup>4</sup> *Ad Eph.* v.

<sup>5</sup> *Ad Rom.* VII. This passage also is in the Syriac.

though probably not written by the companion of St. Paul, is doubtless one of the earliest remains of Christian antiquity, speaks of "That baptism, which brings forgiveness of sins," and says, "That we go down into the water full of sins and pollutions, but come up again bringing forth fruit."<sup>1</sup> Justin Martyr, in his account of the Christian Sacraments, speaks of men as "regenerated" and receiving remission of sins in the water of baptism,<sup>2</sup> and as receiving in the Eucharist, not "common bread and common drink," but "the Flesh and Blood of the incarnate Jesus."<sup>3</sup> Irenæus is as clear on both the grace of baptism and the reception of Christ in the Eucharist.<sup>4</sup> Tertullian speaks of the "blessed Sacrament of water, in which, washed from the sins of our former blindness, we are liberated to life eternal;" in which we "as fish are born, after the pattern of our Ἰηθὺς, Jesus Christ."<sup>5</sup> In the Lord's Supper he speaks of feeding on the Body and Blood of Christ, that our soul may be fattened of God.<sup>6</sup> These are all writers of the first century from the Apostles.

It would keep us needlessly long, if we were to go through all the writers of the early ages. It may fairly be said, that with one voice they proclaim their belief that great spiritual blessings are to be obtained, by all faithful recipients, both in baptism and in the Supper of the Lord. The grace of the former they call remission of sins, regeneration, illumination;<sup>7</sup> the grace of the latter they call the Body and Blood of Christ. In both they looked to receive Christ; in both they hoped for pardon of sins, and the presence of the Spirit of God. The full meaning of these phrases we shall have to consider in the following articles. Let it suffice here to refer to the pregnant words of St. Augustine, in which he contrasts the Sacraments or ordinances of the Law with those of the Gospel; a change having been made, by which the Sacraments have become "easier, fewer, more healthful." "The Sacraments of the new Testament," he says, *give salvation*, whereas those of the old Testament only *promised a Saviour*.<sup>8</sup> Here we have the view of evangelical Sacraments which pervades all Christian antiquity, namely, that they differ from the ordinances of the old Law in this; the ordinances of the old Law were but pledges of future bless-

<sup>1</sup> *Epistol. Barnab.* c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol.* i. p. 93.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 97.

<sup>4</sup> See *Lib. i.* c. 18; *Lib. iii.* c. 19; *Lib. v.* c. 2, &c.

<sup>5</sup> *De Baptismo*, c. 1. "Nos pisciculi, secundum ἰηθὺν nostrum Jesum Christum, in aqua nascimur." Alluding to the word ἸΧΘΥΣ containing the initial

letters of our Lord's Name and titles, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτῆρ.

<sup>6</sup> *De Resurr. Carnis*, c. 8.

<sup>7</sup> *ὁρωσιὰς*. — See Suicer, s. h. v

<sup>8</sup> "Sacramenta N. Testamenti dant salutem; Sacramenta V. Testamenti promiserunt Salvatore." — *Enarr. in Ps. lxxiii.* § 2, Tom. iv. p. 769.

ings, not means to convey them, but the Sacraments of the Gospel not only promised Christ, but, to those who receive them in faith, they are means whereby God gives Christ to the soul.

We read, however, of some early heretics who denied the grace or the necessity of the Sacraments. Irenæus ascribes to some of the Gnostics the error of saying, that outward and material sacraments were unnecessary, so the soul were illuminated; <sup>1</sup> an opinion consistent enough with the ultra-spiritualism of that sect, which made all excellence to consist in spiritual enlightenment, and esteemed all matter to be evil and the source of sin. One of the errors for which St. Jerome attacked Jovinian, was, that he altogether separated baptism by the Spirit from baptism by water, saying that a man who had been baptized by the Spirit would never sin after, but that, if he sinned again, it was a proof that he had received only water-baptism, but not spiritual baptism.<sup>2</sup> The Manichees, like the Gnostics, and probably on the same principles, believing baptism to have no efficacy, never administered it to their converts.<sup>3</sup> The Messalians were a sect of mystics, who are described as devoting themselves wholly to prayer, and avoiding even labour for their bodily necessities.<sup>4</sup> It appears that they had a very low esteem of the Sacraments, so that Theodoret accuses them of denying any efficacy whatever to baptism; <sup>5</sup> though there is some reason to think that he has exaggerated their errors.<sup>6</sup> It is probable enough that, wherever mysticism prevailed, such a disregard of external ordinances would prevail also. Those medieval sects which derived their errors from Gnostic or Manichean sources, would naturally underrate Sacraments, as having material elements, which such heretics regarded as essentially evil. Accordingly, we learn that the Paulicians in the ninth century refused to celebrate the Lord's Supper, and probably in like manner rejected outward baptism.<sup>7</sup> The Bulgarians and Albigenses are said to have sprung from the Paulicians; and, though it is difficult to arrive at the truth concerning the tenets of these persecuted sects, we may yet probably infer, that one of their errors was an underrating of the value of baptism and the Eucharist.

The time, however, for these subjects to be most fiercely con-

<sup>1</sup> *Hæres.* i. c. 18, p. 91. Edit. Oxon. 1702.

<sup>2</sup> Hieronym. *Adv. Jovinianum*, Lib. ii. Tom iv. pt. ii. p. 193.

<sup>3</sup> August. *De Hæres.* c. 46; Bingham, *E. A. Bk. xi. ch. ii. sect. 4.*

<sup>4</sup> Epiphani. *Hæres.* LXXX.; Augustin. *Hæres.* LVII

<sup>5</sup> Theodoret. *Hæret. Fab. Lib. iv. c. 10.*

<sup>6</sup> See Bingham, *E. A. Bk. xi. ch. ii. sect. 5.*

<sup>7</sup> See Mosheim, *I. II. Cent. ix. pt. ii. ch. v.* Also Bingham, *E. A. Bk. xi. ch. ii. sect. 4.*

tested would naturally be the period of the Reformation. We must leave the discussion on Transubstantiation, which agitated the Church in the Middle Ages, for the Articles which treat expressly on the Lord's Supper. Suffice it here to observe, that the school-authors, in their investigations concerning sacramental efficacy, were led, not merely to insist on the value of the Sacraments as means, in the use of which God's Spirit works, but also to lay down the principle, that the Sacraments are so in their own nature vehicles of grace, that, *ex opere operato*, from the mere fact of their administration, they convey Christ to the soul. Such a reception of Christ may not indeed be always to salvation; nay, it may be to condemnation; but still the Sacrament administered always brought with it a spiritual grace. This doctrine was fixed, as the doctrine of the Roman Church, by the decrees of the Council of Trent. They anathematized all, who deny that the Sacraments contain grace,<sup>1</sup> or that this grace is conferred by them *ex opere operato*.<sup>2</sup>

All the reformed, whatever differences may have existed between them on these subjects (and such differences were sufficiently great), appear to have much objected to the statement of the *opus operatum*. To them such a statement seemed to imply, not that Sacraments were means through which God was pleased to work, and which He had promised to bless, but rather, that they were of the nature of magical incantations, which, however carelessly administered, could not be separated from their effects upon the soul. The very elements therefore became the objects of adoration. The water of baptism was in itself holy and the source of holiness; the consecrated wafer was the Body of the Son of God. Extremes generate extremes: and we learn that the anabaptists and other fanatics were led to such extravagance of opposition to the extravagance of Romanism, as impiously to mock the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist; so that "railing bills against it were fixed upon the doors of St. Paul's Cathedral and other places, terming it *Jack in a box*, *The Sacrament of the halter*, *Round Robin*, and such like irreverent terms."<sup>3</sup>

Among the continental reformers, *Zuinglius*, *Luther*, and *Calvin*, adopted three different views of the Sacraments.

*Zuinglius* rejected sacramental grace entirely. He held Sacraments to be bare signs, outward tokens of Christian profession, but

<sup>1</sup> Sess. VII. Can. VI. "Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam, quam significant . . . anathema sit."

erit per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam . . . anathema sit."

<sup>2</sup> Sess. VII. Can. VIII. "Si quis dix-

<sup>3</sup> *Ridley's Life of Ridley*, p. 216, referred to by Dr. Hey on this Article.

in no sense means of grace. He defined a Sacrament to be "an external symbol, by which we testify what we are, and what is our duty, just as one who bears a national costume or badge testifies that he belongs to a particular nation or society."<sup>1</sup> And again, "A Sacrament is the sign of a sacred thing; when therefore I speak of the Sacrament of Christ's Body, I mean no more than that bread which is the figure and type of Christ's Body."<sup>2</sup>

Luther, on the contrary, maintained the great importance and spiritual efficacy of the Sacraments. "We can lay it down as a rule," he writes, "that where are the Eucharist, Baptism, the Word, there is Christ, remission of sins, and life eternal."<sup>3</sup> In the Eucharist, it is well known that he believed that, with the consecrated bread and wine, there are delivered to the recipient the very Body and Blood of Christ; the elements not being transubstantiated, but the Body of Christ being consubstantially united with them.<sup>4</sup> Of the other Sacrament he taught, that, as man is born naturally full of sins, so in baptism he is born spiritually, regenerated, justified. His sins are buried there, and righteousness rises instead of sins.<sup>5</sup> "St. Paul," says he, "teaches that baptism is not a sign, but a clothing in Christ, yea, that Christ Himself is our clothing. Wherefore baptism is a most potent and efficacious rite."<sup>6</sup>

Calvin took a kind of mean between Luther and Zuinglius. Concerning Sacraments in general, he writes, that "though they are figures, yet not naked and empty figures, but having their truth and substance united to them; not only representing, but offering grace. We ought never to separate the substance of the Sacraments from the Sacraments themselves. We ought not indeed to confound them, but to rend them asunder is absurd."<sup>7</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> "Sacramentum quid] Sacramentum ergo . . . symbolum externum, quo quales simus, et quodnam sit officium testatur, significat. Ut enim, qui crucem gestat albam, sese Helvetum esse, et posthac semper fore testatur," &c. — *De Baptismo*, Zuinglii Opera, 1581, Tom. 1. fol. 60.

<sup>2</sup> "Sacramentum quid] Sacramentum est sacræ rei signum. Cum ergo Sacramentum Corporis Christi nomino, non quicquam aliud, quam panem, qui Corporis Christi pro nobis mortui figura et typus est, intelligo." — *De Cæna Domini*, Opera, Tom. 1. folio 274.

<sup>3</sup> *In Genesis*. c. iv. Opera, Tom. vi. fol. 92.

<sup>4</sup> Of this more under Art. xxviii. Meanwhile, see his treatise *De Sacramento Altaris*, Tom. 1. fol. 78; *Catechismus Major*, Tom. v. p. 640.

<sup>5</sup> "Quemadmodum enim mater illo carnali partu plenum peccatis puerum et iræ filium edit, ita baptismus edit spirituales partum, et regenerat nos, ut justificati simus filii gratiæ. Sic peccata in baptismo demerguntur, et emergit pro peccatis justitia." — *De Sacramento Baptismi*, Tom. 1. fol. 72.

<sup>6</sup> "Docet ergo Paulus baptismum non signum, sed indumentum Christi, immo ipsum Christum indumentum nostrum esse. Quare baptismus potentissima ac efficacissima res est." — In iii. cap. *Ad Galat.* Tom. v. fol. 370.

<sup>7</sup> "Figuris igitur et signis, quæ sub oculorum sensum cadunt, ut naturæ nostræ imbecillitas requirit, ostenditur: ita tamen ut non sit figura nuda et simplex, sed veritati suæ et substantiæ conjungitur . . . Sed hoc adjungemus, Sacramenta Domini nullo modo a substantia

word is joined to the external sign, and hence Sacraments have their efficacy . . . . Christ breathed on His Apostles, and they received, not His breathing only, but the Spirit of God. Wherefore? but because Christ had promised? So in baptism we put on Christ, we are washed in His Blood, our old man is crucified, that the righteousness of God may reign in us. In the sacred Supper we are fed spiritually by the Body and Blood of Christ. Whence so great effects, but from the promise of Christ, who effects and makes good by His Spirit what He testifies by His Word?"<sup>1</sup> In regard to the grace received by *infants* in baptism, it is probable, as we shall see hereafter, that Calvin's predestinarian theory materially influenced his views. But as regards adult recipients both of baptism and the Lord's Supper, he clearly taught, that to the faithful God gives, in the one remission and regeneration, in the other, the *real* but *spiritual* presence of Christ's Body and Blood. On the question of the Eucharist especially he differed from the Romanists, in that he rejected transubstantiation, — from the Lutherans, in that he rejected consubstantiation, — from the Zuinglians, in that he maintained a *real* presence of Christ, though he held that presence to be *spiritual*, not *carnal*.<sup>2</sup>

The Calvinistic communions, including the English Puritans and Non-Conformists, have generally followed Zuinglius rather than Calvin in their Sacramental theory; though by no means agreeing with the former on many other points of theology.

The Anglican reformers have sometimes been charged with Zuinglian sentiments concerning the Eucharist. On this subject, however, it is capable of evident proof, that they symbolized, not with Zuinglius, but with Calvin, though not deriving their views from him. On baptism their language is stronger, not only than

et veritate sua separari oportere. Ea quidem ne confundantur, distinguere non tantum convenit, sed etiam omnino necessarium est. Sed ita dividere ut alterum sine altero constituatur, absurdissimum." — *De Cæna Domini*, Calvini *Opuscula*, pp. 133, 134.

<sup>1</sup> "Observent lectores externo et visibili symbolo simul verbum conjungi, nam et hinc sacramenta vim suam mutuantur: non quod in voce, quæ auribus personat, inclusa sit Spiritus efficacia; sed quia a testimonio Verbi pendet eorum omnium effectus, quæ ex sacramentis percipiunt fideles. Flat Christus in Apostolos: hi non flatum modo sed Spiritum quoque recipiunt. Cur? nisi quia illis Christus promittit? Similiter in Baptismo Christum induimus, abluimur Ejus sanguine, crucifigitur vetus homo noster, ut regnet

in nobis Dei justitia. In sacra Cæna spiritualiter Christi carne et sanguine pascimur. Unde tanta vis, nisi ex Christi promissione, qui Spiritu Suo efficit ac præstat quod verbo testatur." — Calvinus *In Evangelium Johannis*, c. xx. v. 22.

<sup>2</sup> "Necesse est igitur nos in Cæna *vere* Corpus et sanguinem Christi recipere . . . . quemadmodum panis in manu distribuitur, ita Corpus Christi, ut Ejus participes simus, nobis communicari." — *De Cæna Domini Opuscula*, p. 134.

"Cæterum hoc imprimis tenendum, ut *carnalis* omnis imaginatio excludatur, animum oportere sursum in cælos erigere, ne existimemus Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum eo dejectum esse ut in elementis corruptilibus concludatur." — *Ibid.* p. 147.

Calvin's, but even than Luther's. But of their views concerning these two Sacraments separately, we must reserve the consideration for the present. Meanwhile, let us observe a few of their statements on Sacraments in general.

We have already noticed their language in this XXVth Article, that Sacraments are "effectual signs of grace, by the which God doth work invisibly in us." We have compared the language of the Homily, in which Sacraments are defined to be "visible signs expressly commanded in the new Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of sins, and of our holiness and joining in Christ." We have seen that the Catechism uses terms of the same significance, calling Sacraments "outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace," which grace is not merely promised, but "given unto us;" saying also that they were "ordained by Christ Himself" to be, not only "a pledge to assure us" of that grace, but also "a means whereby we receive the same."

In like manner Nowell's *Catechism*, a semi-authoritative document, has the following: "How many Sacraments hath God ordained in His Church? A. Two: Baptism, and the Holy Supper, which are commonly used among the faithful. For by the one we are born again, and by the other we are nourished to everlasting life."<sup>1</sup> Jewel's *Apology*, a similar authority, having denied the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, adds: "But when we say this, we lower not the nature of the Lord's Supper, nor teach it to be a mere frigid ceremony, and that in it nothing is done, as some calumniously say that we teach. For we assert, that Christ truly exhibits Himself present with us in His Sacraments; in baptism, that we may put Him on; in the Supper, that we may feed on Him by faith and in Spirit, and from His Cross and Blood have everlasting life: and this we assert to be done, not coldly and perfunctorily, but in very deed and truth."<sup>2</sup> The *Reformatio Legum* again condemns those who would take the Sacraments "for naked signs and external marks, whereby the religion of Christian men may be discerned from others."<sup>3</sup> And to refer once more to the Homilies, "The sermon for repairing and keeping clean the churches" speaks of the house of God as that "wherein be ministered the Sacraments and mysteries of our redemption. The fountain of our regeneration is there presented to us; the partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ is there offered unto us; and

<sup>1</sup> See the *Enchiridion Theologicum*, I. pp. 318, 314.

<sup>2</sup> *Enchiridion Theolog.* I. p. 129.

<sup>3</sup> "Pro nudis signis et externis tantum indicibus." — *Reformatio Legum, De Hæresibus*, c. 17, quoted by Hey



shall we not esteem the place where so heavenly things are handled?"

It may seem needless to add private testimonies of the individual reformers. Yet the names of Cranmer and Ridley stand justly so much at the head of our Reformation that we may well hear one word from each of them. Cranmer, in his *Answer to Gardiner*, writes "Likewise when he (the minister) ministereth to our sight Christ's holy Sacraments, we must think Christ crucified and presented before our eyes, because the Sacraments so represent Him, and be His Sacraments, not the priest's. 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 cometh down upon the child and apparelleth him with His own Self. And as at the Lord's holy table, the priest distributeth wine and bread to feed the body, so must we think that inwardly by faith we see Christ feeding both body and soul to eternal life."<sup>1</sup> "In all ages," says Ridley, "the devil hath stirred up some light heads to esteem the Sacraments but lightly, as to be empty and bare signs."<sup>2</sup> "And as all do agree hitherto in the aforesaid doctrine, so all do detest, abhor, and condemn the wicked heresy of the Messalonians, which otherwise be called Euchites, which said that the holy Sacrament can do neither good nor harm; and do also condemn those wicked anabaptists, which put no difference between the Lord's table and the Lord's meat and their own."<sup>3</sup>

It is not necessary to pursue the history of this subject to more modern times. The Quakers, and some other sects, have not only undervalued Sacramental grace, but actually have rejected all use of the Sacraments. The foreign Protestants, with the exception of the Lutherans, seem mostly to adopt Zuinglian opinions; as have the generality of dissenters among ourselves. In the English Church, those who have formed their theological views for the most part on the Puritan model, have taken in general low ground on the Sacraments, especially on the Sacrament of baptism, whilst the opposite school have zealously maintained the reality and importance of Sacramental grace. The period of Bishop Hoadley and the Bangorian controversy has been pointed to as an era from which lower sacramental doctrines have been very commonly admitted among churchmen. In the present day it is painfully

<sup>1</sup> Cranmer's *Works*, by Jenkyns, 111. pp. 553, 554.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, Parker Society, p. 114.

<sup>3</sup> *Ridley's Works*, Parker Society, p. 9.

known to every one with what fierceness the flame of discord has burst forth, on the subject of those very ordinances of grace which were instituted by Christ on purpose to bind together in one fold and one flock the blessed company of all true believers.

III. Concerning the proper use of the Sacraments, the Article says, —

“The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them.” This sentence alludes to the elevation and procession of the host in the Church of Rome; and, as a similar statement is made, with more direct reference to those customs, in Article XXVIII. we may reserve the consideration of the question for the present. Thus much only we may remark, that the Tridentine definition, that “the grace of the Sacraments is contained in the Sacraments,” naturally led to the adoration of the elements themselves: whereas the doctrine that Sacraments have no efficacy of their own nature, but are ordinances of God, which He is pleased to honour, and by which He has promised to work, will lead to a reverent esteem and diligent use of them, but not to a superstitious veneration of the mere instruments. This is the difference between Rome and England.

IV. The last question treated of is the worthy reception of the Sacraments.

“In such only as worthily receive the same, have they a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.”

This statement also is virtually repeated concerning baptism in Art. XXVII. and still more clearly concerning the Eucharist in Art. XXIX.

Highly as the fathers speak, and often with no expressed reservation or restriction, concerning sacramental grace and the potency of the Sacraments, yet, when occasion offers, we may always observe that they did not so tie the grace to the ordinance as to believe that the impenitent and the unbelieving would benefit by it. Origen, though plainly speaking of remission of sins and the gift of God’s Spirit as the grace of baptism, yet observes that “*all are not Israel that are of Israel*; nor are all baptized with the Spirit who are baptized with water . . . . Some who have received baptism have been unworthy to receive the Holy Spirit. Simon had received baptism, but as he came with hypocrisy for

grace, he was rejected from the gift of the Spirit.”<sup>1</sup> Again, he says that all persons washed with water were not washed to salvation. It was so with Simon Magus. And, accordingly, he urges on catechumens to prepare themselves diligently for baptism, lest they receive the water only, not the Spirit of God. “He who is baptized to salvation receives water and the Holy Spirit; but Simon, not being baptized to salvation, received water, but not the Spirit of God.”<sup>2</sup>

Tertullian says, he denies not that the pardon of sins is assured to those who are baptized, but yet he says, we ought to labour that we attain that blessing. God suffers not the unworthy to come to His treasures. “Some,” he remarks, “think that God must make good His promises, even to the unworthy, and would make His liberality a slavish obligation.” But Tertullian himself plainly indicates his belief, that baptism to such unworthy recipients would not be the fountain of life, but rather *symbolum mortis*, the mark of death.<sup>3</sup>

Just in the same spirit, St. Cyril in the preface to his Catechetical Lectures; in which, though he speaks very excellent things of the blessings of baptism and Communion, yet he warns against unworthy approach to them, and diligently prepares his catechumens for worthy reception of them. He begins by propounding to them the sad example of Simon Magus. “Simon Magus,” says he, “of old came to the laver. He was baptized, but not illuminated. He washed his body with the water, but enlightened not his heart with the Spirit. His body descended and rose up again, but his soul was not buried with Christ, nor raised again with Him.”<sup>4</sup> He then goes on to speak of the man without the wedding garment, and to bid them beware of such conduct as his. He tells them, they have full time for preparation. “If,” he adds, “thou remainest in evil purpose, he who warns thee will be blameless, but look not thou to receive grace. The water will receive thee, but the Spirit will not receive thee.”<sup>5</sup>

Just so St. Augustine: “All the Sacraments are common, but not the grace of the Sacraments to all . . . The laver of regeneration is common to all baptized in the name of the Trinity; but the grace of baptism is not common to all. For heretics, and false brethren in the Catholic Church, have the same baptism.”<sup>6</sup> “The Sacrament is one thing, the grace of the Sacrament another.

<sup>1</sup> In *Numeros*, Homil. III. num. 1.

<sup>2</sup> In *Ezekiel*, Hom. VI. num. 5. See Lumper *De Vita et Scriptis Origenis*, Art. XIII.

<sup>3</sup> *De Penitentia*, c. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Cyrl. Hierosol. Præfatio Cateches.* 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* III.

<sup>6</sup> In *Ps.* 77, Tom. IV. pp. 816, 817

How many eat of the altar, and die, aye! and die by eating. Wherefore saith the Apostle, He eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself." <sup>1</sup> "If, therefore, thou wilt know that thou hast received the Spirit, ask thine own heart, lest perchance thou hast the Sacrament, but not the virtue of the Sacrament." <sup>2</sup>

The Scholastic disputes concerning the grace of the Sacraments originated the theory of the *opus operatum*. The Sacraments were thought to be so completely vehicles of grace that they themselves contained and conveyed the grace which was proper to them. Thus the elements in the Eucharist were believed to be changed into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood; and by whomsoever the bread and wine were received, by the same the Body and Blood of Christ were eaten and drunk. To the unworthy indeed the reception was not to salvation, but to condemnation; yet still it was a real receiving, not only of the Sacrament, but also of the grace of the Sacrament. So Simon Magus was believed to have received, not only baptism, but the grace of baptism, yet not to life, but to death. He was said to have been regenerated by baptism, but regenerate to a greater condemnation. The fathers' expressions were made to bear this meaning, when they speak in glowing terms of the blessings to be expected in the reception of the sacraments.<sup>3</sup> But a hundred such strong statements can never be fairly alleged against a single sentence occurring in qualification or explanation of them. How often soever it be said that baptism is regeneration, and the Eucharist a feeding upon Christ's Body and Blood; a single statement, that this is true only of worthy recipients, is sufficient to prove that such a qualification is always to be understood.

The Roman Church, however, has adopted the theory of the *opus operatum*, and stamped it with synodal authority. Yet in the

<sup>1</sup> *In Johann.* cap. 6, Tract xxvi. Tom. III. pars. II. p. 498, c.

<sup>2</sup> *In Epist. Johann.* cap. iv. Tract vi. Tom. III. pars II. p. 868, f. Compare p. 840, c. See also *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. XXI. cap. 25. Tom. VII. p. 445, seq.

<sup>3</sup> Thus St. Augustine is supposed to have asserted, that Simon Magus received the Holy Ghost in baptism. He is speaking of the many gifts which a man may receive, and yet lack charity; he continues, "Respice ad munera ipsius Ecclesiæ. Munus sacramentorum in baptismo, in eucharistia, in cæteris sanctis sacramentis; quale munus est? Hoc munus adeptus est et Simon Magus. Prophetia quale munus est? Prophetia-

vit et Saul malus rex," &c. S. Augustin. *In Ps.* ciii. Serm. I. 9. Tom. IV. p. 1136. It does not appear to me that anything in this passage is inconsistent with a belief that the grace of the Sacrament may be withheld from the impenitent. At all events, such a vague statement can never be pressed against such positive statements as those given above from the same father. In one passage indeed he leaves it as a kind of open question, whether Simon Magus was regenerated to greater condemnation, or whether he was born of water, but not of the Spirit. He seems to incline to the latter alternative. — *De Baptismo c. Donatist.* Lib. VI. c. 12. Tom. IX. p. 169.

very canon which asserts that the Sacraments *contain grace*, it is added, that “they *confer* grace on those *who do not place a bar.*”<sup>1</sup>

If it were not added soon after<sup>2</sup> that the “Sacraments confer grace, *ex opere operato*,” we might believe that the Tridentine fathers did not materially differ from the statements of our own reformers; *to place a bar* being much the same as *to receive unworthily*.

The reformers all strongly opposed the doctrine of the *opus operatum*.

The Lutherans, who of all the reformed bodies were considered to hold the highest view of the Sacraments, yet plainly rejected the belief that grace was inseparably tied to the reception of them. Luther complains, that the schoolmen and the papists dreamed of virtue infused into the water of baptism; but he held the gift of the Spirit to the baptized to result from the promise of God to them, but that the water was still but water.<sup>3</sup> So, though by the doctrine of consubstantiation Christ's very Body would be received with the bread, yet, as the bread is not said to be changed into Christ's Body, it is possible that by the unworthy the bread alone might be eaten, but the Body and Blood might not be communicated. In this, as in many respects, consubstantiation is much different from transubstantiation; since, according to the latter, the substance of the bread and wine is utterly annihilated, and nothing remains but the substance of the Body and Blood, so that all who receive the Sacrament, must receive by it the very substance of Christ.

It is unnecessary, for the present, to say more concerning our own reformers' views of this subject; they are plainly expressed in this and the following Articles; and we shall hear more of them under Art. XXVII. and XXVIII.

<sup>1</sup> *Concil. Trident. Sess. vii. can. vi.*  
 “Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam, quam significant, aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non conferre, anathema sit.”

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid. Canon viii.*

<sup>3</sup> See Laurence's *Bampton Lectures*, Note on Sermon vii. pp. 157, 158.

## ARTICLE XXVI.

---

*Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacrament.*

*De vi Institutionum Divinarum, quod non tollat malitia Ministrorum.*

ALTHOUGH in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally being found guilty, by just judgment be deposed.

QUAMVIS in ecclesia visibili, bonis mali semper sunt admixti, atque interdum ministerio verbi et sacramentorum præsent, tamen cum non suo, sed Christi nomine agant, ejusque mandato et auctoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in verbo Dei audiendo, tum in sacramentis percipiendis. Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipiunt, quæ propter institutionem Christi et promissionem efficacia sunt, licet per malos administrentur.

Ad Ecclesiæ tamen disciplinam pertinet, ut in malos ministros inquiratur, accusenturque ab his, qui eorum flagitia noverint, atque tandem justo convicti judicio deponantur.

---

### SECTION I. — HISTORY.

IT is natural, in treating of the doctrines contained in this Article, to begin with the question concerning heretical baptism, which agitated the primitive Church. Tertullian denies that the heretics administered Christian baptism at all, because they did not believe in the same God nor the same Christ with the Christians. Hence the rebaptizing of heretics was not, according to him, a repetition of the one baptism; for their former baptism was, strictly speaking, not Christian baptism at all, being baptism into a different faith from that of the Gospel.<sup>1</sup> The same rule seems to be laid down by the Apostolical Canons, the 46th canon commanding the deposition of any "bishop, presbyter, or deacon, who admitted

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. *De Baptismo*, c. 15.

the baptism or sacrifice of heretics" (comp. canons 47, 68). In the famous dispute between Stephen, Bishop of Rome, and Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, the latter, and the African bishops who were with him, denied the validity of baptism by heretics and schismatics also. The baptism of heretics, Cyprian, like Tertullian, held to be baptism into another religion than the Gospel, into the faith of another God than the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Hence, he concluded that such baptism must be void.<sup>1</sup> But, moreover, the baptism of schismatics appears to have been rejected by the African bishops; because according to the interrogation in baptism, ("Dost thou believe in the life eternal, and remission of sins in the Holy Church?") they held that remission of sins could not be given but in the Church.<sup>2</sup>

Stephen, Bishop of Rome, took the directly opposite view, admitting all baptism, whether by schismatics or heretics, so it was with water in the name of the Trinity; and such has been the rule of the Latin Church ever since. The Greek Church has taken a middle course, rejecting heretical, but admitting schismatical baptism.

This was quite a different question from that on which this Article is treating. But, in the controversy, the African Church used language as if they thought that one reason why heretics could not administer baptism aright, was because they themselves had not the grace of baptism, and so could not bestow it on others. "What prayer," they ask, "can a sacrilegious and impious priest offer? As it is written, God heareth not sinners; but who worships Him and doth His will, him He heareth. And who can give what he hath not? or how can a person perform spiritual offices, who hath himself lost the Holy Spirit?"<sup>3</sup> Such a statement, which must be considered as *obiter dictum*, was perhaps naturally put forth as one among other arguments, without having been maturely weighed or traced out to all its consequences. When, however, in the fourth century, arose the famous schism of the Donatists, more was made of it than might at first have been intended. The Synodical letter in which that statement is made was addressed to certain bishops of the Numidians. Now the Donatist faction arose among the Numidians. It originated in an opposition to the election of Cæcilianus into the see of Carthage. His opponents, the Numidian bishops, accused his consecrator,

<sup>1</sup> Cyprian, *Epist.* 78, *Jubaiano Fratri, de Rebaptizandis Hæreticis in Epistol. Cypriani, Epist.* 70, p. 190.

<sup>2</sup> *Epistola Synodica Numidis Episcopis,* <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 191.

Felix, of being a *traditor* (*i. e.* one who in Diocletian's persecution had delivered up the sacred writings to the heathen magistrates to be burned); and hence they denied that his consecration was valid; for a bishop in deadly sin could not confer the grace of ordination.<sup>1</sup> The length to which this controversy went, was very great. The Donatists (as they were called from their chief leader Donatus) became a large and influential sect, having no fewer than 400 bishops of their own. They refused all communion with the African Church, of which Cæcilianus was the chief bishop, and even rebaptized those who came over to their own faction. They naturally referred to the authority of Cyprian and his contemporary bishops, and made the most of their statements concerning the invalidity of heretical baptism.

The controversy which thus arose, hinged much on the question with which we have now to deal. The Donatist writers (Petilianus, Parmenianus, Cresconius) appear to have maintained the invalidity of the acts of those ministers who were in deadly sin; and seemed almost to deny the position, that a true church can contain "the evil mingled with the good." Augustine and Optatus were their chief opponents; and some of the most valuable treatises of the former were called forth by this dispute.

Augustine lays it down as a rule, that ministers do not confer remission of sins, or the grace of the Sacraments, but that the Holy Spirit confers them through their ministry.<sup>2</sup> The remission of sins is given by virtue of the Sacraments, not by the merit of him who ministers them.<sup>3</sup> "It matters not to the integrity of baptism, how much the worse he is who ministers it. For there is not so much difference between the bad and the worse, as between the good and the bad. Yet when a bad man baptizes, he gives no other thing than a good man gives."<sup>4</sup> Still he seems to agree in some measure with Cyprian; for he says that heretical baptism, although it be real baptism, yet tends not to salvation, but to destruction.<sup>5</sup>

St. Chrysostom bears a like testimony in the Greek Church, at the same time. "It is not just," he writes, "that those who approach by faith should receive hurt from the symbols of our sal-

<sup>1</sup> See the *History of the Donatists*, Mosheim, Cent. iv. pt. ii. ch. v.

<sup>2</sup> "Satis ostenditur non ipsos id agere, sed per eos utique Spiritum Sanctum." — *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, Lib. ii. c. 11. Tom. ix. p. 41.

<sup>3</sup> *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, Lib. iv. c. 4, Tom. ix. p. 124, a.

<sup>4</sup> "Nihil interest ad integritatem baptismi, quanto peior id tradat. Neque enim tantum interest inter malum et pejo-rem, quantum interest inter bonum et malum: et tamen cum baptizat malus, non aliud dat quam bonus." — *Ibid.* Lib. vi. c. 24, p. 174, f.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* Lib. v. c. 22, p. 156, b.



vation through the wickedness of another.”<sup>1</sup> So again, “God uses to work even by unworthy persons, and in no respect is the grace of baptism injured by the life of the priest.”<sup>2</sup>

Isidore of Pelusium is very clear to the same effect: “If a wicked man approaches the altar and unholy handles sacred things, he shall bear his punishment, but the altar receives no contamination.”<sup>3</sup> “He that is baptized receives no damage from the symbols of salvation, if the priest be not a good liver.”<sup>4</sup>

There can be no greater obstacle to the progress of religion than inconsistency in its professors, and especially in its ministers. The earnest and enthusiastic naturally sigh for a state of things which shall be free from all such blemishes, and picture to themselves a Church, the members of which shall be all sincere, and its ministers holy. They ill endure that the tares shall grow up with the wheat until the harvest. The Montanists, the Cathari, and later, the Anabaptists, were of this spirit. In the Middle Ages the ill-living of the lower class of friars appears to have been a great cause of scandal to the laity, and a principal ground for the cry of reformation. We know that Wickliffe and his followers inveighed loudly against such corruption; and it is probable enough that much was said at that period concerning the damage that might occur from the ministrations of ungodly men. The council of Constance (Sess. VIII.) condemned the errors of Wickliffe, contained in forty-five propositions; the fourth of which imputes to him the doctrine that “a bishop or priest in mortal sin cannot ordain, baptize, or consecrate.” The Council of Trent (Sess. XIV. *De Pœnit.* cap. 6) decrees, in like manner, that those are in error who contend that the power of absolution is lost by wicked priests; for they exercise this power as Christ’s ministers and by virtue of their ordination.

Whatever may have been the popular feeling on this subject among the advocates of reformation in general, there is no doubt that the Anabaptists (in conformity with their general principle, that the whole Church should be pure and sincere)<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Οὐ δίκαιον ἦν διὰ τὴν ἑτέρον κακίαν εἰς τὰ σύμβολα τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν τοὺς πιστεῖ προσίοντας παραβλάπτεσθαι. — *Homil.* LXXXVI. in *Johannem*. See Suicer, *Tom.* II. p. 383.

<sup>2</sup> νυνὶ δὲ καὶ δι’ ἀναξίων ἐνεργεῖν ὁ θεὸς εἶωθε, καὶ οὐδὲν τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἢ χάρις παρὰ τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἱερέως παραβλάπτεται. — *Homil.* VIII. in *Iad Corinth.* This passage is quoted by Bp. Beveridge on this Article.

<sup>3</sup> Isidor. Pelus. *Epist.* 340, Lib. III.; Suicer, *ubi supra*.

<sup>4</sup> ὁ τελούμενος οὐδὲν παραβλάπτεται εἰς τὰ σωτηριωδῆ σύμβολα, εἰ ὁ ἱερεὺς μὴ εὖ βιοῦς εἴη, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς μὲν παντῶς. — *Epist.* 37, Lib. II. Suic. II. 1083.

<sup>5</sup> Mosheim says, they taught that “the Church of Christ ought to be exempt from all sin.” — *Cent.* XVI. sect. III. pt. II. §§ 5, 17.

held the impropriety of receiving Sacraments from ungodly ministers.<sup>1</sup>

The foreign reformers, however, like the English, rejected these notions of the necessity of personal holiness in the minister to the validity of his ministrations. The VIIIth Article of the Confession of Augsburg is the original of this XXVIth Article of our Church. It was a little modified in the Vth of the Articles agreed on between the Anglicans and Lutherans in 1538, which contains a paragraph nearly word for word the same as the former part of our present Article. The Article stands now exactly as it did in 1552.<sup>2</sup>

It has been thought that, besides what we have been considering, the Roman Catholic doctrine of "Intention" may have been aimed at. This, however, does not appear probable. The Lutheran Article especially mentions "The Donatists and others like them;" and the state of the Church at the time of the Reformation, the disaffection of the laity to the clergy, the scandals said to exist in the lesser monasteries, the irregular lives of the mendicant friars, the ignorance of some among the reformed clergy, the springing up of Anabaptist sentiments, — all these things sufficiently point out a reason and necessity for such an Article as the present. The Roman doctrine of Intention is indeed of most "desperate conse-

<sup>1</sup> See *Reformatio Legum de Hæresibus*, c. 15, which is cited by Hey.

<sup>2</sup> *Confession of Augsburg*.

#### ART. VIII.

A. D. 1531.

QUANQUAM Ecclesia proprie sit congregatio sanctorum et vere credentium; tamen cum in hac vita multi hypocritæ et mali admixti sint, licet uti sacramentis quæ per malos administrantur, juxta vocem Christi, "sedent Scribæ et Pharisei in Cathedra Mosis," &c. Et sacramenta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi sunt efficacia, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur.

Damnant Donatistas et similes, qui negabant licere uti ministerio malorum in ecclesia, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse.

#### *Portion of the Vth Article of 1538.*

"Et quamvis in Ecclesia secundum posteriorem acceptionem mali sint bonis admixti, atque etiam ministerii verbi et sacramentorum nonnunquam præsent; tamen cum ministrent non suo, sed Christi, nomine, mandato et auctoritate, licet eorum ministerio uti, tam in verbo audi-

A. D. 1540.

CUM autem in hac vita admixti sint Ecclesiæ multi mali et hypocritæ, qui tamen societatem habent externorum signorum cum ecclesia, licet uti sacramentis, quæ per malos administrantur, juxta vocem Christi, &c.

endo quam in recipiendis sacramentis, juxta illud, 'Qui vos audit, me audit.' Nec per eorum malitiam minuitur effectus, aut gratia donorum Christi rite accipientibus; sunt enim efficacia propter promissionem et ordinationem Christi, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur."

quence." If no Sacrament is valid, unless the priest intends that it should be so ; then we know not whether our children be baptized, our wives married, our communions received, or our bishops consecrated. And this last question has been made much use of by the Church of Rome against the Church of England. It is urged, that a bishop or presbyter, who has a defective view of the grace of the Sacrament, cannot rightly administer it, because he does not intend to convey the full grace of that Sacrament. The bishops, for instance, who consecrated Archbishop Parker and others in the reign of Elizabeth, had a defective view of the effects of ordination and of the power of the clergy ; they therefore did not intend to give, nor the consecrated ministers to receive, the full grace and privileges of the priesthood. Hence those ministers were not rightly consecrated.

This Article was not originally directed against this error ; but it virtually and in effect meets it. Plainly, the relying on the intention of the minister results from a sort of belief that the minister himself is the depository of grace, and can dispense that grace of his own will. If then, in outwardly ministering a Sacrament, he does not intend to confer the benefits of the Sacrament, they will not be conferred. Such seems the rationale of the doctrine of Intention. This Article, on the contrary, truly sets forth, that the clergy minister the Sacraments, not " in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority ;" and that the Sacraments be " effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, though they be ministered by evil men." So then, it is not because ministers will or intend to bestow grace, but because Christ has ordained to give grace through their ministry. If then they rightly administer, and we rightly receive the ordinance, we need not consider what is the mind of the priest, since it is not in the power of man's intention to frustrate the gracious purposes of God. Were it otherwise, no Church could be sure of its orders, no Christian of his baptism. For none can tell, whether in Rome, or Greece, or England, that some careless or some malicious bishop may not have been indifferent, or opposed to the conferring of ordination, and so the whole line of succession have been cut off, and all the orders of the Church invalidated. None can tell that an evil minister may not secretly have cursed his infant, whilst outwardly invoking a blessing on him, and so his baptismal privileges may have been annulled. But if we believe Christ's Sacraments to be blessed, and Christ's ministers to have authority, not as themselves indued with grace, but as instruments, wherety God pours

it down upon us, then we need not fear to lose the treasure, though the vessel be but earthen, and itself fit only to be burned.<sup>1</sup>

The concluding paragraph in the Article lays it down, that inquiry ought to be made of evil ministers, and that if they are found guilty, they should by just judgment be deposed. There is not need of much history here. From the first, such discipline prevailed, and has prevailed in every Church and sect. Thus the twenty-fifth of the Canons of the Apostles enjoins, that "a bishop or priest found guilty of fornication or perjury shall be deposed."<sup>2</sup> The twenty-seventh commands, that a bishop or priest who strikes one of the faithful, be deposed.<sup>3</sup> The ninth canon of the first Council of Nice forbids that any be advanced to the order of presbyter who have been previously guilty of any grievous sin; and, if it be found out afterwards that he had so sinned, he is to be deposed.<sup>4</sup>

But so patent and obvious has been this custom of the Church, to inquire concerning scandalous ministers, to remove them that have erred, and, if possible, to forbid the ordination of the undeserving, that it is needless to enlarge on it. Of course, there have been times of laxer, and times of stricter discipline; but all times and all Churches have admitted the principle.

---

## SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

1. **T**HE first statement of the Article is, that "In the Visible Church the evil are ever mingled with the good." We saw something of this under Article XIX. It is clearly proved by our Lord's comparison of His kingdom to a field, in which tares and wheat grow together till the harvest (Matt. xiii. 24–30, 37–43); to a net, containing fish of every kind, that is, both the wicked and the just (Matt. xiii. 47–50); to a marriage-feast, where some have the wedding garment, some have not; all, "both bad and good," having been gathered into it (Matt. xxii. 10, 11). So St. Paul compares the Church to a great house, "in which there

<sup>1</sup> The Council of Florence (*Instr. Armenor. Concil.* Tom. xiii. p. 535) and the Council of Trent (Sess. vii. can. xi.) require only an *implicit* intention in the minister, *i. e.* to do what the Church doth, or what Christ instituted. But this distinction; which seems to have some justice in it, is easily drawn out so as to

save themselves, and yet to enable them to condemn us. The student may refer to Abp. Bramhall, *Protestants' Ordination Defended*, v. p. 210, *Lib. of Anglo-Cath. Theology*.

<sup>2</sup> Beveridge, *Synodicon*, Tom. i. p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 70.

are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and earth, and some to honour, and some to dishonour" (2 Tim. ii. 20). These arguments are so conclusive, as, according to St. Augustine, to have converted even the Donatists.<sup>1</sup>

The Article adds, that "sometimes the evil have chief authority (*præsent*) in the ministration of the word and Sacraments." We need go no further than Judas for proof of this. Our Lord Himself gave all the same authority to him that He gave to the rest of the Apostles; and yet He knew, when He chose him, that he was a devil (John vi. 70, 71). And so, later in the new Testament, we read of Diotrophes (3 John 9), and others, who, though ministers of God, were not men of godliness. Our Lord Himself describes especially the character of some, who should be made "rulers over his household, to give them meat in due season," but who should "smite their fellow-servants, and eat and drink with the drunken," and who at last should be "cut asunder, and have their portion with the hypocrites" (Matt. xxiv. 45-51).

2. It should hardly need much argument to prove, that that ministry which Christ permitted in His Church, may lawfully be used by His people. If He ordained Judas, we may use the ministry of such as Judas, and yet not lose blessing. And so He taught us, "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say and do not" (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3). And the Apostles plainly teach, that not holiness in the minister, but God's blessing on their ministry, is the cause of good to His Church and growth to our souls. It was not by their "own power and holiness" that they made the lame to walk; but "His name through faith in His name" (Acts iii. 12, 16). Paul may have "planted, and Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase" (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7). Paul and Apollos were but "ministers, by whom men believed, even as the Lord gave to every man" (ver. 5). Great and glorious as the ministration was (2 Cor. iii. 7, 8), yet the treasure was in "earthen vessels, that the excellency might be of God, and not of" them (2 Cor. iv. 7).

3. Still, though we do not believe that God's ordinances lose their effect, because unworthy hands administer them; yet it is obviously to be much desired, that those who minister in holy

<sup>1</sup> See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. ix. p. 344, who quotes Augustine, *lib. post collationem*, c. 9, 10.

things should themselves be men of holiness. If ungodly members should be excommunicated, much more should ungodly ministers be deposed. For, not only do such hinder the free course of the Gospel, and offend weak brethren; but the torch of truth and holiness is most surely lit and handed on by those in whose heart it is burning and bright. The old Testament teaches that "the priests should be clothed with righteousness" (Ps. cxxxii. 9); and that the Lord "will be sanctified in them that come nigh Him" (Lev. x. 3). In the new Testament, besides general instructions concerning discipline, there are special instructions concerning the discipline of the clergy. These are mostly to be found in the Epistles to Timothy, who, as bishop, has directions given him concerning the importance of "laying hands suddenly on no man" (1 Tim. v. 22), concerning the mode of receiving an accusation against an elder (ver. 19), and as to how he was to rebuke those that sinned (ver. 20). This is a matter too plain to be insisted on; the common instincts of our nature and the universal practice of Christians consenting render argument unnecessary.