

## ARTICLE XXXII.

*Of the Marriage of Priests.*

*De Conjugio Sacerdotum.*

BISHOPS, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

EPISCOPIS, presbyteris et diaconis nullo mandato divino præceptum est, ut aut cœlibatum voveant, aut a matrimonio absteineant. Licet igitur etiam illis, ut cæteris omnibus Christianis, ubi hoc ad pietatem magis facere judicaverint, pro suo arbitratu matrimonium contrahere.

### SECTION I. — HISTORY.

IT admits of evident proof, that in the earliest ages of the Church bishops, priests, and deacons, were allowed to marry. St. Polycarp speaks of Valens, a presbyter, and his wife.<sup>1</sup> Chæremon, Bishop of Nilus, a man of very great age, is mentioned by Eusebius<sup>2</sup> as flying from the Decian persecution, together with his wife. The same Eusebius, speaking of Phileas, Bishop of Thmuis, and Philoromus, says that they were urged, in the persecution under Diocletian, to have pity on their *wives* and children, and for their sakes, to save their own lives.<sup>3</sup> St. Clement of Alexandria, in which he is followed by Eusebius, says, that the Apostles Peter and Philip begat children, and that St. Paul also was married, but did not take his wife about with him, that he might not be hindered in his missionary journeys.<sup>4</sup> The same statement, namely, that St. Peter, St. Paul, and the other Apostles, were married, occurs in the interpolated epistles of St. Ignatius;<sup>5</sup> a spurious work indeed, and no doubt of much later date than the real Ignatius, but not altogether valueless on that account; as forgers always aim at verisimilitude, and would hardly express an opinion which was universally exploded and condemned at the time they wrote. Origen also appears to have believed that St. Paul was married.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Epist.* Polyc. c. xi.

<sup>2</sup> *H. E.* Lib. vi. c. 42.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* viii. c. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Πέτρος μὲν γὰρ καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαυδοποιήσαντο . . . καὶ ὅγε Παῦλος οὐκ ὀκνεῖ ἐν ἑπιτολῇ τὴν αὐτοῦ παραγορεύειν σύζυ-

γον, ἣν οὐ περιεκόμιζεν, διὰ τὸ τῆς ὑπηρεσίας ἐνστολέ. — *Strom.* Lib. iii. p. 535; Potter, *cf.* Lib. iv. p. 607; Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 80.

<sup>5</sup> Coteler. Tom. ii. p. 81.

<sup>6</sup> "Paulus ergo (sicut quidam tradunt)

Tertullian, on the contrary, thought St. Peter was the only married Apostle.<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, after Hegesippus, clearly records that St. Jude was married, for he speaks of his grandchildren.<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius considered Peter, Andrew, Matthew, and Bartholomew, all to have been married men.<sup>3</sup>

There is no doubt but that in very early times *second marriages* were considered as disqualifying for ordination. Thus Origen says, that "no digamist could be a bishop, presbyter, deacon, or widow in the Church."<sup>4</sup> And Tertullian adduced this custom, as an argument against second marriages generally.<sup>5</sup> This, of course, was derived from the rule laid down by St. Paul, that a bishop should be "the husband of *one* wife" (1 Tim. iii. 2). Yet many eminent fathers did not so interpret the words of the Apostle. For instance, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact understand, that the custom so common among the Jews of divorcing one wife and marrying another is that which the Apostle is forbidding, when he would have no one ordained, save those who were monogamists.<sup>6</sup> And it appears, that in the earliest times it was by no means universal to refuse ordination to those who had been married twice.<sup>7</sup>

It is not to be concealed, however, that very soon an exaggerated esteem for celibacy crept in. The ascetic views of the Essenes, of the Montanists, of the Gnostics, and of other sects external to the Church, affected more or less the Church itself. The dread of heathen vices, felt especially by those who had themselves once been heathens, made many attach some notion of impurity even to marriage. Hence, the language of our Lord (in Matt. xix.) and of St. Paul (in 1 Cor. vii.) was pressed to its utmost consequences. They had spoken of a single life as more favourable to piety, inasmuch as it separated more from worldly distractions and gave more leisure for attending to the things of the Lord. But the primitive Christians by degrees fell into the notion, that though marriage was a state permitted, it was still, if possible, to be shunned.

cum uxore vocatus est, de qua dicit ad Philippenses scribens, *Rogo te etiam, germana compar,*" &c. — Origen. *Com. in Rom. i.*

<sup>1</sup> "Petrum solum maritum invenio per socrum." — *De Monogamia*, 8.

<sup>2</sup> *H. E.* Lib. iii. c. 20.

<sup>3</sup> *Hæres. LXXVIII.* 10. Tom. i. p. 1042. Colon. See more such authorities in Cotelerius's note 44, Tom. i. p. 80.

<sup>4</sup> "Ab ecclesiasticis dignitatibus non solum fornicatio, sed et nuptiæ repellunt: neque enim episcopus, nec presbyter, nec

diaconus nec vidua possunt esse digami." Orig. *Hom. xvii. in Luc.*

<sup>5</sup> Tertull. *De Monogam. c. 11.*

<sup>6</sup> Chrysost. *Hom. x. in 1 Tim. ; Hom. ii. in Tit. ; Theodoret. Com. in 1 Tim. iii. 2 ; Theophyl. In 1 Tim. iii. 2.*

<sup>7</sup> So Tertullian, addressing the Catholics says, "Quot enim et digami president apud vos, insultantes utique apostolo." — *De Monogam. c. 12.* See also other authorities; Bingham, *E. A. Bk. iv. ch. v. sect. 4.*

It was not actually unholy, but it was inconsistent with a high degree of holiness.<sup>1</sup> Hence, by degrees also, the belief began to prevail, that the special ministers of God ought to choose the higher condition, and devote themselves to celibacy. Hence, some of the clergy began to separate from their wives. Hence, too, some laymen were disposed to withdraw themselves from the ministrations of the married clergy.

But these errors, when first they sprang up, were opposed by councils and canons. The Canons of the Apostles order, that "A bishop, presbyter, or deacon, shall not put away his wife under pretext of religion. If he does, he shall be separated from communion; and, if he persevere, he shall be deposed."<sup>2</sup> The Council of Ancyra (A. D. 314) decrees, that those who, at the time of ordination as deacons, declared their intention to marry, should be allowed to marry and to remain in the ministry; but it forbids the marriage of those who professed continence at the time of ordination.<sup>3</sup> The very important Council of Gangra, the canons of which were received throughout the East and West (A. D. 324), anathematizes "those who separate themselves from a married priest, as though it were not right to communicate in the oblation, when such an one ministers."<sup>4</sup> But especially observable is the decision of the first and greatest of the general councils, the Council of Nice (A. D. 325). There it was proposed, that the clergy should be obliged to abstain from the society of their wives, whom they had married before ordination. But Paphnutius, an eminent Egyptian prelate, himself unmarried, earnestly protested against putting so heavy a burden on the clergy; for he said, that marriage was honourable in all men, and that it ought to suffice, that the clergy should not marry after ordination, but that they should never be required to separate from their wives. Thereupon, the whole council assented to the words of Paphnutius; and the motion was repressed.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Two extreme views are taken of this fact. The Romanist argues that, from the very first, the Church was in favour of clerical celibacy; therefore it must be right. The author of *Ancient Christianity* contends, that the exaggerated esteem for a single life prevailed from the beginning; therefore the Church was corrupt from the very days of the Apostles. A little candour will lead us to a conclusion different from both of these. We may admit, that an undue esteem for virginity was a natural prejudice for the first Christians to fall into; and accordingly, before very long, they gradually slid into it. But it was gradually. We find nothing of the

sort in Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus. Any one who will read Clem. Alexand. (*Stromat. Lib. 111.*) will see, how highly that learned father esteemed matrimony, and how little he made of celibacy. The first trace of the exaggerated notion in question is to be found in the writings of the ascetic Montanist, Tertullian.

<sup>2</sup> *Can. Apostol. Can. v.*; cf. *Can. LI.*

<sup>3</sup> *Conc. Ancyr. Can. x.*

<sup>4</sup> *Concil. Gangr. Can. 1v.*

<sup>5</sup> *Socrat. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 1. c. 11*; *Sozomen, Lib. 1. c. 23, &c.*

It is true, the Council of Illiberis (Elvira in Spain, A. D. 300) had prohibited the clergy from the use of marriage.<sup>1</sup> But this does not appear to have been a council of much weight; nor can its decrees, or those of such as agreed with it, be compared with the decrees of the Canons of the Apostles, the Council of Gangra, and the first great Council of Nice. It is certain, that for a long time, not only priests and deacons, but bishops also, were allowed to marry. Socrates says that, even in his day, many eminent bishops lived with their wives, and were the fathers of families.<sup>2</sup> In the East, the Council in Trullo (A. D. 692) laid down the rule, that though bishops must observe celibacy, yet presbyters and deacons might live with their wives;<sup>3</sup> and this rule has governed the custom in the Eastern Church from that day to this.

Yet this very canon of the Trullan council speaks of it as then a received rule in the Roman Church, that deacons and presbyters should profess before ordination that they would no more live with their wives. That council itself declares that, in decreeing otherwise, it followed the ancient rule of Apostolical order.<sup>4</sup>

It is not easy, nor necessary, to trace exactly the progress of the principle of clerical celibacy in the West. There appears long to have been a struggle between the natural feelings of the clergy and the rigid discipline of the Church: the clergy, from time to time, in different parts of Europe, relapsing into the custom of living with their lawful wives, and the sterner disciplinarians among the bishops striving to repress it. Gregory VII. (A. D. 1073) is considered as having most effectually restrained the marriage of the clergy. He held several councils in Italy, and especially one at Rome, A. D. 1074: where the marriage of priests was condemned under the name of concubinage.

Two years afterwards (A. D. 1076), a synod of English bishops was held at Winchester, under Archbishop Lanfranc. That Synod decreed, that canons should have no wives, and forbade in future any priest to marry, or bishops to ordain such as would not declare that they were unmarried; but it permitted such priests as lived in the country, and were already married, to retain their wives.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Concil. Illiber.* Can. xxxiii. So the Council of Carthage (A. D. 390). Can. II. enjoins continence on all the clergy.

<sup>2</sup> Socrates, *Lib. v. c. 22.*

<sup>3</sup> *Concil. Trull.* Can. XIII. The Council in Trullo was held at Constantinople. It is also called *Concilium Quinisextum*, from being supplementary to the fifth and sixth councils.

<sup>4</sup> Ἐπειδὴ ἐν Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τάξει γάμος παραδεδοσθαι διέγνωμεν, τοὺς μέλ-

λοντας διακόνου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου χειροτονίας ἀξιοῦσθαι καθομολογεῖν ὡς οὐκέτι ταῖς αὐτῶν συνάπτονται γαμεταῖς· ἡμεῖς τῷ ἄρχαιῳ ἔσα· κολουθοῦντες κανόνι τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἱερα· βείας καὶ τάξεως τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀνδρῶν κατὰ νόμον συνοικεσία καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐρῶσθαι βουλόμεθα, κ. τ. λ. — *Concil. Trull.* Can. XIII.

<sup>5</sup> *Concil. Winton.* Can. I.; *Wilkins's Concil.* I. p. 367.

Under Anselm, the successor of Lanfranc (A. D. 1102), it was finally decreed in England, that neither priest nor deacon, nor even subdeacon, should be ordained, who did not profess chastity, *i. e.* celibacy: a decree which was further confirmed by the Council of London, A. D. 1108.<sup>1</sup>

In general, it may be considered that the laity in the middle ages were favourable to the celibacy of the clergy; but many of the wiser prelates of the Church considered it a doubtful, if not a dangerous restraint. It perhaps tended, in a considerable degree, to dispose many of the clergy themselves to the doctrines of the Reformation. Yet nothing could be a more effectual instrument for uniting the priestly orders together, and giving them common interests. At the same time, no doubt, it often made them more efficient, and left them more disengaged from secular employments and pursuits.

The reformers were all opposed to the vows of continence. Luther, though a monk, and therefore doubly bound to celibacy, married. It was matter of much debate, whether those who had once bound themselves to a single life did well to abandon it, even though they had discovered that such vows were undesirable and wrong. Luther's views were very peculiar. He held monastic vows to be impious and demoniacal:<sup>2</sup> and marriage he sometimes speaks of as a duty incumbent on all men. Indeed, though we may probably make much allowance for the vehemence of his language and the impetuosity of his character, he says many things on this subject which no well instructed Christian can approve.

Our own Cranmer not only married, but married twice. He, however, had not been, like Luther, a monk. Monastic vows were much more stringent than the mere profession of celibacy made by the priesthood. Some there were, like Bishop Ridley, who, though disapproving of restrictions on marriage, thought it not decorous to contract matrimony after they had promised celibacy, even though it were in the days of their former ignorance. Of course, those who did marry, laid themselves open to the charge of embracing the reformed doctrines for the sake of worldly indulgences.<sup>3</sup>

The Council of Trent has one canon condemnatory of those who would permit the clergy to marry.<sup>4</sup> The Confession of Augsburg has not imitated the conciseness of the Romish council, having two very long Articles, one on the marriage of the clergy, the other on monastic vows.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wilkins's *Concil.* i. p. 387.

<sup>2</sup> *De Votis Monasticis*, Tom. II. p. 277.

<sup>3</sup> See Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, p. 293.

<sup>4</sup> Sess. XXIV. *De Sac. Matrimon. Can. IX.*

<sup>5</sup> *Sylloge*, pp. 211, 219.

At this day then, the Eastern Church allows presbyters, but not bishops, to marry: the Roman Church enjoins celibacy on all: the Reformed Churches leave all to marry at their own discretion.

---

## SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

I. **T**HERE are, no doubt, some strong arguments in favour of the celibacy of the clergy, which it may be well to consider before proceeding to the arguments on the other side.

Both our blessed Lord and St. Paul unquestionably give the preference to an unmarried life, as being a more favourable state for religious self-devotion than the state of matrimony. Our Lord's words are, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." To some it is a gift of God, and those who have the gift are advised to abstain from marriage, "for the kingdom of Heaven's sake" (Matt. xix. 12). I assume this to be the sense of the passage: first, because the whole stream of Christian antiquity so explained it;<sup>1</sup> secondly, because I know no commentator of any credit in modern times, of whatever Church or sect, who has explained it differently. St. Paul's language illustrates our Lord's. He begins by saying, that it is a good thing for a man not to marry (1 Cor. vii. 1). Still, as a general rule, he recommends marriage (vv. 2-5). He recommends it, however, as a matter of permission, not as giving a command, (*κατὰ συγγνώμην, οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγήν*, ver. 6); for he would prefer to see all men as he was himself; "but every man has his proper gift, one after this manner, and another after that" (ver. 7). To the unmarried he says, it is good for them, if they abide as he abode (ver. 8). Celibacy is indeed particularly to be advised "for the present distress" (ver. 26).<sup>2</sup> And as a general rule, he lays it down, that there is benefit in an unmarried condition, because it is less subject to the cares of this life, and causes less solicitude and anxiety, giving more time for religion and devotion to God. These are his words: "I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried careth for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things that are of

<sup>1</sup> See for instance, Tertull. *De Virginitate Velandis*, c. 10; *De Cultu Fœminarum*, ii. 9; Origen *In Matt.* Tom. xv. 4, 5; Chrysostom, *Homil. LXII. in Matt.*; Epiphanius, *Hæres. LVIII. 4*, Tom. i. p. 491; Theophylact. *In Matt. xix.*, &c.

<sup>2</sup> It may be a question whether "the present distress" means the state of persecution, to which the early Christians were exposed, or the distress and anxiety of the present life. — See above, p. 350, note 3.

the world, how he may please his wife. There is difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit; but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband. And this I speak for your profit; not that I may cast a snare upon you, but for that which is comely, and that ye may attend on the Lord without distraction" (vv. 32-35).

Here then, though the Apostle is far from finding fault with marriage, he evidently prefers celibacy; not because there is evil in marriage, but because there is less distraction in an unmarried life.<sup>1</sup> Such a life, undertaken and adhered to from religious motives, involves a stricter renunciation of the world, a greater abstinence from earthly comforts and enjoyments, a more entire devotion of the soul to the one end of serving God.

We may fairly conclude from such language of the Apostle, coupled with the words of our Lord, that the tone of popular opinion, concerning marriage and celibacy, is low and unscriptural. With us marriage is ever esteemed the more honourable state; celibacy is looked on as at least inferior, if not contemptible. "But the base things of the world, and things that are despised, hath God chosen" (1 Cor. i. 28). And a true tone of Christian sentiment would make us honour those who live apart from earthly joys, that they may live more to God.<sup>2</sup>

Now these considerations, at first sight, seem to make for the celibacy of the clergy. God's ministers should ever seek the most excellent way. Marriage may be good and honourable; but if celibacy be a more favourable state for religious advancement, giving us leisure, like Mary, "to sit at Jesus' feet," not "careful and troubled about many things;" then must it be well for Christ's special servants to choose that good part, that they may "attend upon the Lord without distraction."

We may add to this prime argument some motives of Church policy. An unmarried clergyman is *expeditior*, more readily moved from place to place, abler to go where his duty may call him, to do what his calling may require of him. He has no children to think about, no wife to carry about with him, no interests, but those of the Church and of the Church's Head. His strength, his wealth, his intellect, he may devote all to one end; for he has no need to

<sup>1</sup> "For the evil is not in the cohabitation, but in the impediment to the strictness of life." — Chrysost. *Hom. xx. in Matt.*

<sup>2</sup> *Matt. xix.* and *1 Cor. vii.* have been considered in another point of view under *Art. xiv.* pp. 348-351; which see.

have anxieties to provide for his own, or to preserve himself for their sakes. He has no temptation to heap up riches for others; none to form worldly schemes and seek worldly interest, for the advancement of his family. "He careth only for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord."

II. Now, I do think, we ought not to underrate such arguments as these. They have, doubtless, much weight; and accordingly long prevailed to keep the clergy in a state of single life. But no inferences from Scripture, or apparent policy and expediency, can weigh against plain declarations to the contrary; and that more especially when the question concerns a penal enactment, — a restraint upon a law of nature, and upon instincts implanted in us by the Creator, and sanctified to us by His blessing. And we assert, that Scripture does contain plain and direct evidence that God Almighty not only sanctions and blesses marriage in general, but sanctions and blesses it in the clergy, as well as in the laity. "What God hath cleansed, that call not we common."

1. If we look at the old Testament, the priests were not only allowed, but encouraged to marry. This is not, of course, a proof that the clergy under the new Covenant may marry; but the Roman Church is especially fond of comparing all things concerning the Levitical priesthood with the priesthood of the Gospel.

2. That some of the Apostles were married is admitted by all. But it is asserted by the Roman Catholics, that they did not live with their wives after they were ordained to the Apostleship. St. Paul, however, says, "Have we no power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?" (1 Cor. ix. 5). It is true, that some of the fathers understood this, not of a wife, but of those Christian women who ministered to the Apostles, as some had ministered to our Lord when on earth (Luke viii. 2, 3).<sup>1</sup> But the more ancient fathers understood it of carrying their own wives about with them. We have already seen that Clement of Alexandria so interpreted this passage; and his testimony is quoted with approval by Eusebius.<sup>2</sup> Tertullian also distinctly asserts from the same passage of Scripture, "that it was permitted to the Apostles to marry, and to lead about their wives with them."<sup>3</sup> The earlier interpretation, therefore, according with the more obvious sense of the words, we can-

<sup>1</sup> See Theodoret and Theophylact *ad A. I. Isidor. Pelus. Epist. CLXXVI. Lib. III.* The same is the opinion of Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine.

<sup>2</sup> Clem. *Strom. Lib. III. p. 535*; Euseb.

*H. E. III. 30*, cited in the first section.

<sup>3</sup> "Licebat et Apostolis nubere et uxores circumducere." — *De Exhortat. Castitat. c. 8.*

not but suspect that the later fathers interpreted them otherwise, from the then unduly increasing esteem for celibacy.<sup>1</sup>

3. But further St. Paul especially directs that bishops and deacons should be the husbands of one wife (1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6); and lays down special rules concerning their management of their children (1 Tim. iii. 4), and the conduct of their wives (ver. 11).<sup>2</sup> A strange interpretation has been given to this passage by some of the Roman Catholics; namely, that the Apostle speaks figuratively, meaning that a bishop should have but one diocese. Yet I imagine that this would not be often pressed. St. Chrysostom, and after him Theodoret and Theophylact,<sup>3</sup> as we have seen already, understand the Apostle to forbid that any should be ordained who had divorced one wife and married another; a custom which seems not only to have been common with Jews and heathens, but to have crept in even among Christians.<sup>4</sup> Some indeed among the fathers held, that second marriages after baptism were thus forbidden by St. Paul; <sup>5</sup> but the ancient Church always interpreted the passage, as permitting and sanctioning at least a single marriage to the clergy, though, in some sense, forbidding a second. St. Chrysostom has even been thought to express himself as though it might be a question whether St. Paul did not *enjoin* marriage, though himself declaring that he understood it of permission, not of injunction.<sup>6</sup> And in another place he says, St. Paul speaks of the marriage of the clergy on purpose “to stop the mouths of heretics who condemned marriage; showing that marriage is not unholy in itself, but so honourable, that a married man might ascend the holy throne.”<sup>7</sup>

Thus then the words of the Apostle, as interpreted by all the ancient Church, whatever they may say about a second marriage, unquestionably sanction a single marriage to the ministers of Christ.

<sup>1</sup> From this interpretation arose that objectionable custom in the Church, that presbyters should have female attendants instead of wives, called *mulieres subintroductæ*, *συνείσακτοι*, &c. This was forbidden by the Council of Ancyra, Can. xix. It is condemned by Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxxviii. See Suicer, Tom. i. pp. 28, 83, 810.

<sup>2</sup> *γυναίκας* in this verse does not certainly mean the wives of the bishops and deacons. It is interpreted by some of the widows or deaconesses.

<sup>3</sup> Chrysost. *Hom.* x. in 1 Tim.; *Hom.* 11. in Tit.; Theodoret In 1 Tim. iii. 2; Theophylact In 1 Tim. iii.

<sup>4</sup> See Hammond on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Origen, *Hom.* xvii. in Luc.; Tertull. *De Monogam.* c. 11, quoted in last Section. See also Ambros. *De Offic.* Lib. i. c. 50; Hieronym. *Ep.* 11. ad Nepotian.

<sup>6</sup> Δεῖ οὖν φησι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι, μίᾳς γυναίκος ἄνδρα· οὐ νομοθετῶν τοῦτο φησιν, ὡς μὴ εἶναι ἄνευ τούτου γίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμετρίαν κολύων. — *Hom.* x. in 1 Tim. See also Erasmus on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

<sup>7</sup> τίνος ἕνεκεν τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰς μέσον παράγει; ἐπιστομίζει τοὺς αἰρετικούς τοὺς τὸν γάμον διαβάλλοντας, δεικνὺς ὅτι τὸ πρᾶγμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐναγὲς. ἀλλ' οὕτω τιμῶν ὡς μετ' αὐτοῦ δύνασθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ὕμνον ἐπιβαίνειν θρόνον. — *Hom.* 11. in Tit.

These words alone are fully sufficient to prove the truth of the Article we have in hand, — to prove that “bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by God’s law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage.” And we may ask, if God has not bound us, what power in Heaven or earth has authority to bind? What can be more presumptuous than to add to the moral laws of the Creator, to forbid as sinful what He has ordained as holy?

Again, our Lord especially says, that “all men cannot receive the saying” that single life may be more profitable for the kingdom of Heaven (Matt. xix. 11). St. Paul says, that “every man has his proper gift” (1 Cor. vii. 7); and that he does not speak of the benefits of celibacy, “to cast a snare upon” us (1 Cor. vii. 35). It is therefore strangely presumptuous to impose that on whole bodies, which our Lord says some cannot receive, which St. Paul calls a peculiar gift, and which he will not *enjoin* on any, lest it be a snare to them.

4. There are some general considerations which much strengthen the above more particular arguments. “Marriage is honourable in all men” (Heb. xiii. 4). What is honourable in all, cannot surely be prohibited to any. The “forbidding to marry” is expressly spoken of by the Spirit, as a sign of the apostasy of the latter days, and as arising from “the hypocrisy of liars, whose own consciences are seared with a hot iron.”<sup>1</sup> Above all, marriage is a type of the union of Christ and his Church (Eph. v. 23–32). It is “consecrated to such an excellent mystery, that in it is signified and represented the spiritual unity of Christ and His Church.” Can we believe that to be unfit for the ministers of Christ, which Christ Himself has honoured with such high approbation and blessing?

5. Lastly, it is said that many benefits are derived to the Church from an unmarried priesthood. Such expediency, however, cannot be set up against the word of God. Romanists themselves have often admitted, that, if there were good reasons for the clergy not to marry, there were still better reasons why they should marry. And, but that such addition to our Scriptural proof seems unnecessary, we might easily bring many arguments from experience to show, that the snares of celibacy have been as great as those of matrimony; and that the charities of wedded life have been as profitable to the married, as the asceticism of single life can have been to the unmarried priesthood.

<sup>1</sup> ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων, κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν, κωλύοντων γαμεῖν, κ. τ. λ. — 1 Tim. iv. 2, 3.

## ARTICLE XXXIII.

*Of Excommunicate Persons, how they are to be avoided.*

THAT person, which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

*De Excommunicatis Vitandis.*

QUI per publicam Ecclesiæ denunciationem rite ab unitate Ecclesiæ præcisus est, et excommunicatus, is ab universa fidelium multitudine, (donec per poenitentiam publice reconciliatus fuerit arbitrio iudicis competentis,) habendus est tanquam ethnicus et publicanus.

### SECTION I.—HISTORY.

CUTTING off from the people is a punishment often denounced and commanded in the old Testament. It appears in general to have meant death by the judgment of God (1 Kings xiv. 10), or by the hand of man (Exod. xxxi. 14, 15; xxxv. 2; Levit. xvii. 4, &c.). But the later Jews understood it of excommunication, of which they had three different kinds. The first and lightest sort was called נִדְּוִי (*Niddui*), separation or excommunication for a month; to be extended to two or three months in case of impenitence. The second and more severe kind was called חֶרֶם (*Cherem*), excommunication accompanied with imprecations from Deut. xxviii. and other places of Scripture. A person so separated was not allowed to have intercourse with any of the Jews, except for the purchase of necessary food: they might not consort with him, “no, not to eat;” a custom to which St. Paul is thought to allude in 1 Cor. v. 11. The third and heaviest form of excommunication was called שְׁמַטָּה (*Shammata*), a word the derivation of which is obscure, and which some have supposed to be of the same signification with the *Maranatha* of St. Paul, namely, “the Lord cometh.”<sup>1</sup> Whether originally the second and third form may not have been the same is still doubtful.

From the very earliest times the Christian Church exercised a

<sup>1</sup> See Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald Talm. Rab.* 827, 2463; also Jahn's *Archæologia Biblica*, § 252.  
*hân.* s. v. נִדְּוִי, חֶרֶם, שְׁמַטָּה, pp. 1303,

power of the same kind. Clemens Romanus probably alludes to it in his First Epistle to the Corinthians.<sup>1</sup> Hermas speaks of some that have sinned and are “rejected from the tower,” (which in his vision means the Church,) and who have afterwards to do penance for their fault.<sup>2</sup> Irenæus tells us of several persons of heretical tendency, who were obliged to perform penitential acts;<sup>3</sup> and of Cerdon, as having been several times put to penance, and finally excommunicated.<sup>4</sup> Origen says, that “offenders, especially such as offend by incontinence, are expelled from communion.”<sup>5</sup> Tertullian speaks of the gravity of Church censures; and of excommunication as a kind of anticipation of the judgment of God.<sup>6</sup> From him indeed we obtain a considerable insight into the customs of public confession, of the penance and humiliations to which offenders were put, of their absolutions and restoration to communion, and of the utter and final excommunication from Church privileges of obstinate and incorrigible sinners.<sup>7</sup> The canons of the Apostles, being especially directed to the ordering of discipline in the Church, are full of sentences of separation and excommunication.<sup>8</sup> It is difficult to assign the exact date of these venerable canons; but Bishop Beveridge places them at the end of the second, or the beginning of the third century.

It being thus apparent, that, from the very first, excommunication was a regular part of the discipline of the Church, it is unnecessary to continue our history through the following centuries, when no one questions that such a punishment was in frequent use. We may be content to notice, that among the Christians, as among the Jews, there prevailed a distinction of greater and lesser excommunication. The lesser excommunication, called ἀφορισμός or *separation*, consisted in exclusion of offenders from the participation of the Eucharist and from the prayers of the faithful, but did not expel them wholly from the Church; for they might be present at the psalmody, the reading of the Scriptures, the sermon, and the prayers of the catechumens and penitents, but might not remain to the service of the Communion. But the greater excom-

<sup>1</sup> § 57; Coteler. Tom. I. p. 178, vid. note 93.

<sup>2</sup> Herm. *Pastor.* Lib. I. Vis. III. § 5.

<sup>3</sup> Lib. I. c. 13.

<sup>4</sup> “Modo homologesin faciens, modo ab aliquibus traductus in his quæ docebat male, et abstentus est a religiosorum hominum conventu.” — Lib. III. c. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Οἷα δ' ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἀγωγὴ καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτανόντων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἰκολαστανόντων, οὓς ἀπελαίνοσσι τοῦ κοινῆ, κ. τ. λ. — Origen. *Cont. Cels.* Lib. III.

<sup>6</sup> “Nam et judicatur magno cum pondere, ut apud certos de Dei conspectu, summumque futuri iudicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut a communicatione orationis, et omnis sancti commercii relegetur.” — Tertull. *Apolog.* c. 39.

<sup>7</sup> See Bishop Kaye's *Tertullian*, pp. 251–254, 262.

<sup>8</sup> See for instance Canons 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 23, 29, 31, 36, 48. On this subject see Marshall's *Penitential Discipline*, ch. II. pt. 1.

munication, called *Anathema* or *total separation* (*παντελής ἀφορισμός*), excluded from all Church communion whatever, from approaching to any assembly of the faithful for prayer, or sermon, or reading of the Scriptures.<sup>1</sup> The former kind, it is needless to add, was used for lighter offences; the latter for grievous and deadly sins.

Something has already been said (under Art. XXV.) concerning the custom of public confession, which was a penitential discipline, enjoined on those who were sentenced either to the greater or lesser excommunication, previously to their restoration to Church fellowship; and also concerning the private confession, which gradually superseded public confession, and so loosened discipline and weakened the hands of the Church. Yet excommunications, in cases of heresy, or of royal and national opposition to the authority of the Church, assumed a new and more formidable aspect in the Middle Ages; so that, although private offenders against morality or piety might escape more easily under the shield of private confession, the obstinate heretic, and the nation whose ruler was not submissive to the see of Rome, were handled with a severity unheard of before. The excommunications of Huss and Wickliffe and Luther are evidence of the mode of proceedings against individual dissenters from the established faith. The excommunication of the Emperor Henry IV. by Pope Gregory VII., and the interdict on England under John by Innocent III., exemplify the use which the successors of St. Peter made of the keys of the kingdom, when kings and nations bowed down before them.<sup>2</sup>

The latter part of the Article speaks of reconciliation to the Church by penance, and of reception into the Church by a competent judge.

Besides *exhomologesis* or public confession, the early Church used to impose a term of public penance on those who expressed contrition for their sins, and desired to be restored to communion. The performance of penance was anciently a matter of considerable time, in order that the sincerity of the repentance might be tested, and that full evidence of sorrow might be given to the Church. Accordingly, penitents were divided into four distinct classes, called respectively *flentes*, *audientes*, *substrati*, and *consistentes*. The *flentes*, or *mourners*, were candidates for penance, rather than persons

<sup>1</sup> See Bingham, *E. A.* Bk. xvi. ch. ii. §§ 7, 8.

<sup>2</sup> The primitive Church did by no means exempt princes from its discipline, as is well known in the case of Theodo-

sius, whom St. Ambrose excommunicated and put to penance for the slaughter of seven thousand men in Thessalonica. — Theodoret, *Lib. v* c. 18; Bingham, xvi. iii. 5.

actually admitted to penitence. They used to lie prostrate at the church-door, begging the prayers of the faithful, and asking to be admitted to do penance. When they had been admitted to penance, they became *audientes* or *hearers*; because then, though not restored to communion, or the prayers of the Church, they might hear the Scriptures and the sermon. From this condition they passed into the state of *substrati* or *kneelers*. These were allowed to stay in the nave of the Church, and to join in certain prayers, specially put up for them, whilst they were on their knees. Lastly, they became *consistentes* or *co-standers*, persons allowed to stand with the faithful at the altar, and join in the common prayers, and to witness, but not partake of the Holy Communion.<sup>1</sup> During the term of their penance, penitents were obliged to appear in sack-cloth, with ashes on their head, to cut off their hair, to abstain from all feasting and innocent amusements, to show liberality to the poor, and to make public confession of their sins.<sup>2</sup> How early this distinction of four orders of penitents was made, and the special rules concerning their penance were laid down, is not indisputably certain. The time of the Novatian schism, *i. e.* the middle of the third century, is the earliest period at which it is thought that mention is certainly made of these distinctions and rules of discipline.<sup>3</sup>

It was only for heavy offences that excommunication, and therefore penance, were ever inflicted. In general it may be said, that the crimes were reducible to three classes; namely, uncleanness, idolatry, bloodshed.<sup>4</sup> The duration of the term of penitence was different, according to the magnitude of the offence, the aggravation of its guilt by circumstances, and the penitence or impenitence of the offender. For the heavier crimes, ten, fifteen, twenty, thirty years, and even the whole of a life, were not thought too long. Some were not reconciled to the Church but on imminent danger of death, and some were thought to have rebelled against God too grievously ever to have communion in this world; though God's mercy might be hoped for them in the next. Moreover, we may add, that, generally speaking, public penance was allowed but once to sinners of any sort.<sup>5</sup>

As for the judge or officer who had power to restore to communion and give absolution, it was ordinarily the bishop. He, for just reasons, might moderate and abridge the term of penance;<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bingham, *E. A.* xviii. ch. ii.

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

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* xviii. ii. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Marshall, *Penitential Discipline*, ch. ii. pt. ii. sect. 1.

<sup>5</sup> See Bingham, *E. A.* xviii. iv.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* § 8.

and, as all discipline was considered to be lodged in his hands, he was esteemed both as the excommunicator, and also as the absolver of the penitent.<sup>1</sup> Yet, in many cases, the power of absolution was committed to presbyters; who, by authority of the bishop, or in his absence, and on great necessity, such as danger of death, might reconcile the sinner to communion, and give him the absolution of the Church.<sup>2</sup> Nay! as in cases of extreme necessity even deacons were allowed to give men the absolution of baptism, so, under the like circumstances, they were authorized to grant penitents the conciliatory absolution.<sup>3</sup>

Having thus considered the primitive customs, and spoken of some abuses in the Middle Ages of the Church, we may proceed to the time of the Reformation. The Council of Trent says, the power of excommunication is to be used "soberly and with great circumspection;" still, if an excommunicated person will not repent, it enjoins that, not only shall he be prohibited "from Sacraments, and the Communion, and intercession of the faithful; but it may even be needful to proceed against him as one suspected of heresy" (*etiam contra eum tanquam de hæresi suspectum procedi possit*).<sup>4</sup>

The Reformers generally insisted on the power of excommunication. The Augsburg Confession gives bishops authority "to exclude from the communion of the Church impious persons, whose impiety is notorious, by the word, not by human violence."<sup>5</sup> The Saxon Confession says, that "those guilty of manifest crimes ought to be excommunicated; nor is just excommunication an empty sound" (*inane fulmen*).<sup>6</sup> Calvin, who was himself the great legislator for all the Calvinistic communions, divides the discipline of the Church into (1) private monition; (2) reprehension before witnesses; (3) excommunication<sup>7</sup> (Matt. xviii. 15-17). For light offences reprehension is enough; but for heavier, exclusion from the communion of the Supper, humiliation before God, and testification of penitence before the Church, are needful.<sup>8</sup> No one, not even the sovereign, must be exempted from such censures; which he illustrates by the case of Theodosius.<sup>9</sup> The Calvinistic communions in general have been very strict observers of the discipline thus maintained by their great reformer.

<sup>1</sup> Bingham. xix. iii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* § 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* § 3. On the whole subject of primitive discipline read Bingham, *E. A. Bks. xvi.-xix.*, and Marshall's *Penitential Discipline*.

<sup>4</sup> Sess. xxv. cap. iii.

<sup>5</sup> "Impios, quorum nota est impietas, excludere ex communione Ecclesiæ, sine vi humana, sed verbo." — *Sylloge*, p. 220.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 293.

<sup>7</sup> *Instit.* iv. xii. 2.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* § 6.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* § 7.

The Church of England is clear enough in its principles, though restrained in its practice. This Article speaks plainly her doctrine. The rubric before the Communion gives to the curate the power of repelling evil livers from the Eucharist, provided that he shall at once acquaint the bishop. The introduction to the Communion Service speaks with great regret of the relaxation of godly discipline, and with earnest desire that it may be restored. The canons of 1663 are sufficiently free in denouncing excommunication against heretics, schismatics, and dissenters of all kinds. The peculiar nature of the connection between the Church and State in England, and the prevalence of what are called Erastian opinions, have been the great causes why ecclesiastical censures have lost their power, and become a dead letter amongst us.

---

## SECTION II. — SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

**T**HERE appear two points here to be demonstrated. I. That the Church is divinely authorized to excommunicate offenders, and to restore them to communion on their repentance. II. That certain persons in the Church are judges, having authority thereto.

I. Our Lord Himself gave power to His Church to excommunicate and absolve. In Matt. xviii. 15–18, He enjoins that, if one brother or fellow Christian sin against another, and refuse to listen to private rebuke, or to the admonition of others to whom the offence may be told, then the grievance is to be communicated to the Church.<sup>1</sup> But if, when it is told to the Church, the erring brother still neglects to hear and to show penitence, then he is to be looked on no longer as a Christian and a brother, but it is said, “Let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican” (ver. 17). The meaning of this would be intelligible enough to

<sup>1</sup> τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. There is no sufficient reason to doubt that our Lord meant here His Church. It was not, indeed, then fully set up, but He was continually foretelling its establishment; why then might He not speak of it by name? The word itself is probably a translation of the Hebrew קהל; but it is by no means likely, that our Lord should intend His Christian followers to tell their troubles to the Jewish congregation, or the elders

thereof, who would already have excommunicated and rejected them. Whilst He was with them, He Himself would be the natural referee. Afterwards he constitutes His Church the judge; the Church, that is, acting through its elders, as the Jewish קהל acted through its elders. Hence Chrysostom and Theophylact explain τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ by τοῖς προεδρεύουσι. — See Suicer, Tom. I. p. 1052.

the first disciples of Christ. They had been bred Jews, and knew that Jews had no communion with heathen men and publicans, not merely not in religious ordinances, but not even to eat. This direction then Christ gives to His Church, that those who, having sinned openly against their brethren, would not listen to her godly admonitions, should be separated from the fellowship of the faithful, and treated as heathens or publicans. Then, to confirm the Church in her authority, to assure her that her censures, and her remission of censure both had a warrant from God, He adds: "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven" (ver. 18). In this context there can be no reasonable question, that the binding means to place in a state of bondage or excommunication from Church privilege, that the loosing signifies to restore again to the freedom of Christian communion.

At the risk of anticipating the subject of our second division, we ought to compare with this the promise to St. Peter (Matt. xvi. 19) and to the Apostles at large (John xx. 23). To St. Peter, as to the Church, it is promised, that by means of the keys of the kingdom he shall bind, and it shall be bound in Heaven; he shall loose, and it shall be loosed in Heaven. And to all the Apostles it is promised: "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted: and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (ver. 23). Now to no human being, save to Christ alone, has the power of forgiving sins primarily and absolutely been committed by God. (See Matt. ix. 6. Rev. iii. 7.) But to admit to the Church (*i. e.* to the kingdom of Heaven, Christ's kingdom on earth) by baptism, to exclude from it by excommunication, to restore again by absolution and remission of censure, — these are powers which Christ commits to His people, and especially to the rulers and elders of His people.

To illustrate this, we must look at the practice of the Apostolic Church. In 1 Cor. v. 5, we find St. Paul enjoining the Corinthians to "deliver" the incestuous man "to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." It is true many of the ancients were of opinion, that St. Paul meant here to inflict by a miracle some bodily disease upon the man. But the Apostle does not say that he himself will deliver him to Satan, but bids the Corinthian Church to do so. If it were a miraculous punishment, it is far more likely that he should have inflicted it himself. But he bids them (ver. 4)

assemble together, "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ;" promises that, as their bishop, he will be with them in spirit; and then tells them, with the power of the Lord Jesus to deliver the offender to Satan. Now the world is Satan's kingdom; the Church is Christ's. To expel from Christ's kingdom is to turn over into Satan's kingdom. What more fit than such language to express excommunication? And to prove that this is what is meant, we find (in 2 Cor. ii.) that, when the incestuous man had repented, the Apostle enjoins the Corinthians to restore and forgive him; and promises that he will forgive whomsoever they forgive. (See vv. 5-11.) All this exactly corresponds with a case of excommunication, succeeded by restoration and absolution.<sup>1</sup>

We may compare with these many passages, in which the Apostles enjoin upon Christians to withdraw from the company of brethren who do not live according to their Christian profession, but who are either impure in their lives, or heretical in their belief. (See Rom. xvi. 17. 1 Cor. v. 9; xv. 33; xvi. 22. 2 Cor. vi. 14, 17. 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14. 2 John 10, 11.) These, though not all directly bearing on the subject, show that Christians ought to keep themselves from all communion with ungodly men; and therefore make it probable, that they should be enjoined to exclude them from Church-fellowship.

II. We have next to show, that our Lord gave certain officers in His Church special authority, both to excommunicate, and to restore to communion.

The Church in the early ages must be viewed as a distinct society, separated from the world at large, held together by great and independent interests, governed by laws peculiar to itself, and ordered by its own officers. It was in the midst of the wilderness, with wolves and wild beasts all around it; a sheepfold, and with shepherds of the sheep. The shepherds or governors were the bishops and elders. "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine" (1 Tim. v. 17). "We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for

<sup>1</sup> See Theodoret and Theophylact *In 1 Cor.* v. 5; Balsamon and Zonaras *In Basil. Can.* vii.; Beza *In 1 Cor.* v. 5; Estius *In 1 Cor.* v. 5; Beveridge, *Not. in Can. Apostol.* x.; *Pandectæ*, Tom. ii. *Adnotat.* p. 20; Suicer, Tom. ii. p. 940. These all advocate the view taken in the

text. On the opposite side see Grotius and Lightfoot on 1 Cor. v. 5; also Hammond, who combines both views in one, thinking both excommunication and bodily disease to have been inflicted. So, I rather think, does St. Chrysostom. See *Homil.* xv. in 1 Cor. v.

their work's sake" (1 Thess. v. 12, 13). "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God" (Heb. xiii. 7). "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves unto them; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account," &c. (Heb. xiii. 17). Such passages show, that the primitive pastors had a pastoral *authority*, as well as a pastoral care.

Now we have seen, that our Lord committed to His Church the keys of discipline, the power to bind and to loose. But, as all bodies act through their officers, so, what at one time He gave to the Church as a body, at another He specially assigned to the rulers of that body, the Apostles and elders. To St. Peter, the first and most honoured of the college of the Apostles, He promised, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19). And the power which he thus bestowed on St. Peter, He afterwards yet more solemnly conveyed to all the Apostles, and apparently with them to other elders of the Church (see ver. 19), in the words, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John xx. 22, 23). The hypothesis, that this commission to the first disciples of Christ was miraculous, and therefore temporary, is utterly untenable. If a miraculous power were bestowed, it was no less than a power of searching the heart, and pronouncing authoritatively a judgment of perdition on the guilty, and pardon of sins to the penitent. But such power is the attribute of God alone; and He will never so give His glory to another. The Apostles, though endued with the gift of tongues, of prophecy, of miracles, were not endued with the power to bestow an actual remission of offences, such as would free the soul from all danger, when appearing before the judgment-seat of Christ; and as little might they hurl the thunderbolt of vengeance, and sentence transgressors to the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone. It is plain, therefore, that the keys committed to St. Peter were the badge of his stewardship, as "minister of Christ, and steward of the mysteries of God." The power to bind and to loose was the same as the Church's power to bind and to loose. And the power to retain and to remit sins, was but the same authority conveyed in different terms.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Hammond's note on John *κρατέω* in St. John are all one with *the* **xx.** 23. He shows that the *ἀφίεναι* and *λύει* and *δέειν* in St. Matthew.

Now this power, considered as the power of admitting to, and excluding from the Church and her fellowship, as the Church exercised it, so the Apostles especially claimed it, as immediately resulting from their own commission from Christ. In the case of the incestuous man at Corinth, St. Paul enjoins the Church to excommunicate and afterwards to restore him; but, in both instances, he himself is to be considered as judging with them and ratifying their sentence, by virtue of his own special authority as an Apostle of Christ; in which office he claims to be exercising Christ's own authority. Thus (in 1 Cor. v. 3, 4, 5), he says, "I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already . . . In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one to Satan." Here is a solemn excommunication, performed by the Church, ratified by the Apostle, and so confirmed by Christ Himself. And, in 2 Cor. ii. 10, when enjoining that the penitent sinner should be restored to communion, he writes, "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also: for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it, in the person of Christ." What can be plainer than that, in both these cases, St. Paul considered that he had himself, as a chief governor in the Church, an especial power, coupled with the general assent of the Church, to judge, to expel, and to restore? So (in 1 Tim. i. 20) he says that he had himself excommunicated Hymenæus and Alexander. Whether we must infer that he did so of his own authority alone, or calling in other members of the Church, as assessors to him, we cannot say. Again, in 2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, 10, we find him threatening to hold a regular judicial inquiry, summoning witnesses, not sparing those who should be proved to have sinned, but using sharpness, "according to the power which the Lord had given him, to edification, not to destruction."

To pass to other chief pastors, besides the Apostles themselves, we find that to Timothy and Titus, appointed bishops in the Church, St. Paul lays down rules, how they should judge, rebuke, and reject (1 Tim. v. 19-21. Tit. iii. 10, 11). Moreover, we have at least one case of the abuse of this power recorded in the new Testament. Diotrophes, who aimed at a primacy (*φιλοπρωτεύει*), cast the brethren out of the Church (3 John 10). And herein we may recognize that Divine wisdom which ordained that, though the chief officers of the Church should be the principal executors of its authority, yet the authority should not be vested in them alone, but, with them, in the whole body of the faithful. (See again

Matt. xviii. 17, 18.) And it may appear that, as our Lord, in immediate context with the promise of ratifying Church censures and Church absolutions, promised that "where two or three were gathered together in His name, He would be in the midst of them" (ver. 20); so it was with a kind of synodical authority that the Apostles ordinarily armed themselves, when they administered discipline (compare again 1 Cor. v. and 2 Cor. ii), that so they might not seem to lord it over the heritage of God, and that their power might be obviously for edification, not for destruction.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> If we pass from the early to the present times, we may observe, that our Ecclesiastical Courts are, in theory, formed upon the primitive principle. They are, indeed, lay tribunals. Yet their judges represent, first, the authority of the pri-

mate, whose delegates they are; and secondly, as being themselves laymen, and as holding power from our civil, as well as our ecclesiastical rulers, they represent not only the hierarchy, but also the laity of the Church.

## ARTICLE XXXIV.

*Of the Traditions of the Church.*

*Traditiones Ecclesiasticæ.*

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like,) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

TRADITIONES atque cæremonias easdem non omnino necessarium est esse ubique aut prorsus consimiles. Nam et variæ semper fuerunt et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum, et morum diversitate, modo nihil contra verbum Dei instituat.

Traditiones, et cæremonias Ecclesiasticas, quæ cum verbo Dei non pugnant, et sunt autoritate publica institutæ atque probatæ, quisquis privato consilio volens, et data opera, publice violaverit, is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem Ecclesiæ, quique lædit autoritatem Magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut cæteri timeant, arguendus est.

Quælibet Ecclesia particularis, sive nationalis, autoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi cæremonias, aut ritus Ecclesiasticos humana tantum autoritate institutos, modo omnia ad ædificationem fiant.

**T**HE Reformation was in a great measure a national movement. The power and authority of the see of Rome had annihilated the distinctions of national Churches, and produced an uniformity, not only of doctrine, but also of ceremonial and discipline, throughout the West. This Article, like the XVth of the Confession of Augsburg, is an assertion of the right of particular Churches to retain or adopt, in things indifferent, local and peculiar usages. The Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, headed "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained," is a farther and fuller exposition of the sentiments of our Reformers on this head. It should be read in connection with the Article.

The two points insisted on, and which we have to consider, are

I. That traditions and ceremonies were not to be everywhere alike, but that particular or national Churches may ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies of mere human authority, so all be done to edifying.

II. That private persons, of their private judgment, are not

justified in openly breaking the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to God's word.

I. There is little direct proof, either for or against our first position, to be drawn from holy Scripture itself. The Apostolic rule was, that all things should "be done to edifying" (1 Cor. xiv. 26); "all decently and in order" (ver. 40). This certainly leaves a great liberty, and a great latitude, to order the ceremonies and offices of the Church.

But, if we come to Christian history, we shall find that the different Churches, in early times, though having wonderful concord in doctrine, and in Apostolical government, had yet great variety in discipline and ritual. The well-known controversy concerning Easter very early divided the East and West. The Church of Rome kept Easter, as we keep it now, so that it always falls on a Sunday; whilst the Churches of Asia Minor observed it on the fourteenth day of the month Abib, after the manner of the Jewish Passover, let it fall on whatever day of the week it might. The Apostolical Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, paid Rome a visit, to endeavour to arrange with Anicetus an uniformity of custom on this head; but though they could come to no agreement here, they agreed that the unity and harmony of the Churches should not be broken on such a point of tradition and ceremony.<sup>1</sup> Later indeed, Victor, Bishop of Rome, was disposed to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches, because they did not follow the Roman custom; for which uncharitableness Irenæus sent him a letter of reproof.<sup>2</sup>

The still more important controversy concerning the rebaptizing of heretics arose in the next century; Cyprian and the African bishops maintaining the propriety of baptizing anew those who had received baptism from heretics; whilst Stephen and the Roman Church maintained, that such baptism was valid, and therefore that it could not be repeated. The controversy indeed ran high; but for a length of time each branch of the Church followed its own views.<sup>3</sup>

Another instance of diversity of custom was the mode in which the Jewish Sabbath was treated. Some Churches, those of the Patriarchate of Antioch especially, not only observed the Christian Lord's day, but also the Jewish Sabbath. On the other hand, some Churches used to fast on the Saturday, or Sabbath, as well as on the Friday; because on the former our Lord lay in the grave, as

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 14, v. 24.

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

<sup>3</sup> See Mosheim, *De Rebus ante Constan-*

*tinum*, sæc. III. § xviii. Also Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* Cent. III. P: II. ch. III. § 13.

on the latter he was crucified. St. Augustine mentions, that St. Ambrose wisely determined to fast on the Saturday, when he was in those places where it was customary; but not to fast on that day, where the custom was against it.<sup>1</sup>

Another observable thing in the early ages is, that the different bishops were so far independent of each other, that they were allowed to frame their own Liturgies, and even to express the Creed in different forms.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, we hear of the Liturgies of Antioch, and Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Rome, of Gaul, of Spain,<sup>3</sup> &c. &c.

Now, all these facts prove the right of particular Churches to some degree of independence one of another, as regards bare ceremonies and traditional rites and customs.

II. That private persons should not wantonly break or neglect the traditions of the Church to which they belong, may be said to result from the very nature of a Christian society, and indeed of society altogether.

The scriptural authority is strong in favour of obedience to both civil and ecclesiastical authorities; even when both are corrupt. Of the former see Rom. xiii. 1; Tit. iii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 13, 17. Of the latter, we have our Lord's injunction to His disciples to obey the Pharisees, because they sat in Moses' seat, Matt. xxiii. 2, 3; and the example of the Apostles, who, in all things not unlawful, adhered to Jewish observances and the customs of their own nation, even after the Church of Christ had been set up in the world. See Acts ii. 46; xxi. 20, 26; xxviii. 17. The Apostles indeed denounce severely those who cause divisions and schisms in the Church (Rom. xvi. 17. 1 Cor. iii. 3, &c.); and enjoin all Christians to obey their spiritual rulers, and to submit themselves to them (1 Cor. xvi. 16. 1 Thess. v. 12. Heb. xiii. 17).

It seems unnecessary to add authority from the primitive ages. The whole system of discipline and order, then so strictly observed, of necessity involves the principle, that laws and regulations made by the body of the Church were binding on, and to be observed by, every individual Christian who belonged to the Church. The decrees of Councils and Synods, often relating to discipline and ceremony, of course proceeded on the same understanding and principle.

<sup>1</sup> "Cum Romam venio, jejuno Sabbato; cum hic, non jejuno; Sic etiam tu ad quam forte Ecclesiam veneris, ejus morem serva, si cuiquam non vis esse scandalo, nec quemquam tibi." *Epist.*

LIV. *ad Januarium*, Tom. II. p. 154, quoted by Beveridge on this Article.

<sup>2</sup> See Bingham, *E. A.* Bk. II. ch. VI.

<sup>3</sup> See Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, "Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies."

## ARTICLE XXXV.

### *Of the Homilies.*

THE second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of *Edward* the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.

Of the names of the Homilies.

- 1 *Of the right Use of the Church.*
- 2 *Against Peril of Idolatry.*
- 3 *Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.*
- 4 *Of good Works: first of Fasting.*
- 5 *Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.*
- 6 *Against Excess of Apparel.*
- 7 *Of Prayer.*
- 8 *Of the Place and Time of Prayer.*
- 9 *That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought, to be ministered in a known tongue.*
- 10 *Of the reverend estimation of God's Word.*
- 11 *Of Alms-doing.*
- 12 *Of the Nativity of Christ.*
- 13 *Of the Passion of Christ.*
- 14 *Of the Resurrection of Christ.*
- 15 *Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.*
- 16 *Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.*
- 17 *For the Rogation-days.*
- 18 *Of the State of Matrimony.*
- 19 *Of Repentance.*
- 20 *Against Idleness.*
- 21 *Against Rebellion.*

### *De Homiliis.*

TOMUS secundus homiliarum, quarum singulos titulos huic articulo subjunximus, continet piam et salutarem doctrinam, et his temporibus necessariam, non minus quam prior tomus homiliarum, quæ editæ sunt tempore *Edwardi* Sexti. Itaque eas in Ecclesiis per ministros diligenter et clare, ut a populo intelligi possint, recitandas esse judicavimus.

De Nominibus Homiliarum.

- Of the right Use of the Church.*
- Against Peril of Idolatry.*
- Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.*
- Of good Works: first of Fasting.*
- Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.*
- Against Excess of Apparel.*
- Of Prayer.*
- Of the Place and Time of Prayer.*
- That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue.*
- Of the reverend estimation of God's Word.*
- Of Alms-doing.*
- Of the Nativity of Christ.*
- Of the Passion of Christ.*
- Of the Resurrection of Christ.*
- Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.*
- Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.*
- For the Rogation-days.*
- Of the State of Matrimony.*
- Of Repentance.*
- Against Idleness.*
- Against Rebellion.*

---

[The American revision adds, "This Article is received in this Church, so far as it declares the Books of Homilies to be an explication of Christian doctrine, and instructive in piety and morals. But all references to the constitution and laws of England are considered as inapplicable to the circumstances of this Church: which also suspends the order for the reading of said Homilies in churches, until a revision of them may be conveniently made, for the clearing of them, as well from obsolete words and phrases, as from the local references." It is needless to add that the revision has never been made. — J. W.]

**T**HERE is not much to be said concerning this Article. At the time of the Reformation there was great need of simple and sound instruction for the people, and but few were competent to give it. Many of the clergy were but partially affected to the so-called new learning. Many were very illiterate. In many parishes, therefore, the clergy were not licensed to preach, and hence the reformers put forth these popular discourses, to meet the exigencies of the times.

The First Book of Homilies, which was published in the reign of Edward VI., is attributed to the pens of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and others. The second, published in Elizabeth's reign, is supposed to be due in great part to Jewel. The former seems to be written with much greater care and accuracy than the latter, and is indeed most full of sound and valuable teaching.

It is not possible to prove the assertion, that they "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," without going through the whole book of Homilies, and commenting on them all. All writers on the subject have agreed, that the kind of assent, which we are here called on to give to them, is general, not specific. We are not expected to express full concurrence with every statement, or every exposition of Holy Scripture contained in them, but merely in the general to approve of them, as a body of sound and orthodox discourses, and well adapted for the times for which they were composed. For instance, we cannot be required to call the Apocrypha by the name of Holy Scripture, or to quote it as of Divine authority, because we find it so in the Homilies. We cannot be expected to think it a very cogent argument for the duty of fasting, that thereby we may encourage the fisheries and strengthen the seaport towns against foreign invasion.<sup>1</sup> And perhaps we may agree with Dr. Hey, rather than with Bishop Burnet,<sup>2</sup> and hold, that a person may fairly consider the Homilies to be a sound collection of religious instruction, who might yet shrink from calling the Roman Catholics idolaters. The Homilies are, in fact, semi-authoritative documents. The First Book is especially valuable, as having been composed by those who reformed our services and drew up our Articles. The second also shows popularly the general tone of instruction, which the divines of the reign of Elizabeth thought wholesome for the people. They are therefore of much

<sup>1</sup> See Homily *On Good Works; and first, Of Fasting.*

<sup>2</sup> See Burnet on Art. xxxv.; Hey, iv. p. 466.

value in throwing light on documents more authoritative than themselves ; and may be useful for the instruction of our clergy and people in the doctrines of the Reformation. The higher education of our parish priests, and the now somewhat antiquated style of the discourses in question, render it not very likely that they will ever again be much read in Churches.

Something has been said before of the "Homily of Salvation,"<sup>1</sup> which is of greater authority than the rest, being referred to in Article XI. as a fuller exposition of the doctrine there delivered. It was written by Cranmer, and is indeed of great value, sound, simple, and eloquent.

It has been apparently thought doubtful by some, whether anything uninspired ought to be read in Churches. The Bible should be read there, prayers offered up, and sermons preached ; but to read ancient writings which are not inspired, is to put them on the same level with the inspired Scriptures. This objection has been considered, with reference to the reading of the Apocrypha, under Article VI.<sup>2</sup> What was said of that will fully apply to the reading of homilies. There can be no danger that the Homilies, or any such things, should ever be esteemed by the people as of like authority with the Scriptures. The same objection would apply to sermons and hymns, at least as strongly as to homilies. It is not possible, in any ordinary state of the Church, that all sermons should be, not only extempore effusions, but uttered by direct inspiration of the Spirit. We must therefore esteem them as merely human compositions. And, though special blessing may be expected on the teaching of faithful ministers of Christ ; yet it is difficult to see what there is to raise their written or precomposed discourses to an eminence above the writings of martyred bishops, such as Cranmer and his fellows. The lawfulness therefore of the putting forth of the Homilies seems unquestionable.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 299.

<sup>2</sup> Art VI. sect. III. No. II. p. 188.

## ARTICLE XXXVI.

*Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.*

*De Episcoporum et Ministrorum Consecratione.*

THE Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of *Edward* the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it anything, that of itself is superstitious and ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the forenamed King *Edward* unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

LIBELLUS de consecratione Archi-episcoporum, et Episcoporum, et de ordinatione Presbyterorum et Diaconorum, editus nuper temporibus *Edwardi VI.* et autoritate Parlamenti illis ipsis temporibus confirmatus, omnia ad ejusmodi consecrationem, et ordinationem necessaria continet, et nihil habet, quod ex se sit, aut superstitiosum, aut impium: itaque quicumque juxta ritus illius libri consecrati, aut ordinati sunt, ab anno secundo predicti regis *Edwardi*, usque ad hoc tempus, aut ordinabuntur, rite, atque ordine, atque legitime statuimus esse et fore consecratos et ordinatos.

[The only change, in the American revision, is the omission of the references to the time of *Edward* the Sixth, and the insertion of a reference to the General Convention of 1792, by which the Ordinal was set forth. One change was, however, made in the Ordinal itself, of which something must be said; since the alteration of the age requisite for the Diaconate, — which only recurs to the provisions of the period antecedent to 1662, — and the local adaptations of promises and oaths, require no special consideration.

In the PROPOSED BOOK, the English Ordinal was accepted, with a proviso omitting "any oaths inconsistent with the American Revolution."

Bishop White says, that "the alterations of the Ordinal were prepared by the Bishops;" and adds, "there was no material difference of opinion, except in regard to the words used by the Bishop at the ordination of Priests." Bishop Seabury was urgent for retaining the words in the English Ordinal, though he finally consented to the insertion of the alternative form. Bishops White, Prévost, and Madison appear to have been disposed to omit the words, though they also agreed to the alternative. Indeed, it is believed that Bishop White proposed it.

Some, doubtless, may object to the alternative form as insufficient. To such persons it is quite enough to reply that no special form of words has ever been considered requisite, as accompanying the imposition of hands. Others will fault the first form, as savouring of Romish superstition. Let such remember that the words objected to are the very words used by our Lord in commissioning His Apostles; that unless they involved Romish superstition in His using, they need not in ours; that to give up all Scripture which the Roman Church has corrupted is something worse than folly; and that the retention and use of our Lord's words in the Ordinal is, when rightly viewed, the strongest possible protest against such corruption.

— J. W.]

WHEN the Liturgy of the Church was undergoing a revision in the reign of Edward VI., it was obviously desirable that the Ordinal should be revised too. Accordingly, A. D. 1549, an act of Parliament was passed to appoint six prelates and six other learned men, to devise a form of making and consecrating archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons, and other ministers.<sup>1</sup> The Ordinal, drawn up by these divines, was in use till 1552; and six bishops were consecrated by means of it.

According to the forms in the Ancient Roman Pontificals, those who were ordained priests had their hands anointed, the vessels of the Eucharist were delivered to them, and authority was given them to offer sacrifice. The new Ordinal omitted the Chrism, and all mention of offering sacrifices, but retained the custom of delivering "the chalice or cup with the bread."<sup>2</sup>

In the year 1552, the Second Service Book of Edward VI. came forth; and with it a still further revision of the Ordinal. In the latter, the porrection of the chalice and paten was omitted. The form of ordination was nearly as in our present services; except that in the prayer of ordination of priests it was only said, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost," without adding, "for the office of a priest," &c.; and in the prayer of consecration of bishops, it was said, "Take the Holy Ghost," without the words, "for the office and work of a bishop," &c.

On the accession of Queen Mary, the new Ordinal was immediately suppressed. The orders conferred in the late reign, and with the use of the reformed Ordinal, were not declared invalid; but those who had been so ordained, were to be reconciled, and the deficiencies supplied, such as unction, porrection of the chalice,<sup>3</sup> &c.

In the reign of Elizabeth the reformed Ordinal was again restored, and in its use were consecrated Parker, the primate, and other bishops of the reformed Church. In confirmation of its authority, the Convocation of 1562 inserted this present Article among the XXXIX., in place of the XXXVth Article of 1552, which was more general, and concerned the whole Prayer Book, this being restricted to the Ordination Services. It was farther enforced by Act of Parliament, A. D. 1566; and the Article of 1562 was confirmed in 1571. On the accession of Charles II. and

<sup>1</sup> Heylyn, *History of Reformation*, p. 82.

<sup>3</sup> Heylyn, *Hist. Ref. History of Queen*

<sup>2</sup> *Liturgies of Edward VI.* Parker Society, p. 86.

ciety, p. 179.

the restoration of Episcopacy, which had been abolished during the Commonwealth, the ordination services, being restored, were, however, subjected to a review, and reduced to their present form. The most important additions were the insertion, in the prayer of ordination of priests, after the words "Receive thou the Holy Ghost," of the words "for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands;" and a like change in the prayer of consecration of bishops; so that the office of a bishop is distinctly expressed, whereas at first the words were general, and as applicable to a priest as to a bishop.

The Preface, which is assigned to Cranmer, was the same in the first reformed Ordinal as it is in the present Ordination Service in our Prayer Books.<sup>1</sup>

The object of this Article is to meet objections to the validity and propriety of ordinations conferred in the use of this Ordinal. The objections are of two kinds: I. That the Ordinal lacks some essential ceremonies. II. That it has some superstitious forms and expressions.

#### I. The first objection comes from the Romanists.

1. It is urged, that our bishops do not confer the chrism, nor offer the sacred vessels, nor more especially give the power of sacrificing; therefore none can be truly ordained by them to the Christian priesthood.

To this we answer, first, that Scripture gives no authority for all these forms. All that we read of there, is laying on of hands with prayer. Secondly, we say that we find no authority for such forms in the customs of the primitive Church. Gregory Nazianzen<sup>2</sup> indeed speaks of unction, but he means the unction of the Holy Ghost. The earliest specimen we have of a form of ordination is in the VIIIth book of the Apostolical Constitutions, c. 16, which is as follows.

"When thou ordainest a presbyter, O bishop, place thy hand on his head, the presbytery standing with thee, and also the dea-

<sup>1</sup> The question concerning the unbroken succession of our Bishops might naturally occur to us here. But it does not properly come under consideration in this or any other of the xxxix. Articles. The student may consult Courayer, *Defence of English Ordinations*; Bramhall, *Protestants' Ordinations Defended*; Mason's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*. See also Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, 11. ch.

xii.; *On the Church*, part vi. ch. x.; Harington's *Succession of Bishops in the English Church*.

[The student may profitably read Dr. Evan's excellent *Essay on Anglican Ordinations*, and Dr. Oldknow's small, but very useful tract on the same subject. — *J. W.*]

<sup>2</sup> *Orat. v. Tom. i p. 136.*

cons; and pray thus: O Lord, Almighty, our God, who hast created all things by Jesus Christ, and by Him providest for all, in whom is the power of providing in various ways. Now therefore, O God, Thou providest for immortals by preservation, for mortals by succession, for the soul by care of laws, for the body by supply of necessity. Do thou, therefore, now look upon Thy holy Church, increase it, and multiply those who preside over it; and give power that they may labour in word and work to the edification of Thy people. Do thou also look now upon this Thy servant, who, by suffrage and judgment of all the clergy, is chosen into the presbytery; and fill him with the Spirit of grace and counsel, that he may aid and govern Thy people with a pure mind; in like manner as Thou hadst respect to Thine elect people, and as Thou commandest Moses to choose elders whom Thou filledst with Thy Spirit. And now, O Lord, make good this, preserving in us an un-failing Spirit of Thy grace, that he, being filled with healing powers, and instructive discourse, may with meekness teach Thy people, and serve Thee sincerely with a pure mind and willing soul, and *may perform the blameless sacred rites for Thy people.*<sup>1</sup> Through Thy Christ, with whom to Thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory, honour, and reverence forever. Amen."

This is the whole form of ordaining priests given in the Apostolical Constitutions. The words in Italics are the only words which can refer to sacrifice or Sacraments; and they are certainly as general as those in our own Ordinal, "Be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of His holy Sacraments." The words in the Roman Pontifical, "Receive thou power to offer sacrifices to God, and to celebrate the mass for the quick and the dead," were not in any ancient form of consecration. Morinus, as cited by Bishop Burnet, acknowledges that he could not find any such words for the first 900 years.<sup>2</sup> The Greek Church merely prays God to grant to the newly ordained presbyter, "that he may stand blameless at Thy altar, may preach the gospel of Thy Salvation, offer to Thee gifts and spiritual sacrifices, and renew Thy people by the laver of regeneration."<sup>3</sup> This again is perfectly general; and the earlier we go, the simpler we find all the forms of ordination, in all parts of the world. "Not a father, not a council, not one ancient author at any time mentions the delivery of the paten or chalice, or the formal words used by the Church of Rome, even when they

<sup>1</sup> τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἱερουργίας ἀμώμους ἐκτελεῖ.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet, *Vindication of English Orders*, p. 24; Bingham, II. xix. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Morinus, *De Sacr. Ordin.* pt. II. p. 55; Walcott's *English Ordinal*, p. 260.

describe the ordination of their days, and where this could not have been omitted, if it had been essential.”<sup>1</sup> This is surely proof enough that the omissions complained of are not sufficient to invalidate all the orders of the Church.

2. It has also been objected, that the bishops consecrated according to the Ordinal of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, could not have been rightly consecrated, because the words of consecration were only, “Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love and soberness.” Here is nothing which might not apply to a priest or deacon, as well as to a bishop.

But we may reply, that the whole service concerns bishops, not priests and deacons; and that, if the words, “for the office of a bishop,” &c. afterwards inserted, were not at first added, it is quite evident that they were sufficiently implied. Everybody must have felt that it was episcopal consecration which was conferred. The form of ordination does not consist merely in the prayer of consecration. The whole service forms part of it. And, moreover, even in the Roman Pontifical, the words which accompany the imposition of hands are simply, “Receive the Holy Ghost;” and the prayer, which follows, does not directly mention the office of a bishop.<sup>2</sup>

II. Another objection proceeds from a very different quarter. The Puritans, and many well-meaning Christians since them, have much stumbled at our using those memorable words of our Lord and Saviour Christ, “Receive the Holy Ghost . . . Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.” The objection is of this nature.

1. The power of remitting and retaining sins was miraculous, and confined to the Apostles, and so not to be expected by other ministers.

2. Man cannot bestow God’s Spirit, and it is profane to claim the power to do so.

It is remarkable, that the reformers who rejected as superstitious some mere ceremonies, such as delivering the paten and chalice,

<sup>1</sup> Bramhall, *Protestants’ Ordinations Defended*, Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, v. p. 216. Several ancient forms, and much

useful information, may be found in Walcott, *On the English Ordinal*, ch. vi.

<sup>2</sup> Palmer, *On the Church*, pt. vi. ch. x. Vol. II. p. 460.

and the anointing of the hands, should yet have retained this form of words, which to many seems nothing short of blasphemy. Was it that the reformers had a deeper insight into Scripture than those who now object to their proceedings?

1. Under Art. XXXIII. I have already considered at length the question concerning the remitting and retaining sins. There it has been shown that such power was not miraculous, nor peculiar to the Apostles. A power of that higher kind never was given to mere man. The only authority which our blessed Lord thus conveyed to His first ministers was, more solemnly than before, authority to bind and to loose, — that which is elsewhere called the power of the keys, — so that ministerially they had the keys of the Church or kingdom, to admit men to it by preaching and baptism, to exclude men from it by excommunication, to restore them to it again by absolution. The assurance given them is, that their acts, as Christ's ministers in all these respects, shall be ratified in Heaven. It has been shown moreover, that this power of the keys is a portion of the Church's birthright. It is committed to the Church as a body, and more particularly to her bishops and presbyters. Hence every bishop, having authority to ordain, has also authority to declare that the power of the keys is committed to the person ordained by him. And no more is meant by these solemn words in our ordination service, than that, as Christ has left to the presbytery the right of ministering His Sacraments, and of excluding from His Sacraments; so the newly ordered presbyter now receives by Christ's own ordinance that right, — a divine commission to minister, and at the same time a divine commission duly to exercise the authority of excluding the unworthy, and admitting again the penitent sinner.<sup>1</sup>

2. On the words, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost," we may observe, that, as the power to remit and retain sins was not a personal and miraculous power conferred on the Apostles, so neither was the gift of the Spirit then breathed upon them the personally sanctify-

<sup>1</sup> I have not fully entered into the question of the efficacy of absolution, when pronounced on a repenting sinner. That it may restore to Church communion, none can doubt. But many, in our day, question, or rather deny, that it can be accompanied with any spiritual grace. The whole subject of ministerial blessing and absolution seems to be explained by the words of our Lord (Luke x. 5, 6): "Into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if the

son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it; if not, it shall turn to you again." Here the blessing of the minister was to be accompanied by blessing from above, if the recipient was rightly disposed for blessing. But if the recipient was unbelieving and impenitent, the blessing could not reach his heart; but yet the minister would himself have comfort from having acted on his commission, and having sought to convey comfort to others.

ing influence, nor yet the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. We cannot doubt that they had long ago received the sanctifying grace of God in their hearts, and so the ordinary operations of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity. And the miraculous baptism of the Spirit, which gave them powers peculiar to the Apostolic age, they did not receive until the day of Pentecost. Hence, this bestowal of the Spirit in the twentieth chapter of St. John was neither the one nor the other of these. What then must it have been? Evidently the ordaining grace of God. All ministerial authority has ever been believed to proceed from the Holy Ghost. Ministry, the right to minister, is one of the *charismata* of the Spirit. That *charisma* our Lord then for the first time fully bestowed upon His Church. But the same *charisma* was afterwards given "by the laying on of the Apostle's hands (2 Tim. i. 6), and, "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (1 Tim. iv. 14). Not that the Apostles or their successors could from themselves send forth the Spirit of God, or the gifts of the Spirit; but that, as our Lord had appointed ordination to be the means of receiving the grace of ordination, so the Church in undoubting faith believes, that, whensoever ordination is rightly ministered, the proper gift of orders flows down direct from the ordaining Spirit; not to sanctify the individual personally, but to constitute him truly a minister of Christ, and to make his ministry acceptable to God. Hence, when the bishop's hand is laid on the head of him whom he ordains, we doubt not that the *charisma* of God's Spirit is given, "for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God." The difference between such an ordination and our Lord's ordaining of His first ministers recorded in St. John chap. xx. is this. In the latter case, Christ Himself, to whom the Spirit is given without measure, gave of that Spirit authoritatively to His disciples; and so, in giving, He breathed on them, as showing that the Spirit proceeded from Him. But in the other case, our bishops presume not to breathe, nor did the Apostles before them, for they know that ordaining grace comes not from them, but from Christ, whose ministers they are; and so they simply, according to all Scriptural authority, use the outward rite of laying on of hands, in use of which they believe a blessing will assuredly come down from above.<sup>1</sup> That blessing is the gift of the Spirit of God, for the office and work of a priest.

And thus we conclude, that, as the Ordinal lacks nothing essential to the due administering of orders in the Church, so does it not contain anything that of itself is superstitious and ungodly.

<sup>1</sup> See Hooker, Bk. v. 77, 78.

## ARTICLE XXXVII.

### *Of the Civil Magistrates.*

THE Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of *England*, and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which Titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the injunctions also lately set forth by *Elizabeth* our Queen do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of *Rome* hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of *England*.

The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons and serve in the wars.

### *De Civilibus Magistratibus.*

REGIA Majestas in hoc Angliæ regno, ac cæteris ejus dominiis, summam habet potestatem, ad quam, omnium statuum hujus regni, sive illi ecclesiastici sint, sive civiles, in omnibus causis, suprema gubernatio pertinet, et nulli externæ jurisdictioni est subjecta, nec esse debet.

Cum Regiæ Majestati summam gubernationem tribuimus, quibus titulis intelligimus, animos quorundam calumniatorum offendi, non damus regibus nostris, aut verbi Dei, aut Sacramentorum administrationem, quod etiam injunctiones ab *Elizabetha Regina* nostra, nuper editæ, apertissime testantur. Sed eam tantum prærogativam, quam in sacris Scripturis a Deo ipso, omnibus piis Principibus, videmus semper fuisse attributam, hoc est, ut omnes status, atque ordines fidei suæ a Deo commissos, sive illi ecclesiastici sint, sive civiles, in officio contineant, et contumaces ac delinquentes, gladio civili coerceant.

Romanus pontifex nullam habet jurisdictionem in hoc regno Angliæ.

Leges Regni possunt Christianos propter capitalia, et gravia crimina, morte punire.

Christianis licet, ex mandato magistratus, arma portare, et justa bella administrare.

[The American Article reads:—

“ART. XXXVII. *Of the Power of the Civil Magistrates.*

“The Power of the Civil Magistrate extendeth to all men, as well Clergy as Laity, in all things temporal; but hath no authority in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men who are professors of the Gospel, to pay respectful obedience to the Civil Authority, regularly and legitimately constituted.”

The writer ventures to consider it unfortunate that the two declarations concerning “capital punishment,” and the propriety of Christians bearing arms, were omitted. The reasons for the omission, though he can conjecture what they were, he does not feel sufficiently sure of, to state. — *J. W.*]

## SECTION I.—THE SUPREMACY OF THE CROWN.

THE present Article concerns one of the most involved and difficult questions that have agitated Christian men: the question, namely, of the due proportions and proper relation between the civil and ecclesiastical powers in a Christian Commonwealth. The whole course of Church History, from the time of Constantine to the present, seems to have been striving to unravel the difficulty and solve the problem. Perhaps it never will be solved, until the coming of the Son of Man, when there shall be no king but Christ, and all nations, peoples, and languages, shall bow down before Him.

Without pretending then to clear up all that is dark in such a question, we may by a hasty survey of past events be enabled to place ourselves in such a position, that the mists of prejudice, whether religious or political, may not blind us to the perception of that light which Providence has given to guide us.

For the first three hundred years, the spiritual kingdom of Christ was on earth, having no relation to any earthly kingdom. The kingdoms of this world, instead of fostering, persecuted it. There was a direct antagonism between the Church and the world; and the external development of that antagonism was plainly visible in the opposing organization of Church and State. Christians indeed were from the first obedient subjects, wherever obedience was not incompatible with religion. They even marched in the armies of the heathen emperors, prayed for them in their public liturgies, and in persecution took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, resisting none but those commands which could be obeyed only by disobedience to God. But the whole Christian Church, as far as possible, shrank within itself from the polluting atmosphere of heathenism and heathen morality. The Apostle had condemned the Corinthians for going to law before the unbelievers (1 Cor. vi. 1), and had encouraged them to erect private tribunals among themselves, for the decision of disputes, which would inevitably arise.<sup>1</sup> The result was naturally, that the courts of the bishop became the ordinary courts of judicature, when Christians impleaded Christians. The rulers of the Church were looked up to with that kind of veneration which we call loyalty; whilst obedience to the em-

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 4. Some consider the word *ἔξουθενημένους*, used in this verse, to mean persons destitute of any public authority in the state.

peror was the result of no natural enthusiasm, but of a principle of self-denying, self-sacrificing obligation.

The accession of Constantine to the throne of Augustus, his conversion to Christianity, and his removal of the seat of empire to Byzantium, produced a remarkable revolution. Christians fondly hoped, that the kingdoms of this world had become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ. They naturally recognized the duty of Christian princes to protect the faith of the Gospel. They joyfully embraced the newly opened course for the progress of the Gospel. They reasonably were thankful for the promised freedom to worship God according to their consciences; and alas! it is to be feared, that they were not averse to using the civil authority to put down the pride of the now fast increasing heresy of Arius. Constantine, on his part, whether sincere or politic in his adoption of the Gospel, could not be ignorant of the vast machinery which his connection with the Church might put into his hands. In heathen times, the supreme ruler at Rome was also the supreme administrator of the affairs of religion. There was a sacredness attached to him, however vile his personal character. The Roman Emperor even became the Pontifex Maximus.<sup>1</sup> And, although Constantine found it not possible to assume a sacerdotal function in the Christian Church, he yet claimed a peculiar supremacy; which was sufficiently undefined to be inoffensive to others, and yet satisfactory to himself. "You," said he to the Christian prelates, "are bishops of the things within the Church; but I am constituted by God bishop of those which are without."<sup>2</sup> The words were perhaps originally spoken in jest, but time led him to apply them in earnest.

From this period the Church, though never endowed by the State, received a full and ample protection for the revenues which it might acquire. The Christian princes ever considered themselves as its protectors, and in some sense as its governors. There is good reason to think, that the power, which they so exercised, was often by no means paternal, but as tyrannical and arbitrary as was their more secular administration. The bishops indeed maintained the exclusive right of the clergy to minister in sacred things; and the emperors readily admitted that to the clergy alone such functions appertained.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of bishops and patriarchs was carefully preserved to them. Patri-

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon, ch. xx.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. *Vit. Constant.* iv. 24.

<sup>3</sup> The story of St. Ambrose forbidding

Theodosius to enter the chancel (*Theodoret*, l. v. c. 18) is well known.

archs were permitted to call provincial, and bishops to call diocesan synods ; but a synod of the universal Church was never called but by the Emperor himself. Though the decrees of the councils were made by the bishops, yet the Emperor thought himself justified in enforcing them by his own temporal power. Thus Arius, condemned at Nice, was banished by Constantine ; and there is too good reason to fear that court influence was unsparingly used to intimidate the members of a synod into voting with the Emperor, or absenting themselves altogether. Eusebius assigns to Constantine a principle, which was probably never admitted by the Church at large, but which may have materially influenced him in his own conduct ; namely, that as a kind of universal bishop, he assembled councils of the ministers of God.<sup>1</sup>

From this time, then, the Church and the State were no longer in the position of a persecuting power and a patient victim. They no longer represented, respectively, the principle of good and the principle of evil. The good of the one had penetrated the other ; and it may be feared, that there was something of reciprocal interchange. They had, however, entered into an alliance ; but still, more or less, the Christianized state was sure to retain some of the worldly elements which characterized it when heathen ; and there was still a struggle, though less conspicuous, between the Church in the Church and the world in the State. In the East, the power of the Emperor over the Church was the greater, because the East had become the seat of empire ; and there is little doubt, that the degeneracy of the Eastern Church had much connection with the influence of the court. Nay ! the power of that court became at once apparent, when, on the adoption of heresy by the Emperor, the whole East seemed suddenly overspread with Arianism.

There was a different state of things in the West ; the result, it may be, in part, of the greater vigour of the Western bishops, but still more of the absence of the seat of government from Rome. The Church was no longer the same isolated, distinct body that it had been when the empire was heathen ; and had it not been for the nucleus formed for it by the clergy, it might have been all dissipated in the midst of the half Christianized people that were around it. But the clergy were still a substantive, tangible body ; and, irrespective of any ambition of their own, it was almost essential to the existence of the Church, that they should form them-

<sup>1</sup> Οἷά τις κοινὸς ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ Θεοῦ καθι- συνεκρότει. — *De Vit. Constantin.* Lib. i. c. στάμενος, συνόδους τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργῶν 44.

selves into that kind of close corporation which had before embraced the whole society of Christians. Besides which, as their sacred character brought them respect even in the eyes of their tyrants, as they had a prescriptive right to hold private tribunals for the settlement of their private differences, as their sacred buildings had conceded to them the right of sanctuary possessed of old by heathen temples; they had in their hands the power, not only of supporting religion, but also of evading, or at least limiting, both for themselves and their fellow-Christians, the tyrannical domination of the emperor. The subject has been so clearly and liberally set forth by an accomplished writer of the day, that we may well use his own words. "If it be right to condemn the fiscal tyranny of the Roman rulers, it can hardly be also right to condemn those sacerdotal claims, and those imperial concessions, by which the range of that tyranny was narrowed . . . The Church is arraigned as selfish and ambitious, because it formed itself into a vast clerical corporation, living under laws and usages peculiar to itself, and not acknowledging the jurisdiction of the temporal tribunals. That the Churchmen of the fourth century lived beneath a ruthless despotism no one attempts to deny. That they opposed to it the only barrier by which the imperial tyranny could, in that age, be arrested in its course, is equally indisputable. If they had been laymen, they would have been celebrated as patriots by the very persons who, because they were priests, have denounced them as usurpers. If the bishops of the fourth century had lived under the republic, they would have been illustrious as tribunes of the people. If the Gracchi had been contemporaries of Theodosius, their names would have taken the place which Ambrose and Martin of Tours at present hold in ecclesiastical history. A brave resistance to despotic authority has surely no less title to our sympathy, if it proceeds from the episcopal throne, than if it be made amidst the tumults of the forum."<sup>1</sup>

If this was true of the relation of the Church to the empire, it was certainly not less true as regards its condition under the several kingdoms which were formed by the Gothic barbarians out of the ruins of the empire. The feudal monarchies, whether in their earlier condition or in their more matured and full-grown despotism, were amongst the most lawless, oppressive, and tyrannical forms of government that an unhappy people have ever groaned under. In those days when might was the only right, "we may rejoice to know," says the just-cited authority, "that the

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures on the History of France*, by the Rt. Hon. Sir James Stephen 1. p. 83.

early Church was the one great antagonist of the wrongs which were then done upon the earth, that she narrowed the range of fiscal tyranny, — that she mitigated the overwhelming poverty of the people, — that she promoted the accumulation of capital, — that she contributed to the restoration of agriculture, — that she balanced and held in check the imperial despotism, — that she revived within herself the remembrance and the use of the franchise of popular election, — and that the gloomy portraits which have been drawn of her internal or moral state, are the mere exaggerations of those who would render the Church responsible for the crimes with which it is her office to contend, and for the miseries which it is her high commission effectually, though gradually, to relieve.”<sup>1</sup>

The same may be said of much later times. The struggle between the crown and the clergy was, in fact, often a struggle of religion against lawlessness, avarice, licentiousness, and tyranny. The clergy were the guardians not only of the Church, but of the people; and one great secret of their increasing power was the conviction, even among their opponents, of the righteousness of their cause, and, among those whom they defended, of the blessings of their protection.

But there was one important element at work, which we have now to take into account. From the earliest times, the Bishop of Rome was the most important prelate in the West. His see was in the imperial city. It claimed the chief of the Apostles as its founder. The Apostolic sees were everywhere respected; and Rome was the only Church in Europe certainly Apostolic. So early as the third century, St. Cyprian had urged the priority of St. Peter, and the precedence of the Bishops of Rome, as an argument for the unity of the Church. To all Europe Rome was, on every account, a centre; and the ambition of its prelates never ceased to turn such advantage to their own account. There were few Churches which owed not some obligation to the Roman Church; if not as founding, yet as strengthening and enlightening them. There were a thousand causes tending to give additional importance to the Popes. The emperors found it politic to court them. The patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch sought defence from them against the overwhelming power of Constantinople in the East. The kings of distant nations asked for missionaries from them, to instruct their people more perfectly in the Gospel. The removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople, whilst it raised the see of that city to the position of eminence next to that

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures on the History of France*, by the Rt. Hon. Sir James Stephen, i. p. 37

of Rome, yet rather favoured the increase of the power of the latter. When there was an emperor at Rome, the Pope was controlled by a superior; but when the emperor was at a distance, the Christian bishop became the most important person in the imperial city. By degrees a *primacy*, which might have been reasonable, became a *supremacy* which was pernicious. The whole constitution of Europe favoured such an arrangement. As all Europe looked to Rome as its civil centre, so Christian Europe looked to Rome as its ecclesiastical centre. Then, the power of the Pope was a happy counterpoise for the power of the sovereign. In the Middle Ages the barons owed fealty to their feudal suzerain; and the bishops and clergy owed a spiritual fealty to their ecclesiastical head. The Church, as an united body, was disposed to look to one visible centre, one visible head. Evil as its consequences have been, still in these dark and troubled times such union and submission on the one hand, and a corresponding aid and protection on the other, may possibly have been the means of keeping the Church from utter disintegration, by protecting it from that lawless and arbitrary feudalism which might otherwise have swept away both Church and religion from the earth.

But the authority, thus fostered and matured, now overtopped all other authorities, and grew into a tyranny as intolerable as that against which it once promised to be a bulwark. Like a dictatorship after a republic, it was more absolute than legitimate monarchy. The power of the Pope was not merely spiritual, but political.<sup>1</sup> In the first place, the clergy were not esteemed as subjects of the crown, in the country in which they lived. The Pope was their virtual sovereign; to him they owed a supreme allegiance. All causes concerning them were referred to spiritual tribunals, and there was a final appeal to the jurisdiction of Rome itself. Bishops felt the grievance of such a power, when the Pope at his pleasure exempted monasteries from their control, and claimed all benefices, as of right vested in the supreme pontiff, and not held legally without his permission. But kings felt it still more; when a large portion of their subjects were withdrawn from their authority; when a large number of causes, under the

<sup>1</sup> Bellarmine calls it a heresy not to allow to the Pope power over sovereign princes in temporal affairs. And Baronius says, "They are branded as heretics, who take from the Church of Rome and the see of St. Peter one of the two swords, and allow only the spiritual." This heresy Baronius calls the "Heresy of the Politici." Bellarmin. *De Rom. Pont.* v. 1; Baronius, Anno 1053, § 14; Anno 1073, § 13, quoted by Barrow, *On the Pope's Supremacy*, p. 17. Bellarmine states it as the general Catholic sentiment, that popes have not *directly* temporal authority, but that *indirectly*, by virtue of their spiritual authority, they have temporal authority.

name of ecclesiastical, were withdrawn from their courts; when taxes were levied in the name of Peter's pence upon their kingdoms; when their clergy and many of their people could be armed against them by a foreign influence; and, worst of all, when the right was asserted of putting their whole country under an interdict, nay, even of either granting to them new kingdoms,<sup>1</sup> or of deposing them from their thrones, and releasing their people from their oaths of allegiance.<sup>2</sup>

The Reformation was a reaction from this state of things, as well as a throwing off of internal corruption of faith. It was viewed indeed by different persons according to their respective feelings and interests. The prince desired it, for the sake of regaining his former, and more than his former authority. The nobles desired it, that they might fatten on the spoils of the Church. The reforming prelates and clergy desired it, that they might be freed from the power of Rome, and have liberty to order God's worship aright. The people desired it, that they might have freedom of conscience and purity of faith. As the fathers had hailed the conversion of an emperor, to free them from heathen tyranny; as clergy and people in the Middle Ages had sought a refuge at Rome from the exactions of their domestic oppressors; so now the reformers hoped that the throne would prove to them a protection from the tyranny of the Vatican. We must plead this in excuse for what is the foulest stain on the Reformation, namely, the undue servility of the ecclesiastical leaders of it to the vicious and tyrannical princes that sided with it.

In England, Henry, whose love for reformation was love only for his own power, passions, and interests, wished not to free religion from restraint, but to transfer to himself the power formerly wielded by the Pope. And we may partly account for the opposition to reform among the commonalty, who had originally sighed for it, by remembering that they discovered now a prospect for themselves of the same tyranny here in England which had heretofore been as distant as Rome. Their desire for a restoration to a simpler worship and a purer faith had been met by a rapacious seizing of those ecclesiastical revenues from which so much benefit had

<sup>1</sup> As Alexander III. gave Henry II. a grant of Ireland.

<sup>2</sup> As Gregory VII. did to the Emperor Henry IV. A. D. 1076; Alexander III. did to the Emperor Frederick I. A. D. 1168; Innocent III. did to the Emperor Otho IV. A. D. 1210; and to our own King John, A. D. 1212. Thomas Aquinas, the great school authority, lays it

down as a principle, that the subjects of excommunicate princes are released from their allegiance. "Quum quis per sententiam denunciatur propter apostasiam, excommunicatus, ipso facto ejus subditi a dominio et juramento fidelitatis ejus liberati sunt."—Tom. II. *Secund. qu.* 12, Art. 11.; Barrow, *On the Pope's Supremacy*, p. 3.

ever been derived to the poor and to the oppressed; and by a transference of a power over their consciences from one whom they did look up to as a Christian prelate, to an avaricious and blood-stained sovereign.

However, notwithstanding the difficulties of the case, and the evil passions of some, the problem was working itself out. The Pope's power was happily abolished. Appeals to Rome were no longer legal. Ecclesiastical as well as civil causes were heard in the king's name. The acts of Convocation in the reforming of the doctrines and formularies were sanctioned by the crown. The clergy were all made amenable to the civil tribunals, and became in fact subjects of the throne of England, not of the throne of St. Peter.

But in what sense had the king thus become the head or chief governor of the Church? The very principle of the Reformation may be said to have been, that there is no Supreme Head of Christ's Church but Christ Himself. Yet by the acts 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, and 35 Henry VIII. c. 3, the king is declared in express terms, "the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England." And in the following reign, the Article of 1552 is worded in accordance with such acts, "The King of England is supreme head in earth, next under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland."<sup>1</sup>

Many thoughtful men, not disinclined to the Reformation, were much offended at this apparent assumption of spiritual authority over Christ's flock by a temporal sovereign. Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More went to the scaffold, rather than acknowledge it. But among those who submitted to the authority, there was a diversity of feeling as to the sense attached to it. Henry himself doubtless wished to be both pope and king. The Parliament probably accepted the title in no very definite signification; but rejoiced in any advance of the lay power to preëminence over the clergy. The Convocation thought it doubtfully consistent with their allegiance to God, and recognized the title only "so far as by the law of Christ they could."<sup>2</sup>

What was the opinion of the leading divines of the Reformation on this subject, and especially of the Archbishop, must be an interesting question. I have been surprised to find so little about it in the writings of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer. Cranmer had

<sup>1</sup> "Rex Angliæ est supremum caput in terris, post Christum, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ et Hiberniæ."

<sup>2</sup> "Ecclesiæ et cleri Anglicani, cujus

singularem protectorem et supremum Dominum, et, quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum caput ipsius majestatem recognoscimus."

evidently, at one time, a very extravagant notion of the sacredness of kings, as he had a very low view of the office of the ministry; so that he even ventured a statement, that the royal power might make a priest.<sup>1</sup> But this sentiment he afterwards entirely abandoned. We may remark then, that he ever constantly affirmed that in all countries the king's power is the highest power under God, to whom all men by God's laws owe most loyalty and obedience; and that he hath power and charge over all, as well bishops and priests as others.<sup>2</sup> But the occasion on which he gave the fullest exposition of the meaning which he and his fellows attached to the supremacy, was in his examination before Brokes, just before his death. Then he declared, that "every king in his own realm is supreme head, and therefore that the king of England is supreme head of the Church of Christ in England." He admits that on this principle, "Nero was Peter's head," and "head of the Church;" and that "the Turk is the head of the Church in Turkey."<sup>3</sup> "After this, Dr. Martin demanded of him, who was supreme head of the Church of England? Marry, quoth my Lord of Canterbury, Christ is head of this member, as He is of the whole body of the universal Church. Why, quoth Dr. Martin, you made King Henry the Eighth supreme head of the Church. Yea, said the Archbishop, of all the people of England, as well ecclesiastical as temporal. And not of the Church, said Martin. No, said He, for Christ is the only head of His Church, and of the faith and religion of the same. The king is head and governor of his people, which are the visible Church. What! quoth Martin, you never durst tell the king so. Yes, that I durst, quoth he, and did. In the publication of his style, wherein he was named supreme head of the Church, there was never other thing meant."<sup>4</sup>

Whether Cranmer durst or durst not tell the king thus, the king probably took it differently; and indeed it is pretty clear, that something more than the power of Nero, or of "the Turk," over Christians in their dominions, was intended to be assigned to Christian kings over their Christian subjects. Whatever too was meant by the publication of the style, "Supreme head of the Church," it caused offence to many besides those who were sure to take offence. Accordingly, when the Acts of Henry VIII. and Edw. VI. had been repealed by the Statute 1 Philip and Mary, c. 8, the title, "Supreme head," was never revived by authority, but was rejected by

<sup>1</sup> *Answers to Questions on the Sacraments*, A. D. 1540. See this subject considered under Article XXIII.

<sup>2</sup> See Cranmer's *Works*, IV. Appendix, pp. 266, 308, 328, &c.

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, IV. p. 98.

<sup>4</sup> Cranmer's *Works*, IV. pp. 116, 117.

Elizabeth, and "Supreme governor" substituted in its place.<sup>1</sup> The Statute 1 Eliz. c. 1, is an "act for restoring to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same." In this act all foreign jurisdiction is abolished, and the power of visiting and correcting ecclesiastical abuses is, by the authority of Parliament, annexed to the imperial crown of the realm. But the acts conferring the title of "Head of the Church" (26 Henry VIII. c. 1, 35 Henry VIII. c. 3) are not revived, and thenceforward "government" is substituted for "headship."<sup>2</sup>

In Elizabeth's reign, the authorized formularies explain, to a considerable extent, the meaning attached at that time to the authority in question. First comes this article, the words of which should be carefully considered. It excludes all foreign domination, assigns to the sovereign the only supreme authority over all sorts of men, whether civil or ecclesiastical, but especially denies that sovereigns have any ministerial function in the Church, whether as regards the Sacraments or the word of God; but the power which they have is such as godly princes in Scripture had, — "to rule all estates and degrees, whether ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the *civil* sword the stubborn and evil-doers."

The Injunctions of Elizabeth, to which the Article refers, enjoin all ecclesiastics to observe the laws made for restoring to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical, and abolishing all foreign authority. The queen's power is declared to be "the highest under God, to whom all men within the same realms and dominions by God's law owe most loyalty and obedience."<sup>3</sup>

In the reign of James I. the Convocation agreed on the Canons of 1603. The second canon expressly affirms, that the "king's majesty hath the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had among the Jews, and Christian emperors of the Primitive Church;" and both the first and second canon speak of the laws, as having "restored to the crown of this kingdom the *ancient* jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical." The XXXVth Canon contains three articles, which are subscribed by all ministers at their ordination. The first is, I. "That the king's majesty,

<sup>1</sup> Jewel mentions the Queen's refusal of the title of Head of the Church in a letter to Bullinger, May 22, 1559: "The Queen is unwilling to be addressed, either by word of mouth, or in writing, as the Head of the Church of England. For she seriously maintains, that this honour is due to Christ alone, and cannot belong to any human being what-

ever." — Collier, *Church History*, pt. II. Bk. vi.

<sup>2</sup> See a very learned pamphlet entitled *The Papal Brief Considered*, by Ralph Barnes, Esq. Rivingtons, 1850. Note, page 90.

<sup>3</sup> Sparrow's *Collection of Articles*, p. 67. See also p. 83.

under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal; and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, or potentate hath, or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preëminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within his majesty's said realms, dominions, and countries."

These documents, then, which at present form the charter of union between Church and State, evidently assign to the sovereign no *new* functions. The principle enunciated by them is, that the sovereign is entitled to those ancient privileges which belonged, 1, to devout princes in Scripture; 2, to Christian emperors in primitive times; 3, to the ancient sovereigns of England before the times of Papal domination. The very reference to Scriptural and primitive examples seems to be a demonstration of the justice of the claims; for, if nothing is claimed beyond what Scripture warrants and the Catholic fathers allowed, the claim should seem to be both Scriptural and Catholic. Yet some important objections may be urged, which we must not neglect to consider.

1. It is said that "godly princes in Scripture" must mean "godly kings among the Jews." Now the Jewish dispensation was utterly dissimilar from the Christian; for the Jewish Church was national, the Christian Church is not national, but Catholic. Hence naturally among the Jews the king, as head of the nation, was supreme over the Church. But the Catholic Church acknowledges no local distinctions; and to assign a national supremacy is to rend the Church of Christ into separate societies. Kings, as well as others, are but members of the one spiritual body, which meddles not with temporal distinctions, but holds all alike as subjects and servants of Christ.

To this we reply, that our kings, since at least the time of Elizabeth, have not an authority such as should separate one portion of the Church from the other. It is not our national distinctions, but our doctrinal differences, which divide us from our fellow-Christians. Our sovereigns claim only those powers which were exercised by their predecessors, in times which Romanists must acknowledge to have been Catholic, but before the full-grown authority of the see of Rome. Gregory VII. was the original founder of that great authority, and it culminated under Innocent III. But we see not that the Church was less Catholic in the days of Alfred and Edward the Confessor, than in the reigns of the Plantagenets. If then we concede to our princes the influence of

the Saxon monarchs, we shall not have destroyed the Catholicity of the Church, more than it was destroyed centuries before the Reformation.

2. It is said again that the Jewish princes can be no examples for us, because, from the theocratic nature of the Jewish kingdom, there was a sacredness attaching to their office, as that of God's special vicegerents, which cannot attach to ordinary rulers. Israel, as a theocracy, was a type of the Church; and its kings were types of Christ. As the high priests foreshadowed His priestly office in His Church, so the kings foreshadowed His regal authority over His spiritual kingdom. But there is no vicegerent of Christ on earth; no type now of His spiritual sovereignty. Hence earthly kings now cannot claim the position and privileges of the ancient Jewish kings.

This is doubtless a very weighty argument, and is a just reply to some who would unduly magnify the royal authority in things ecclesiastical. But it has been observed in a former Article,<sup>1</sup> that the Jewish state may be considered in some respects as a model republic; and that, notwithstanding the peculiar circumstances and special object of its institution, we may still derive lessons of political wisdom from the ordinances appointed by the All-wise for the government of His own chosen race. Now, in that government, He was pleased to conjoin the spiritual and secular elements, in such a manner that the king was to show a fatherly care for religion, yet not to intrude upon its sacred offices (see 1 Sam. xiii. 8-14; 2 Chron. xix. 11, &c.); and we may humbly conclude, that what was ordained by heavenly wisdom then, cannot be wholly evil now.<sup>2</sup> Besides which, we see throughout Scripture that there is a sacredness in civil government. Kings are always said to hold their power of God, and to be especially under His protection and guidance. They are His ministers for good; and therefore to be esteemed by God's people, as exercising in some degree God's authority (see Prov. viii. 15; Dan. ii. 21, 37; Rom. xiii. 1-5; 1 Pet. ii. 13, 17; 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, &c.).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Art. VII. See above, p. 214.

<sup>2</sup> The way in which kings and rulers among the Jews interfered in the affairs of religion may be seen from the following passages: Josh. xxiv. 25, 26; 1 Chron. xv. 12; xxiii. 6; 2 Chron. viii. 14, 15; xv. 8, 9; xvii. 9; xx. 3, 4; xxix. 3-5, 25; xxxiv. 31, 32.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. xiii. 1: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." Archbishop Laud thus sums up the consent

of the ancient fathers, that "*omnis anima, every soul, comprehends all without exception, all spiritual men, even the highest bishop; Πᾶσι ταῦτα διατίθεται, καὶ ἑπεῖται. . . . Omnibus ista imperantur et sacerdotibus et monachis . . . . Et postea: Etiam si Apostolus sis, si evangelista, si propheta, sive quisquis tandem fueris. — St. Chrysost. Hom. xxiii. in Rom. — Sive est sacerdos, sive antistes. — Theodoret. In Rom. xiii. Si omnis anima est vestra.*

3. Another objection to the precedents claimed by the English monarchs is, that the influence of the Christian emperors, and the connection of religion with the state, which sprang up after the time of Constantine, were the very origin of evil and corruption in the Church. It was an unhallowed alliance between the Church and the world, and never had God's blessing on it.

It perhaps cannot be denied that the sunshine of worldly prosperity has never been the most favourable condition for the development of Christian graces. When the Church could no longer say, "Silver and gold have I none," it could no longer command the impotent man to "arise and walk." Yet we cannot thence conclude, that the Church is ever to seek persecution, or to refuse such vantage-ground as God's providence permits it to stand upon. To court or fawn upon the great is indeed most earnestly to be shunned. The minister of God must reason before the governor, of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come;" and, if possible, make the ungodly ruler "tremble," as much as the meanest of the people. Yet St. Paul rejoiced to gain converts in Cæsar's household (Phil. i. 13; iv. 22). And, as there seems no more probable way to Christianize a people than to Christianize their rulers, it is obviously desirable that the government of a country should be induced to support religion in it. And again, on the other hand, it is the plain duty of sovereigns and constituted authorities to maintain true religion in the land. Nations and rulers are as much responsible to God's judgment as private individuals. Scripture condemns ungodly rulers and ungodly nations, as much as ungodly individuals; and praise is given to such sovereigns as fear God and honour His name. (See Psalm ii. 10. Jer. xviii. 7-10. Jonah *passim*.) National, as well as individual, mercies and judgments come from Him. Now, nations and their rulers can only show their piety to God in a public and national manner, by maintaining true religion and the public service of religion. Moreover, it was prophesied concerning the Christian Church, that "kings should be her nursing fathers and queens her nursing mothers" (Isai. xlix. 23); and it is difficult to know how they can be nurses to the Church, if it be forbidden her to have any connection with them.<sup>1</sup>

Quis vos excipit ex universitate? . . . Ipsi sunt qui vobis dicere solent, servatis vestræ sedis honorem. . . . Sed Christus aliter et jussit et gessit, &c. — S. Bernard. *Epist. 42 ad Henricum Senonensem Archiepiscopum*. Et Theophylact. *In Rom.* xiii., where it is very observable that Theophylact

lived in the time of Pope Gregory VII., and St. Bernard after it; and yet this truth obtained then: and this was about the year 1130." — Laud, *Conference with Fisher*, p. 170, note. Oxford, 1839.

<sup>1</sup> The Eastern Church admits the supremacy of the Crown, probably in a

If we once admit the propriety of a connection between the Church and the State, and at the same time deny the supremacy of the Pope, it seems almost to follow of necessity, that we should admit a supremacy of the sovereign. The sovereign must in that case hold some position in the Church; and it can only be the highest. It is not consistent with his sovereignty that he should have a superior in his own kingdom. But, in considering the sovereign as chief ruler over all persons in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, we must remember one or two particulars. "It may be, that two or three of our princes at the most (the greater part whereof were Roman Catholics) did style themselves, or gave others leave to style them, 'the Heads of the Church within their dominions.' But no man can be so simple as to conceive, that they intended a spiritual headship, — to infuse the life and motion of grace into the hearts of the faithful; such an Head is Christ alone; no, nor yet an ecclesiastical headship. We did never believe that our kings, in their own persons, could exercise any act pertaining either to order or jurisdiction; nothing can give that to another which it hath not itself. They meant only a civil or political head, as Saul is called 'the head of the tribes of Israel;' to see that public peace is preserved; to see that all subjects, as well ecclesiastics as others, do their duties in their several places; to see that all things be managed for that great and architectonical end, that is, the weal and benefit of the whole body politic, both for soul and body."<sup>1</sup>

The sovereign "assumes not the office of teaching or of explaining the doubtful points of the law, nor of preaching or of minister-

more unrestricted sense than the Anglican Church. Yet they maintain the sole spiritual Headship of Jesus Christ, as opposed to the supremacy of the Pope.

"In 1590 certain prelates of the Russian Church joined the Roman communion on some concessions being made to them. Thus Rome raised the *Unia*; and it continued nearly 250 years. At the first partition of Poland, between two and three million uniats returned to the Eastern Church; and in 1839 the remaining Russian uniats were received into the unity of the Eastern Church, the only act of profession required being, that 'Our Lord Jesus Christ is the only true Head of the one true Church.'" — Neale's *History of the Eastern Church*, i. pp. 56, 57.

"In 1833 a Synod met at Nauplia for the regeneration of the Greek Church. The two following propositions were approved by thirty-six prelates: —

"1. The Eastern Orthodox and Apostolic Church of Greece, which spiritually owns no head but the Head of the Christian faith, Jesus Christ our Lord, is dependent on no external authority, while she preserves unshaken dogmatic unity with all the Eastern orthodox churches . . . with respect to the administration of the Church, which belongs to the Crown, she acknowledges the King of Greece to be her supreme head as is in nothing contrary to the holy Canons.

"2. A permanent synod shall be established, consisting entirely of archbishops and bishops appointed by the king, to be highest ecclesiastical authority, after the model of the Russian Church." — *Ibid.* p. 60.

<sup>1</sup> Archbishop Bramhall, *Answer to M. de Milletière*, Works, i. pp. 29, 30.

ing Sacraments, of consecrating persons or things, of exercising the power of the keys, or of ecclesiastical censures. In short, he undertakes not anything which belongs to the office of the ministers of Christ. But in matters of external polity he claims the right of legislating; and we gladly give it him. The care of religion is an affair of the sovereign and the nation, not merely of the clergy."<sup>1</sup>

Again, the supremacy of the crown must not (according to our constitution in Church and state) be considered as an arbitrary and unlimited supremacy. Everything in England is limited by law; and nothing more than the power of the sovereign. In matters of state, the power of the crown is limited by the two houses of Parliament; in the affairs of the Church, it is limited also by the two houses of Convocation. Legally and constitutionally, the sovereign or the sovereign's government can do nothing concerning the state of the Church, her doctrine and discipline, without first consulting the clergy in Convocation, and the laity in Parliament; so that, when we acknowledge the supremacy of the crown, we do not put our consciences under the arbitrary guidance of the sovereign or the ministry; for we know, that legally nothing can be imposed upon us, but what has received the consent of our clergy and laity, as represented respectively.

Indeed, of late, no small difficulty has arisen. The supremacy of the crown is now wielded, not by the sovereign personally, but by the minister; that minister is the choice of the House of Commons: that House of Commons is elected by the three kingdoms; and, in two out of those three kingdoms, the vast majority of electors are not members of the Church of this kingdom of England. In short, the supremacy of the crown has insensibly passed, or at least is rapidly passing, into a virtual supremacy of Parliament. This unhappily is not a supremacy of the laity of the Church of England; because Parliament is composed of representatives from England, Ireland, and Scotland; and in the two last the majority are Roman Catholics and Presbyterians. This difficulty existed not at the period of the Reformation; but is steadily increasing on us

<sup>1</sup> The words are those of Bishop Andrewes, selected by James I. to defend his supremacy against Bellarmine. "Docendi munus vel dubia legis explicandi non assumit, vel conciones habendi, vel rei sacræ præeundi, vel sacramenta celebrandi; non vel personas sacrandi vel res; non vel clavium jus, vel censuræ. Verbo dicam, nihil ille sibi, nihil nos illi fas putamus attingere, quæ ad sacerdo-

tale munus spectant, seu potestatem ordinis consequuntur. Procul hæc habet Rex; procul a se abdicat.

"Atqui in his quæ exterioris politię sunt, ut præcipiat, suo sibi jure vendicat; suosque adeo illi lubentes merito deferimus. Religionis enim curam rem regiam esse, non modo pontificiam," &c. — Andrewes, *Tortura Torti*, p. 380, p. 467, *Anglo-Catholic Library*.

at present. Up to the time of the Reformation, the whole nation was of one faith, and united as one Church. The Reformation did not introduce a new faith, but restored purity to the old, and removed the abuses which time had permitted. It was the work of prince, prelates, and people; and the Church, which had from the beginning been protected by the state, was protected by it still.<sup>1</sup>

It has been reasonably thought, that the supremacy of the Pope, which was suffered before the Reformation, was (to use a term growing into use) the extreme *expression* for the superiority of the clergy and their dominance over the laity; whereas the supremacy of the crown was the counter expression for the independence and power of the laity.

The same principle only would be expressed by the supremacy of Parliament, and so of the minister, if Parliament represented only the laity of the English Church. But, as at present constituted, it in part represents, not only the laity, but the clergy also of other communions, which we must, alas! almost call hostile to us.

It is utterly vain to speculate on the future. We cannot question, that the relation between Church and state is now widely different from that which once existed, and that it is fraught with new dangers. Yet perhaps it may also bring new advantages. And the Rock of the Church still stands unshaken; and shall forever stand. There is our hope; not in the favour of princes, nor of multitudes of the people. Nor need our fear be of their frown. Our real danger is, lest the lukewarmness of the Church lead to Erastian indifference, or her zeal degenerate into impatience, faction, or intemperance.

[NOTE. A few words may be added, on a point which, it is believed, is not generally understood.

It is matter of history, that Cranmer and other Bishops took out commissions from Edward VI. for the exercise of their Episcopal functions. This has been insisted on, especially by the late Lord Macaulay, as proof positive that they regarded the Sovereign as the source of their spiritual authority. The truth however is, that the act was the natural result of a distinction which was made between *spiritual power*, and the *right to exercise that power, after a coercive manner*, in any country or state.

There is contemporaneous evidence, in the book called the *Institution of a Christian man*, published in 1537, that this distinction was made. It is therein asserted,

<sup>1</sup> The remarks in the text are abundant answer to the cavil, that the Church of England is an Act of Parliament Church. At the time of the Reformation, and at the various reviews of our Services, the Church was, to a very great ex-

tent, truly represented as to its clergy in Convocation, as to its laity in Parliament. The acts of Convocation and Parliament, ratified by the Crown, were therefore the true acts of the Church of England, king, priests, and people.

that "God's law committed to bishops or priests the power of jurisdiction in excommunicating or absolving offenders, *but without corporeal restraint or violence.*" This last is something which it clearly contemplates as coming from the State, and which, therefore, the State can revoke.

So too Bramhall, in his first *Vindication*, says, "It is true the *habitual* jurisdiction of bishops flows from their ordination; but the actual exercise of it, *in public courts, after a coercive manner*, is from the gracious concessions of Sovereign Princes." And again, "*Habitual* jurisdiction is derived only by ordination. *Actual* jurisdiction is a right to exercise that habit, arising from the lawful application of the matter or the subject." And yet again, "We must distinguish between the interior and the exterior courts, — between the court of conscience and the court of the Church. . . . The power which is exercised in the court of conscience is *solely* from *ordination*. But that power which is exercised in the court of the Church [*i. e.* as he explains it, coercive power imposing other than spiritual penalties] is partly from the Sovereign Magistrate."

The commissions, then, which Cranmer and his brethren in the Episcopate received from the Sovereign, were not considered to convey *habitual jurisdiction*. That had been received in ordination. But they gave them the right to exercise that habitual jurisdiction, in recognized courts, and after a coercive manner. The idea of course grows out of the union of Church and State; and however little it may approve itself to us, however undesirable it may seem to add temporal penalties to spiritual censures, it at least proves that no such theory was entertained as the taking out of the commissions has been supposed to indicate. — *J. W.*

---

## SECTION II. — THE SUPREMACY OF THE BISHOP OF ROME.

THIS is a most extensive subject, and of primary importance in the controversy between the Churches of Rome and England. For, if once the supreme authority of the Roman Patriarch is conceded, all other Roman doctrines seem to follow as of course. And so it will probably be found, that all converts to the Roman Church have been led to it from a conviction of the necessity of being in communion with the Supreme Pontiff, not from persuasion of the truth of particular dogmas.

The grounds on which the claim rests, are as follows: I. That St. Peter had a supremacy given him over the universal Church. II. That St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. III. That this supremacy is inherited by his successors; those successors being the Bishops of Rome.

I. It is said, that St. Peter had a supremacy given him over the rest of the Apostles, and over the universal Church.

1. We may readily admit that St. Peter had a certain priority among his brother Apostles assigned to him by our blessed Lord.

It is constantly the case that, in a company of equals, one, from

greater age, greater energy and zeal, greater ability, or greater moral goodness, takes a lead, and acquires a superiority. This may have been the case with St. Peter. Our Lord certainly appears to have honoured him and St. John, and St. James, with His peculiar love and favour. And, both during our Lord's ministry and after His resurrection, St. Peter appears to have been signally forward in the service of Christ. The fathers observe much this quickness, boldness, activity, and energy of St. Peter; which naturally brought him into the foremost position, and also qualified him to take the lead among the disciples.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, a kind of priority of position or rank was apparently conceded by the other Apostles to St. Peter. This is what St. Augustine observes, that "St. Peter being the first in the order of the Apostles, the most forward in the love of Christ, often alone answers for the rest."<sup>2</sup> The fathers account for this on the grounds: 1, that he was the first called of the Apostles; <sup>3</sup> 2, that he was the eldest; for which cause St. Jerome supposed that he was preferred to St. John, lest a youth should take precedence of an elderly man; <sup>4</sup> 3, that he outstripped his brethren in a ready confession of faith in Christ.<sup>5</sup> So, St. Peter's name is ever first in the catalogue; and he seems to take the lead in speaking and writing.

2. But this priority of order involved not a primacy of power, or preëminence of jurisdiction.

(1) If it had done so, we should have found some commission of this kind given to him in Scripture. There is plain enough commission to the Apostleship; but none to a hyper-apostleship, nor any mention of the existence of such an office in the history of the Gospels and Acts, or in the Epistles of the Apostles. (2) There is no title of preëminence given to St. Peter, such as Vicar of Christ, Sovereign Pontiff, or Arch-apostle. (3) There was no office known to the Apostles or the primitive Church higher than that of Apostleship. This, St. Chrysostom tells us, is "the greatest authority, the very summit of authorities."<sup>6</sup> (4) Our Lord distinctly declared against any such superiority; and said that if any of the Apostles coveted it, he should be counted least of all (Matt.

<sup>1</sup> θερμότερος τῶν ἄλλων εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν Χριστοῦ. — Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 84. Tom. i. p. 549. Colon. See several passages to a like effect in Barrow, *On the Pope's Supremacy*, pp. 30, 31.

<sup>2</sup> "Ipse enim Petrus in Apostolorum ordine primus, in Christi amore promptissimus, sæpe unus respondet pro omnibus." — August. *De Verbis Evangelii*, Matt. xiv. Serm. 76, Tom. v. p. 415.

<sup>3</sup> "Quem primum Dominus elegit." — Cypr. *Ep.* 71.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. *In Jovin.* i. Tom. iv. part II. p. 168.

<sup>5</sup> "Superminentem beatæ fidei summæ confessione gloriam promeruit." — Hilar. *De Trin.* Lib. vi.

<sup>6</sup> ἀρχὴ μεγίστη . . . κορυφὴ ἀρχῶν. Chrys. *De Utilit. Lect. Script. in Princip. Actorum* iii. Tom. iii. p. 75. Edit. Benedict.

xx. 27; xxiii. 8. Mark ix. 34, 35; x. 44. Luke ix. 46; xxii. 14, 24, 26). (5) St. Peter, in his Epistles, claims no peculiar authority (see 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 2); and in the history, there is no appearance of his taking it. The appeal in Acts xv. is not to St. Peter, but to the Apostles and elders; and the decree runs in their names, ver. 22. If any one presided there, it was not he, but St. James. Nay! the other Apostles took upon themselves to send Peter and John into Samaria (Acts viii. 14); and "he that is sent is not greater than he that sends him" (John xiii. 16). (6) If St. Peter had been the visible head of the Church, those who were of Paul or of Apollos might indeed have been factious; but St. Paul as severely reproveth for a schismatical spirit those who say, "I am of Cephas" (1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 21). (7) The complete independence of the Apostles in all their proceedings, in their missionary journeys, their founding of Churches, &c. shows the same thing (see 1 Cor. iv. 14, 15; ix. 2; Gal. iv. 19, &c.). (8) St. Paul's conduct especially proves that he owned no dependence on St. Peter, nor subjection to him. He declares himself, "in nothing behind the very chiefest Apostles" (2 Cor. xii. 11). On his conversion, he took no counsel with men, not even with the Apostles (Gal. i. 16, 17); but acted on his independent commission derived direct from Christ (Gal. i. 1). James, Cephas, and John gave him the right hand of fellowship, as their equal and co-Apostle (Gal. ii. 9). He hesitated not to "withstand St. Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Gal. ii. 11). And St. Chrysostom observes, that thus St. Paul showed himself equal to St. Peter, St. John, and St. James, and that by comparing himself, not to the others, but to their leader, he proved that each enjoyed equal dignity and importance."<sup>1</sup>

Lastly, all these arguments from Scripture, against a supreme authority of St. Peter over the rest of the Apostles, are fully borne out by the statements of the fathers, who, though they speak much of the high honour of the former, yet declare that the other Apostles were all equal and coördinate with him in power and authority. Thus St. Cyprian: "The other Apostles were what Peter was, endowed with an equal share of honour and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity, that the Church might be shown to be one."<sup>2</sup> "His was," says St. Ambrose, "a precedence

<sup>1</sup> δέικνυσιν αὐτοῖς ὁμότιμον ὄντα λοιπῶν, καὶ οὐ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ τῷ κορυφαίῳ συγκρίνει, δεικνὺς ὅτι τῆς αὐτῆς ἑκαστος ἀπέλασεν ἀξίας. — Chrys. In Gal. ii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> "Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli

quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis; sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut Ecclesia una monstretur." — Cyp. De Unit. Eccles. p.

107.

of confession, not of honour; of faith, not of order.”<sup>1</sup> St. Jerome says that, though the Church were founded on St. Peter, yet it was equally on the other Apostles.<sup>2</sup> So Isidore: “The other Apostles received equal share of honour and power with St. Peter, and dispersed throughout the world preached the Gospel; to whom, on their departure, succeeded the bishops, who are constituted through the world in the sees of the Apostles.”<sup>3</sup>

Let us now, on the other side, consider those passages of Scripture, on which it is contended that a distinct supremacy over the universal Church was granted to St. Peter.

1. The first is Matt. xvi. 18: “I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” Here, say the Roman divines, St. Peter is called the foundation of the Church; and foundation implies government and superiority.

It is observable, that our Lord called St. Peter Πέτρος, in the masculine, which properly signifies *a stone*, or *fragment of a rock*; and that He said He would build His Church, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, using the feminine noun, which more expressly denotes *an entire rock*. This has led many commentators, ancient and modern, to believe that the Rock on which the Church should be built, was not St. Peter; since in that case, the Lord would have used the masculine word πέτρον.<sup>4</sup>

Accordingly, a large number of the fathers were of opinion that the Rock, on which the Church was to be built, was either Christ Himself, or, which is much the same thing, the faith of Christ thus confessed by St. Peter. Thus, St. Chrysostom interprets “On this Rock,” by “On the faith of this confession.”<sup>5</sup> So

<sup>1</sup> “Primum confessionis utique, non honoris; primum fidei, non ordinis.” — *Lib. de Incarn. T. IV.*

<sup>2</sup> “At diebus super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia, licet id ipsum alio loco super omnes apostolos fiat, et ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur.” — Hier. *In Jovin. I. Tom. IV. part. II. p. 168.*

<sup>3</sup> “Cæteri Apostoli cum Petro par consortium honoris et potestatis acceperunt, qui etiam in toto orbe dispersi evangelium prædicaverunt, quibusque decedentibus successerunt episcopi, qui sunt constituti per totum mundum in sedibus Apostolorum.” — Isidor. *Hispal. De Offic. Lib. II. c. 5.*

<sup>4</sup> It is thought that the Syriac version refutes this opinion; since our Lord spoke Syriac, and in that version the

words are the same, both being ܩܘܪܝܘܬܐ.

It is, however, justly observed by Bp. Beveridge on this Article, that the second ܩܘܪܝܘܬܐ, where it means *a rock*, is shown to be feminine, by the use of the feminine pronoun ܗܝܬܐ; whereas the first must be masculine, since it is a man's name. Hence the difference between Πέτρος and Πέτρα is not quite lost in the Syriac; though that language does not admit of the same changes of termination as the Greek has.

<sup>5</sup> ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ . . . τοιέσται ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας. — *Hom. LVI. in Matt. xvi.*

St. Augustine says that our Lord meant, "On this Rock, which thou hast confessed, will I build My Church."<sup>1</sup> And, in his *Retractions*, he tells us that he had formerly interpreted the passage of St. Peter, but that he afterwards thought it more correct to understand it of Him whom St. Peter confessed. *Non enim dictum est illi, Tu es Petra, sed Tu es Petrus. Petra enim est Christus, quem confessus Simon, sicut tota ecclesia confitetur, dictus est Petrus.* Yet he leaves to the reader to choose which is the more probable interpretation.<sup>2</sup> In like manner St. Ambrose had said, that not Peter, but the faith of Peter, was the foundation of the Church;<sup>3</sup> and in another place the same father writes, that "The Rock is Christ, who granted to His disciple that he should be called *Petrus*, as having from the Rock the solidity of constancy and firmness of faith."<sup>4</sup>

To the same effect write Hilary,<sup>5</sup> Cyril of Alexandria,<sup>6</sup> Basil of Seleucia,<sup>7</sup> Theodoret,<sup>8</sup> Isidore of Pelusium,<sup>9</sup> Theophylact,<sup>10</sup> and others.

On the other hand, no doubt, a great many of the ancients understood Peter himself to be the rock. Tertullian is the first who so applies the passage; but we shall see hereafter, that he understood no supremacy to be implied in it, and certainly did not consider it to be transmitted to the Bishop of Rome.<sup>11</sup> Origen too applies it to St. Peter, but evidently understood all the other Apostles to have a similar promise.<sup>12</sup> Nay! he declares that every disciple of Christ is a rock, as having drunk from the Spiritual Rock; and on every such rock as this the word of the Church is founded.<sup>13</sup> Next comes St. Cyprian, who also calls St. Peter the rock; and he says: "Though He committed an equal power to all the Apostles, saying, *As My Father hath sent Me, so send I*

<sup>1</sup> "Super hanc Petram, quam confessus es, ædificabo ecclesiam meam." — August. *In Johan. tr.* 124, Tom. III. par. II. p. 822, and *De Verbo Evangelii, Matt. xiv.*; *Serm.* 76, Tom. v. p. 415.

<sup>2</sup> *Retractat.* I. 21, Tom. I. p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> "Fides ergo est Ecclesiæ fundamentum. Non enim de carne Petri, sed de fide dictum est, quia portæ mortis ei non prævalebunt, sed confessio vincit infernum." — Ambros. *De Incarnat. Domin. Sacrament.* c. 5.

<sup>4</sup> "Petra est Christus; qui etiam discipulo suo hujus vocabuli gratiam non negavit, ut et ipse sit Petrus, quod de Petra habeat soliditatem constantiæ, fidei firmitatem." — Ambros. *Lib. VI. In Evangel. Lucæ.*

<sup>5</sup> "Super hanc confessionis Petram

Ecclesiæ ædificatio est." — Hil. *De Trin. Lib. VI.*

<sup>6</sup> *In cap. xlv. Jesaie*, p. 598; *Id. Dial. IV. De SS. Trinit.* p. 507.

<sup>7</sup> *Orat. xxv.* p. 142.

<sup>8</sup> *Epist. 77.*

<sup>9</sup> *Epist. 235, Lib. I.*

<sup>10</sup> *In Matt. xvi.* 13.

<sup>11</sup> *De Pudicit. c. 21; De Præscript. Hæret. c. 22.*

<sup>12</sup> εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ἕνα ἔκεινον Πέτρον νομί-  
ζεις οἰκοδομῆσαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μόνον, τὶ  
ὡν φῆσαις περὶ Ἰωάν. x. τοῦ τῆς βροντῆς  
υἱοῦ καὶ ἐκίστου τῶν Ἀποστόλων. — Origen.  
*In Matt. Tom. XII. 11.*

<sup>13</sup> Πέτρα γὰρ πᾶς ὁ Χριστοῦ μαθητῆς, ὅφ'  
οὐ ἐπὶνον οἱ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθουσης  
πέτρας, κ. τ. λ. — *Ibid.*

you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost; Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto him; and whose soever sins ye retain, they shall be retained; yet, that He might manifest unity, He disposed by His authority the origin of that unity, so that it might take its rise from one. The rest of the Apostles indeed were what Peter was; endowed with an equal share of honour and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity, that the Church may be shown to be but one."<sup>1</sup>

So Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius,<sup>3</sup> Basil the Great,<sup>4</sup> Jerome,<sup>5</sup> and others understand, that St. Peter was the rock.

But supposing this latter to be the true interpretation; does it follow thence, that St. Peter had a supreme government over the other Apostles? Foundation does not, of necessity, imply government. Our Lord may have promised to St. Peter, that he should be the first to found His Church; which was fulfilled on the great day of Pentecost, when St. Peter's noted sermon brought the first-fruits of the Church of Christ.<sup>6</sup> But the fathers say, that the other Apostles were rocks as well as St. Peter, and that the Church was built on them also.<sup>7</sup> The Fathers, in no instance, suppose the other Apostles to have any dependence on, or subjection to St. Peter; and Dr. Barrow justly observes, that the Apostleship itself could not be built on St. Peter, for that had been founded by Christ Himself before this promise was given; and hence the Apostles were all clearly independent of St. Peter, and therefore their successors, the bishops, must be independent of his successors.<sup>8</sup> A passage so doubtful in its interpretation can never be sufficient to the purpose for which it is adduced; especially seeing that none of the most ancient fathers, however they may interpret it, have discovered in it that supremacy of St. Peter which has since been asserted. If St. Peter be called a

<sup>1</sup> "Super unum ædificat ecclesiam suam. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus parem potestatem tribuat et dicat; Sicut misit Me Pater, et Ego mitto vos, accipite Spiritum Sanctum; si cui remiseritis peccata, remittentur illis, si cui tenueritis, tenebuntur: tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejus originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis; sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut una ecclesia monstretur."—Cyp. *De Unitate*, p. 106. Fell.

<sup>2</sup> *Orat. xxvi.* Tom. i. p. 418.

<sup>3</sup> *Hæres. lix.* Tom. i. p. 500.

<sup>4</sup> *In Cap. ii. Jesaie*, Tom. ii. p. 869.

<sup>5</sup> Hieronymus. *Ad Marcellam adv. Montanum*, Epist. 27. Tom. ii. part. ii. p. 64.

<sup>6</sup> "Petrus dicitur, eo quod primus in nationibus fidei fundamenta posuerit."—Pseudo-Ambros. *De Sanctis*, Serm. 2.

<sup>7</sup> See Origen, as above. So Jerome: "Dicis super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia, licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat."—Hieron. *In Jovin.* Tom. iv. par. ii. p. 168. So Basil. M.: ἐκκλησία ἠκοδόμηται ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν· ἐν τῶν ὁρέων ἦν καὶ Πέτρος, ἐφ' ἧς καὶ Πέτρος ἐπηγγέλлатι ὁ Κύριος οἰκοδομήσειν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.—Basil. *In Isai.* ii. p. 869.

<sup>8</sup> Barrow, *Supremacy*, p. 62.

rock and a foundation, still all the Apostles were foundations, as well as he. "In the twelve foundations of the city are the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb" (Rev. xxi. 14). It is "built on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets" (Ephes. ii. 20). In the highest sense, which indeed points out supremacy, "other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. iii. 11). And, as St. Ambrose says that the Apostle was a rock, as deriving firmness from the Rock; so the Apostles were foundations, as themselves built on the One Foundation; and their qualification, as rocks or as foundations, they received, not from Peter, but from Christ.

2. The next argument for St. Peter's supremacy is the verse immediately following the last; namely, "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19). Here it is said that the power of the keys was given to St. Peter alone, and that the rest of the Church therefore derives that power through him.

We may admit, that the promise being first given to St. Peter was a mark of special honour to him. But the same power was conferred upon the *Church* as a body; to which our Lord said, "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven" (Matt. xviii. 18). And again, after the resurrection, the same power was given to all the Apostles, when the risen Saviour "breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John xx. 22). It is evident therefore, that neither the Church nor the Apostles received this power through St. Peter, but directly from Christ Himself; and though the *promise* was first to St. Peter, yet the *gift* appears to have been simultaneous to all. So then, though St. Peter is honoured by a priority, the whole College of the Apostles is endowed with an equality of power.

The fathers unanimously consent to this view of the case. "Are the keys of the kingdom of Heaven given to St. Peter alone, and shall not all the saints receive them? And if this be common, how are not all the things common which were spoken to St. Peter?" So writes Origen.<sup>1</sup> And St. Cyprian, "Christ, after His resurrection, gave an equal power to all His Apostles, and

<sup>1</sup> Ἄρα οὖν τῷ Πέτρῳ μόνῳ δίδονται ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου αἱ κλεῖδες τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἕτερος τῶν μακαρίων αὐτὸς λήψεται; ἐλ δὲ κοινὸν ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς ἑτέροισ τὸ δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ πάντα τὰ τε προειρημένα καὶ τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα ὡς πρὸς Πέτρον λελεγεμένα.—Origen. *In Matt.* Tom. xii. 11.

said, *As the Father hath sent Me, so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.*"<sup>1</sup> "On all," says St. Jerome, "the strength of the Church is equally founded. You will say, the Church is founded on Peter; but in another place this is said to be on all the Apostles; and all receive the keys of the kingdom of Heaven."<sup>2</sup> St. Ambrose, "What is said to Peter, is said to all."<sup>3</sup> St. Augustine, "Did Peter receive the keys, and not Paul? Peter, and not John and James and the rest of the Apostles?"<sup>4</sup> Theophylact, "Though it be spoken to Peter alone, *I will give thee*, yet it is given to all the Apostles. When? Why, when He said, *Whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted.*"<sup>5</sup> And so St. Leo, himself a famous Bishop of Rome, says, that "This power of the keys is translated to all Apostles and bishops. It was commended singly to St. Peter, because the example of St. Peter was propounded to all pastors of the Church."<sup>6</sup>

Some indeed considered, that the whole Church received the keys with St. Peter. St. Peter they esteemed as a kind of figure of the Church, and an emblem of its unity; and so that all received the power, even when it was ostensibly given to but one.<sup>7</sup>

And if, notwithstanding this testimony of the fathers, we still esteem some special authority to be implied in the promise, we can only understand it of his being appointed to be the first, who, by preaching of the word and admitting converts to baptism, should unlock the gates of the kingdom, and open them to believers. "So," says Tertullian, "the event teaches. The Church was built on him, *i. e.* by him. He first put in the key, when he said,

<sup>1</sup> "Christus Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuit et dicit: Sicut misit me Pater, et Ego mitto vos, accipite Spiritum S. Si cui remiseritis peccata, remittentur ei, si cui retinueritis, tenebuntur." — Cyprian. *De Unitate*, p. 107. Fell.

<sup>2</sup> "Dicis, super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia; licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves cœlorum accipiant; et ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur." — Hieron. *C. Jovinian*. Lib. 1. Tom. iv. part 11. p. 168.

<sup>3</sup> "Quod Petro dicitur, cæteris Apostolis dicitur." — Ambros. *In Ps. xxxviii.*

<sup>4</sup> "Numquid istas claves accepit Petrus, et Paulus non accepit? Petrus accepit, et Joannes, et Jacobus non accepit, et cæteri apostoli?" — August. *Serm. cxlix.* Tom. v. p. 704.

So, again, "Ecclesia quæ fundatur in Christo, claves ab eo regni cœlorum accepit, *i. e.* potestatem ligandi, solvendi que

peccata." — Aug. *Tract.* 124, in *Joh.* Tom. III. par. 11. p. 822.

<sup>5</sup> "εἰ γὰρ καὶ πρὸς Πέτρον μόνον εἰρηται τὸ δῶσω σοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι ἀποστόλοις δέδοται: πότε; ὅτε εἶπεν ἂν τῶν ὀφίτη τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἄβιενται." — Theophyl. *in loc.*

<sup>6</sup> "Hæc clavium potestas ad omnes etiam apostolos et Ecclesiæ præules est translata. Quod autem sigillatim Petro sit commendata, ideo factum est, quod Petri exemplum universis Ecclesiæ pastoribus fuit propositum." — Leo. I. *Serm. de Nativ.*

<sup>7</sup> "In typo unitatis Petro Dominus dedit potestatem." — August. *De Bap.* III. 17. Tom. ix. p. 117.

"Quando ei dictum est, *Tibi dabo claves* . . . universam significavit ecclesiam." — *Tract.* 124 in *Johan.* Tom. III. pt. 11. p. 822.

"Ecclesiæ claves regni cœlorum datæ sunt, cum Petro datæ sunt." — *De Agone Christi* 30, Tom. vi. p. 260.

*Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, &c.* Acts ii. 22. He first opened the entrance to the kingdom of Heaven by baptism, whereby the sins were loosed by which they had been bound; and he too bound Ananias with the bond of death,"<sup>1</sup> &c.

3. The last argument of any weight, for St. Peter's supremacy, is the command, "Feed My sheep" (John xxi. 16).

This, however, is an injunction and command, not the bestowal of a privilege. Dr. Barrow has observed, that, as well might the elders of Ephesus, whom St. Paul exhorts to "feed the Church of God" (Acts xx. 28), have esteemed, that St. Paul thereby constituted each of them an universal governor of the Church, as St. Peter, that he was made by this command an universal bishop. And so the fathers understood, that what was here enjoined on St. Peter was equally enjoined on all pastors. "When it is said to Peter, it is said to all," says St. Augustine.<sup>2</sup> "These sheep and this flock," says St. Ambrose, "not only St. Peter did then receive, but all we pastors received with him."<sup>3</sup> And so St. Cyprian, "All of them were shepherds; but the flock was shown to be one, which was fed by all the Apostles, with unanimous consent."<sup>4</sup> The command, too, is to feed the flock, not to feed the shepherds. Hence, whatever authority may be supposed to be given over the people by these words, plainly none is given over the other Apostles. Every pastor is, in some sense, a pastor of the whole flock of Christ; the Church of God is committed unto him. But every pastor has not therefore authority over his brethren, neither can it be shown, that, in thus committing a duty to St. Peter as regards the laity, our blessed Lord assigned him a supremacy over the clergy.

The most then that can be fairly made of the case is, that St. Peter had a priority of honour among the Apostles; that he was *primus inter pares*. More than this our Lord did not bestow on him; more the Apostles did not concede to him; more the earliest fathers never assigned to him; and especially, more he never claimed or exercised himself. Eusebius quotes, from Clement of Alexan-

<sup>1</sup> "Sic enim et exitus docet. In ipso Ecclesia extracta est, id est, per ipsum: ipse clavem imbuit; vides quam — *Viri Israelitæ, auribus mandate quæ dico; Jesum Nazarenum, virum a Deo destinatum et reliqua*. Ipse denique primus in Christi baptismo reseravit aditum cælestis regni, quo solvuntur alligata retro delicta, et alligantur quæ non fuerint soluta secundum veram salutem, et Ananiam vinxit vinculo mortis." — Tertull. *De Pudicitia*, c. 21.

<sup>2</sup> "Cum ei dicitur, ad omnes dicitur, *Amas me? Pasce oves meas.*" — August. *De Agone Christi*, 30, Tom. vi. p. 260.

<sup>3</sup> "Quas oves et quem gregem non solum tum B. suscepit Petrus, sed et cum eo nos suscepimus omnes." — Ambros. *De Dignitat. Sacerd.* 2.

<sup>4</sup> "Pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimes consensione pascitur." — Cypr. *De Unitate Eccles.*

dria, a passage markedly illustrative of all these statements. "Peter and James and John," says he, "after the ascension of the Saviour, contended not for glory, as having been most highly honoured by the Lord, but chose James the Just to be Bishop of Jerusalem."<sup>1</sup> The writer of this passage could not have believed that St. Peter had, or claimed a supremacy over his brethren; nor, we may observe by the way, could he have thought any bishopric in the Church more honourable than that of Jerusalem.

II. The next position of the Roman Church is, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome.

It is not to be doubted, that a tradition did exist in early times that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. But, if that tradition be submitted, like others of the same kind, to the test of historical investigation, it will be found to rest on very slender foundation. In the first place, Scripture is silent about his having been at Rome, — a remarkable silence, if his having been Bishop there was a fact of such vital importance to the Church, as the Roman divines have made it to be. Then, the first tradition of his having been at Rome at all does not appear for more than a century after his death. It is nearly two centuries after that event that we meet with anything like the opinion that the Roman bishops were his successors. It is three centuries before we find him spoken of as Bishop of Rome. But when we reach three centuries and a half, we are told, that he not only was Bishop of Rome, but that he resided five and twenty years at Rome; a statement utterly irreconcilable with the history of the New Testament.

To begin with the new Testament, the only evidence that can be thence adduced for St. Peter's having been at *Rome*, is that he seems to have written his first Epistle from *Babylon* (1 Pet. v. 13). Eusebius<sup>2</sup> says this meant Rome. He appears to say it on the authority of Papias; though some learned men deny, that he ascribes the tradition to Papias. Jerome follows Eusebius in this statement.<sup>3</sup> The Roman divines generally adopt it. Yet a learned writer of their communion truly observes, that the use of such a metonymy may be very proper in a symbolical book, like the Apocalypse, "but would only be credible in the subscription of an epistle, if *arcana nomina Ecclesiarum* had existed among Christians."<sup>4</sup> If the tradition be due to Papias, he is doubtless a very

<sup>1</sup> "Euseb. II. E. II. 1, quoting Clement from the sixth book of the *Hypotyposes*."

<sup>2</sup> *H. E.* Lib. II. c. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *De Viris Ill.* c. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Hug, *Introduction to the New Testament*, part II. sect. 165.

early authority (A. D. *circ.* 110) ; but Eusebius himself has given us to understand, that he was a person whose judgment was not to be depended on, and particularly that he was an enthusiast about the Apocalypse. Hence his interpreting St. Peter by the language of the Apocalypse is not of much weight.

Farther than this, the Acts of the Apostles, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul's four Epistles written from Rome, St. Peter's two Epistles, are all profoundly silent about St. Peter ever having been at Rome. Indeed, it seems almost certain that, when St. Paul went to Rome, St. Peter had not been there. Not only is there no mention of such a thing, but St. Paul, when writing to the Romans, writes much as if no Apostle had ever been amongst them. (Comp. Rom. i. 10-15 ; xv. 15-24). And, when he was at Rome, it seems clear from the narrative, that the Jews of Rome had had no communication with any chief teacher among the Christians, at least with any who had been converted from Judaism ; they were therefore desirous to hear of him what *he* thought, knowing only that the sect of Christians was everywhere spoken against (Acts xxviii. 22). Now how is this compatible with the alleged fact, that St. Peter, the Apostle of the circumcision, to whom the conversion of the Jews had been peculiarly intrusted, had been the founder of the Church of Rome, and had been resident there for some time ? Again, if St. Peter had been at Rome, when St. Paul wrote to the Romans, St. Paul would surely have saluted him. If he had been there when St. Paul was there, it would surely have been mentioned in the Acts. If he had previously been there, and had been established as bishop of the city, it is utterly incredible that St. Paul should have assumed such authority over St. Peter's flock, as he does assume over the Romans, and that the Jews of Rome should have been utterly uninstructed in the Gospel.

Of the fathers, the first who speaks to the purpose is Irenæus. He says, that the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, founded and established the Church of Rome, and delivered the bishopric to Linus, to whom succeeded Anacletus, and to him Clement.<sup>1</sup> Clement of Alexandria says that St. Peter preached at Rome, and that St. Mark wrote his Gospel at the request of St. Peter's hearers.<sup>2</sup> Tertullian says, Clement was ordained by St. Peter to be Bishop of Rome.<sup>3</sup> Origen tells us, that St. Peter, having preached to the Jews in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia,

<sup>1</sup> Iren. III. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *De Præscript.* c. 32.

<sup>3</sup> *Hypotyp.* Lib. VI. apud Euseb. *H. E.* II. 14.

and Asia, *at last* (ἐπὶ τέλει) came to Rome, and was crucified with his head downwards.<sup>1</sup> The Apostolical Constitutions say, that Linus was made first Bishop of Rome by St. Paul, and that after his death Clement was ordained to the same office, by St. Peter.<sup>2</sup> Lactantius tells us that the time of St. Peter's going to Rome was the reign of Nero.<sup>3</sup> Eusebius speaks of Linus as the first Bishop of Rome, after St. Paul and St. Peter; <sup>4</sup> and elsewhere, that Linus was first Bishop of Rome after St. Peter, and that Clement was the third.<sup>5</sup> Also he assigns the date of St. Peter's first going to Rome to the reign of Claudius.<sup>6</sup>

Now here we have a collection of the earliest and best authorities, concerning St. Peter's connection with Rome, and concerning the bishops that first presided there. Origen says, he went there *at last*; Lactantius says, in the reign of Nero. Eusebius, later than either of them, and much later than Origen, assigns as a date the reign of Claudius. None of them say, that he was Bishop of Rome. On the contrary, all agree in saying that the first bishop of that see was Linus. All place Linus there during the Apostles' lifetime. Some say that St. Paul, others that St. Peter and St. Paul, ordained him; whilst some say that Clement, the third bishop, was ordained by St. Peter. The inference is plainly this. At whatever time St. Peter came to Rome, (which most probably was in Nero's reign, and very shortly before that tyrant put him to death,) there was some one else Bishop of Rome then, and therefore St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome. Linus was bishop first, then Anacletus, then Clement. Very probably all three, one after the other, were bishops before St. Peter's death. But, whether one or three, some one else, not St. Peter, was Bishop of Rome, in St. Peter's lifetime. Two bishops were never permitted to preside over one see; and therefore it is quite clear that St. Peter was not Bishop of the see of Rome.

It is very true that St. Cyprian and Firmilian, in the middle of the third century, speak of Stephen, Bishop of Rome, as claiming to be successor to St. Peter; and, though not submitting to his authority, they still appear to acknowledge his claim. Yet they never said that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; but they acknowledged Stephen's succession from him, because they considered that St. Peter founded the Church of Rome, ordained the first

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* III. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Constitut. Apostol.* VII. 46. Here Clement is made the second bishop of Rome; Anacletus, whom Irenæus mentions as second, being omitted.

<sup>3</sup> *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. 2.

<sup>4</sup> III. 2.

<sup>5</sup> III. 4.

<sup>6</sup> II. 14.

bishop there, and that therefore the apostolical succession came, through the Bishops of Rome, from that Apostle.

The circumstances of the Roman Church were very remarkable. It was the only Church in the West that could *certainly* trace its origin to Apostles. The Apostles who were at Rome, were the greatest of all ; for there St. Paul undoubtedly taught, there probably both St. Paul and St. Peter ordered the Church, ordained its first bishops, and finally watered it with their blood. There, if the tradition speak truly, St. John too was thrown into boiling oil, and escaped unhurt. The three greatest Apostles then had probably taught and suffered at Rome. St. Peter and St. Paul had ordered the Church, and ordained very probably the first three bishops. No Church but Jerusalem could claim such privileges as this. No wonder then, that throughout the West the Church of Rome and her bishop should be had in high honour. No wonder that St. Cyprian, himself a Western bishop, should have looked up to the see of Rome as the centre of Christian unity, and the depository of sound doctrine. But all this does not make St. Peter the first diocesan bishop there, nor does it prove that Cyprian thought him so.

The explanation of Rufinus is evidently the true, namely, that Linus, Cletus, and Clement were the Bishops of Rome ; but that St. Peter, whilst he was there, exercised apostolical authority, which was above every episcopate, and therefore not interfering with it.<sup>1</sup>

And so it is observed, that many churches took their names from the Apostles, and were called Apostolical sees ; not because Apostles were Bishops in them, but because Apostles taught and appointed bishops there. Thus Ephesus was so called, because St. Paul founded it, and St. John resided and ordained there. Smyrna, because Polycarp was placed there by St. John or other Apostles. Alexandria, because St. Mark was placed there by St. Peter. Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi, because founded by St. Paul. Antioch, because St. Peter is said to have resided there, and to have constituted its first bishops.

It is true that, when we get to the later fathers, we find that the story of St. Peter's Roman episcopate (a fiction eagerly cherished by the prelates of that see) was gaining ground and attracting credit. Epiphanius therefore speaks of St. Peter and St. Paul as

<sup>1</sup> " Linus et Cletus fuerunt quidem ante Clementem episcopi in urbe Roma, sed superstite Petro ; videlicet ut illi Episcopatus curam gererent, ipse vero Apostolatus irperet officium." — Rufin. in *Præf. Clem. Recog.*

the first Apostles, and also bishops of Rome ;<sup>1</sup> no very definite statement after all. But Jerome (A. D. *circ.* 400) positively asserts, that St. Peter, after having been Bishop of Antioch, went to Rome, where he was bishop for five and twenty years. He says this, both in his treatise *De Viris Illustribus*,<sup>2</sup> and also in his Latin translation of Eusebius's *Chronical Canon* ;<sup>3</sup> which, however, contains many things not said by Eusebius, and this amongst the rest.<sup>4</sup> The fact, thus stated by Jerome, is simply impossible ; and the origin of it is probably to be attributed to a perversion of the account of Lactantius ; which account is, that, after preaching five and twenty years in divers provinces, Peter came, in Nero's reign, to Rome.<sup>5</sup> Thus the tradition was like Homer's *Ἔρις* : —

Ἦ ῥ' ὀλίγη μὲν πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα  
Οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη, καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει.<sup>6</sup>

At first, it was but that St. Peter and St. Paul had constituted the Church in Rome, ordained Linus as its bishop, and there suffered for their testimony. Then they are spoken of as if they might have been bishops themselves ; the Roman bishops are then said to be St. Peter's successors ; and lastly, it is roundly asserted that St. Peter was actually Bishop of Rome for five and twenty years. That to fan the spark into a flame was the interest and the wish of such prelates as Victor and Stephen, even charity cannot make us doubt. But, after such a plain history of the rise and progress of the tradition, it is impossible not to see that it has no firm foundation.

There is indeed no good reason to doubt, that St. Peter was at Rome ; that he assisted St. Paul to order and establish the Church there ; that, in conjunction with St. Paul, he ordained one or more of its earliest bishops, and that there he suffered death for the sake of Christ. But there is no reason to believe, that he was ever, in any proper or local sense, Bishop of Rome ; or indeed that, in that sense, any one of the Apostles had a fixed episcopate ; with the single exception of St. James (if he were an Apostle), who was appointed to preside over Jerusalem, lest that city, where Jesus died,

<sup>1</sup> Ἐν Ῥώμῃ γὰρ γεγόνασι πρότεροι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, εἶτα Λίνος. — Eriph. *Hæc.* xxvii. num. 6.

<sup>2</sup> " Post episcopatum Antiochensis Ecclesiæ . . . Romam pergit, ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit." — *De V. I.* c. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Chron.* p. 160.

<sup>4</sup> The Greek of Eusebius is, Πέτρος ὁ κερυφαῖος τὴν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ πρώτην θεμελίωσας ἐκκλησίαν εἰς Ῥωμὴν ἀπεισι κηρύττων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. — *Χρον. Καν. ad Nu n.* M. Γ

<sup>5</sup> " Apostoli per annos xxv usque ad principium Neroniani imperii per omnes provincias et civitates Ecclesiæ fundamenta miserunt. Cumque jam Nero imparet, Petrus Romam advenit," &c. — *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. 2. Pagi gives this explanation, *Critic. in Baron. Ann.* 43, num. iii. quoted by Lardner, *Works*, vi. p. 547.

<sup>6</sup> *Il. Δ.* 442.

and rose from the dead, and from whence the Church first took its origin, and thence spread through the world, should lack an Apostle, and witness of the resurrection, to be constantly present there, and to form a kind of centre and home for the first preachers of the faith. All the other Apostles had the world for their diocese ; and wheresoever they came, they, as a thing of course, exercised supreme and hyper-episcopal control, discipline, and government. Indeed, if any Apostle could be called Bishop of Rome, St. Paul has more claim to that title than St. Peter. For St. Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles ; whereas St. Peter's mission was to the Jews. St. Paul wrote an Epistle to the Romans, which St. Peter did not. St. Paul lived two years at Rome, before there is any good ground for believing that St. Peter had been there at all. St. Paul is said to have constituted the first bishop there.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, St. Paul himself speaks of having "the care of all the Churches," *i. e.* the Gentile Churches (2 Cor. xi. 28). All this will constitute a better case for St. Paul's Roman episcopacy, and for his supremacy over the Gentile Churches, than can possibly be made out for St. Peter's.

III. The third position of the Roman divines is, that St. Peter's supremacy is inherited by his successors, the Bishops of Rome.

If we have seen that St. Peter had no proper supremacy, and that he was not Bishop of Rome ; then, the premises being gone, the consequence must fall with them. If St. Peter had no supremacy, it could not be inherited. If he was not Bishop of Rome, the Popes could not inherit from him.

But farther, whatever priority St. Peter had among his brother Apostles was personal, not official. He held no office, which they did not hold equally. There is no mention of an Arch-Apostle ; and though St. Paul speaks of the chiefest Apostles (*οἱ ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀπόστολοι*), he speaks of them in the plural, not as if there were but one of supreme authority ; and he says that he himself was "not a whit behind them" (2 Cor. xi. 5). As then St. Peter's priority was personal, not official, it could not be inherited. It was grounded on personal acts, especially his faithful confession of Christ. It contained some personal privileges ; *e. g.* the first founding of the Church, which, being that on which much stress is laid, is yet incommunicable to his successors, who cannot now be the first founders of the Christian temple or commonwealth. And so Tertullian observes, that the manifest intention of the Lord was to

<sup>1</sup> *Constitut. Apostol.* vii. 46, as above.

confer this privilege personally on St. Peter, and that the presuming to derive that power to the bishop of a particular see was a subverting of that intention.<sup>1</sup>

Again, we can trace the rise and progress of this supremacy of Rome, and easily perceive the grounds of it. It was not admitted at the first, but crept in by degrees, till it reached its perfect stature. St. Clement, who was Bishop of Rome, writes to the Corinthians in a brotherly tone, and with less appearance of authority than St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, seems to assume when writing to the Romans. St. Polycarp knew nothing of the supremacy of Anicetus, when he went to consult with him about the keeping of Easter. He yielded in no degree to the Roman Bishop's authority; but both determined to retain their own customs and sentiments, yet not on that account to divide the Catholic Church.<sup>2</sup> Not very long after this, we find Polycrates, a successor to Polycarp in the see of Smyrna, again at issue with Victor, Bishop of Rome, on the Easter controversy. Victor indeed showed much of the spirit which has since prevailed at the Vatican, and excommunicated Polycrates. But Polycrates and the Synod of Asiatic bishops refused to acknowledge the authority of that prelate.<sup>3</sup> Several bishops, though agreeing in Victor's opinion, were much displeased at his violence; and letters were written by them severely reproving him for such conduct. Especially St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, in the name of the Christians of Gaul, over whom he presided, wrote a dignified remonstrance, warning Victor not to break the unity of the Catholic Church.<sup>4</sup>

At the end of the second century, we find from Tertullian that the Bishop of Rome claimed that he, *and all other Churches founded by St. Peter*, derived through St. Peter the power to bind and to loose.<sup>5</sup> This claim Tertullian disallows; but it is a claim very different from that of universal dominion; for it must have admitted the Bishops of Antioch and others to the like privilege.

<sup>1</sup> "Qualis es evertens atque commutans manifestam Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem." — *De Pudicit.* c. 21. See also Bishop Kaye's *Tertullian*, pp. 236, 237.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 14, v. 24.

<sup>3</sup> "Si qui discrepabant ab illis Victori non dederunt manus." — Hieronym. *De V. I. s. v. Irenæus.*

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24; Hieronym. *De V. I.* Irenæus indeed in one place says, that, "in the Church of Rome, on account of her more powerful principality, the faithful everywhere must meet, in which,

by the resort of so many, Apostolical tradition is preserved." — *Adv. Hæc.* iii. 3. All that we can gather from this is, that the city and the Church of Rome had a great preëminence, that it was the great centre or focus of the Christian world, and so the truth was best preserved there.

<sup>5</sup> "Idcirco præsumis et ad te derivasse solvendi et alligandi potestatem, id est, ad omnem ecclesiam Petri propinquam." — *De Pudicit.* c. 21. The *De Pudicitia* is a Montanist tract, but its evidence as to the claims of Rome is as good as if it were Catholic.

In the third century, we have the famous controversy about heretical baptism, dividing the Western Church. It had first begun amongst the Asiatics. Afterwards, Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, being consulted by the Numidian bishops, called several councils at Carthage, A. D. 255, which were attended by large numbers of African bishops.<sup>1</sup> They unanimously decreed the rebaptizing of heretics. This brought them into collision with Stephen, Bishop of Rome; as the Roman Church took the opposite view. Stephen refused to listen to the deputies from the Council, and renounced communion with the African Churches. They, on the other hand, maintained their own views, and expressed their disapproval of Stephen's attempt to make himself a "bishop of bishops."<sup>2</sup> A correspondence took place between Cyprian and Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; in which both express extreme disapprobation of Stephen's conduct, and accuse him of schismatically introducing differences throughout the Church. Firmilian says, the power of binding and loosing was given by Christ to the Apostles and the bishops who succeeded them; and blames the manifest folly of Stephen, who gloried in the place of his episcopate, and contended that he was a successor of St. Peter, on whom the Church's foundation was laid, and yet himself introduced new rocks and new foundations.<sup>3</sup> Again on another occasion, the bishops of Africa, among whom was St. Augustine, not only submitted not, in the case of Apiarius, to the authority of the Bishops of Rome, Zosimus, Boniface, and Celestine, but in the Council of Africa, A. D. 424, wrote strongly to Pope Celestinus, denying his right to interfere with their jurisdiction, complaining that he violated the canon of the Council of Nice, which directed, that causes of the bishops and clergy should be heard by their own metropolitan, and not carried elsewhere.<sup>4</sup> They had even in a previous Council at Milevis, A. D. 416, forbidden appeals to be carried beyond the seas, on pain of separation from all communion with the African Churches.<sup>5</sup>

But above all, Pope Gregory the Great, himself an illustrious Bishop of Rome, so vehemently protested against John Nesteuta,

<sup>1</sup> Seventy-one were present at the second, and eighty-seven at the third Council.

<sup>2</sup> "Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit; aut tyrannico terrore, ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adegit; quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ, arbitrium proprium, tanque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare." — Cyprianus *In Concil. Carthage.*

<sup>3</sup> *Epistol. Firmilian. Oper.* Cyprian *Epist. LXXV. p. 225, &c.*

<sup>4</sup> *Concil. Tom. II. p. 1674; Jastelli, Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric. p. 408.*

<sup>5</sup> "Non provocent nisi ad Africana concilia, vel ad primatas provinciarum ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiatur." — *Concil. Milev. Can. 22; Barrow, On the Supremacy, p. 248. See also Bingham, ix. i. 11; Huesey's Rise of the Papacy, pp. 40-46.*

the Bishop of Constantinople, for desiring to have the name of universal bishop, that he pronounced such an assumption a proof that he who made it was the *forerunner of Antichrist*.<sup>1</sup> "None," says he, "of my predecessors ever consented to use so profane a word; because if one patriarch is called universal, the name of patriarch is taken away from the rest."

If we look to the canons of the general councils, we find that they acknowledge the great Patriarchs; that they give them authority according to ancient custom within their own patriarchates; that they put Rome first, not because of St. Peter's primacy, but because Rome is the imperial city; Constantinople next, because it is new Rome; and afterwards elevate Constantinople to an equality with Rome; and that they specially forbid bishops to interfere with the dioceses of other bishops. Thus, the viith Canon of the Council of Nice says: "Let those ancient customs be in force which concerned Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria should have authority over them, since the like is customary with the Bishop of Rome. So also in Antioch, and the other provinces, let the dignities be preserved to the Churches."<sup>2</sup> Balsamon's gloss on this is, that they confirmed the authority of the four Patriarchs, namely, of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, over their respective patriarchates.<sup>3</sup> So that this great Council placed the Roman Bishop only on a level with those of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem; and this too, as a matter of ancient custom, not of divine right.

The second canon of the Council of Constantinople (A. D. 381) especially forbids that bishops should go beyond their dioceses, restrains the Bishop of Alexandria to Egypt, the eastern bishops to the East, and so on; and forbids, that any bishop should go out of his own diocese for ordination, or any other ecclesiastical ministrations.<sup>4</sup> The third canon of the same council decrees, that the Bishop of Constantinople shall take rank immediately after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is new Rome.<sup>5</sup>

The eighth canon of the Council of Ephesus (A. D. 431) forbids

<sup>1</sup> "Ego autem fidenter dico quia quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, seu vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit." — Gregor. Magn. *Epist.* vii. 33.

So again, "Nullus unquam decessorum meorum hoc tam profano vocabulo uti consensit, quia videlicet si unus Patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomer cæteris derogatur." — *Ibid.* v. 43.

"Indignant as Gregory was at the Bishop of Constantinople calling himself Œcumenical Patriarch, that title had been given him by law from the time of Justinian, and was therefore no new thing in Gregory's time." — See Bingham, *E. A.* xvii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Bevereg. *Synodic.* Tom. i. p. 86.

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

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 87.

<sup>5</sup> *δὲ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην.* — *Ibid.* p. 89.

any bishop to invade another province, which has not from the beginning been under his own authority.<sup>1</sup>

The twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon declares, that the fathers of the Council of Constantinople gave privileges to the see of Rome, because that city was the seat of empire. Wherefore also, moved by the same reason, the fathers assigned the like privileges to the see of new Rome, *i. e.* Constantinople, seeing that Constantinople was now honoured with the empire and the senate.<sup>2</sup> These decrees of the Council of Constantinople the Council of Chalcedon accordingly confirms.

From all this we plainly learn, that the Roman Patriarch had no more authority given him than the other Patriarchs, of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria; that the first place was assigned to Rome, because Rome was the imperial city, not because her bishop had a divine right to preëminence; that, however, the Bishop of Constantinople had a like honour bestowed upon him, when his city rose to the like position with that of his brother Patriarch; and, above all, that no bishop was ever to invade any diocese, which had not from old times been subject to him or to his predecessors. How any of these considerations will agree with the later claims of the Roman Pontiff, it is hard to say.

The first great step towards supremacy was given to the Pope by the Council of Sardica (A. D. 347). Before this time, when bishops had been deposed and had reason to complain, they appealed to the Emperors to summon a larger synod to review their cause. The great Athanasius had thus appealed to the Emperor, and had been restored, after he was deposed by the Tyrian Synod. The XIIIth Canon of the Council of Antioch, supposed to be directed against him, forbade such an appeal. Subsequently Athanasius, ill-used by the Eastern bishops and by Constantius the Arian Emperor, had fled for assistance and support to the Western bishops, especially to the Patriarch of Rome. As there was an Arian Emperor, and there had at all times been a difficulty connected with the imperial interference in doctrinal questions, it was not unnatural for the orthodox bishops to look for some other

<sup>1</sup> ὥστε μηδένα τῶν θεοφιλεστώτων ἐπισκόπων ἐπαρχίαν ἑτέραν, οὐκ οὖσαν ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἡγοῦν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ χεῖρα, καταλαμβάνειν. — Bevereg. *Synodic.* Tom. i. p. 104.

<sup>2</sup> Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πρετέρες εἰκότως ὑποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα. Καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ἑκατον

πεντήκοντα θεοφιλεστάτοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἕπνευμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ εὐλόγως κρίναντες τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμῆσαι τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τῶν ἰσῶν ὑπολινοῦσαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρα βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς, ὡς ἐκείνην, μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν — *Ibid.* p. 145.

centre, where appeals might be made; and the see of Rome most naturally presented itself. The bishop there was the most important on every account. Rome was the head of the world, the centre of civilization, the centre of orthodoxy; and the greatest number of bishops and clergy looked up to its Patriarch as their leader and chief. Accordingly, in an unhappy moment, the Synod of Sardica, in its third canon, gave to Julius, Bishop of Rome, "honouring the memory of St. Peter," the power, if he thought fit, "to appoint the neighbouring bishops of a province to hear" an appeal, "and to send assessors," such as the emperor used to send.<sup>1</sup> It is added, by the fourth canon, that if a deposed bishop appeal to Rome, his place shall not be filled till the Bishop of Rome has heard the case.<sup>2</sup> And by the fifth canon it is decreed, that, when an appeal has been made to the Bishop of Rome, he may appoint the provincial bishops to try the case, or send legates himself.<sup>3</sup> The whole wording of the canons shows that all this was new. Moreover, the council was not general. But the effect of its decrees was very evil. Pope Zosimus afterwards quoted them as decrees of the Council of Nice, in the case of Apiarius mentioned above; and the African bishops were obliged to investigate the question, as to whether they did really issue from that great synod; and finding that they did not, they utterly rejected their authority.<sup>4</sup> Yet these canons laid the foundation of appeal to Rome, and so of Roman supremacy. And Dr. Barrow calls them "the most unhappy ever made in the Church."<sup>5</sup>

From this time, the power of the see of Rome rapidly gained ground. It would be long to trace its progress, and the opposition which was raised to it by wise and far-seeing men, as it advanced towards its zenith.<sup>6</sup> Such a survey of history would indeed be instructive, as showing how different were the pretensions of Gregory VII. and Innocent III. from those of such prelates as even Victor or Stephen; though the latter were amongst the most imperious of the early "successors of the fisherman." Suffice it to have given some proof, that St. Peter had no proper supremacy; that he was never Bishop of Rome; and that the Roman Patriarchs had not *jure divino*, nor from the earliest ages, a jurisdiction over the universal Church.

<sup>1</sup> Bevereg *Synodic*. Tom. i. p. 485.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 487.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 488.

<sup>4</sup> See Hussey's *Rise of the Papacy*, pp. 44-47.

<sup>5</sup> See Barrow, p. 250; Stillingfleet's

*Origines Britan.* ch. III., near the end; Palmer, *On the Church*, II. pp. 520, 548.

<sup>6</sup> The progress is well traced by Professor Hussey in the small volume already referred to.

IV. There is one other ground, besides that of universal Primacy, on which the Pope claims jurisdiction in England; namely, that England was in the Patriarchate of Rome.

When patriarchates first arose is uncertain. The name is first used by Socrates (about A. D. 440<sup>1</sup>). But the office was evidently more ancient. It probably arose from the gradually apparent usefulness of such an order in the government of the Church. Their authority was confirmed, as we have seen, to the great patriarchs, by the Council of Constantinople, and afterwards by those of Ephesus and Chalcedon.<sup>2</sup> All bishops indeed were esteemed equal, as bishops, by the primitive fathers; *i. e.* they were of equal authority, *jure divino*;<sup>3</sup> but, for the sake of a more orderly Church-government, metropolitans were placed over provinces, and patriarchs over those still larger divisions which were then called dioceses, corresponding with the civil divisions of the Empire.<sup>4</sup>

As to the limits of the Roman Patriarchate, much depends on what is meant by the term *Suburbicary Churches*. Rufinus, in his translation of the Nicene Canons, gives us the sixth of these in the words: "The custom of Alexandria and of Rome shall still be observed, that the one shall have the care of the Egyptian, the other of the suburbicarian Churches."<sup>5</sup> The very word *suburbicarian* clearly points to churches not far distant from Rome; and it has been proved, that the suburbicarian Churches meant those within the district, which belonged to the *Vicarius Urbis*; *i. e.* the

<sup>1</sup> Socr. *H. E.* v. 8. Conc. Chalced.

<sup>2</sup> Bing. *E. A.* ii. xvii. 1, 9.

<sup>3</sup> "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur." — Cyprian. *De Unitate*, p. 108.

"Ubicumque est episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, ejusdem est meriti, ejusdem sacerdotii; potentia divitiarum et paupertatis humilitas sublimiorem vel inferiorem episcopum non facit." — Hieronym. *Ad Evagrium*, Epist. 85.

<sup>4</sup> A bishop's jurisdiction was over a *παροικία*, a metropolitan's over an *ἐπαρχία*, a patriarch's over a *διοίκησις*, corresponding with the civil jurisdiction of imperial officers. In the Empire there were seven dioceses in the East, and six in the West, besides the Prefecture of Rome. Hence, in the Church there were fourteen dioceses or patriarchates. In the East, 1. Egypt, under the Patriarch of Alexandria. 2. The East, under the Patriarch of Antioch. 3. Asia, under the Patriarch of Ephesus first, — afterwards under Constantinople. 4. Pontus, under Cæsarea. 5. Thrace, under Thessalonica, — afterwards under Constantinople. 6. Macedonia. 7. Dacia. In the West, 1.

Rome, containing the suburbicarian provinces, under the Patriarch of Rome. 2. Italy, under Milan. 3. Africa, under Carthage. 4. Illyria, which afterwards fell under Constantinople. 5. Gaul, under Treves, — afterwards under Arles. 6. Spain, under Seville, — afterwards under Toledo. 7. Britain, under York. In the fourteen dioceses of the empire there were 118 provinces; and there was the like number in the Church. But, as in the civil government there were three chief cities, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, so the bishops of these were called Patriarchs by preëminence (as was afterwards the Bishop of Constantinople); the bishops of the other great dioceses being called Primates, though with patriarchal powers, — *Primates of dioceses*, not merely metropolitans of provinces. See Crackanthorp, *Defensio Eccles. Anglican.* cap. xxii. §§ 64, 65.

<sup>5</sup> "Ut apud Alexandriam, et in urbe Roma, vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut vel ille Ægypti, vel hic suburbicarium ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat." — Rufin. *Hist. Lib.* i. c. 6.

greater part of middle Italy, all lower Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.<sup>1</sup> It has been shown that the Bishop of Rome did not in early ages exercise authority in Spain, or Gaul, or Africa, nor even over the Bishops of Milan and Aquileia.<sup>2</sup> Far less could he have had patriarchal rights in the more distant isles of Britain. And, though the Synod of Arles, A. D. 314, speaks of the Bishop of Rome as "holding the larger dioceses,"<sup>3</sup> which Roman divines have construed to mean all the great divisions of the Western Empire, yet there is good proof, that the word *diocese* had before this time been assigned to the ordinary provinces of the empire, and that it was even used of single episcopal Churches; so that it must by no means be inferred that the Synod of Arles meant to speak of the Roman patriarchate as including all the West.<sup>4</sup>

Again, it has been proved, beyond a question, that the British Church was of very early origin: founded as early as, perhaps earlier than, the Church of Rome.<sup>5</sup> It clearly acknowledged no obedience to the Pope; for, when Augustine met the British bishops, and pleaded with them for subjection to Rome, they replied, "that they owed no obedience to the Bishop of Rome, but were under the government of the Bishop of Caerleon upon Uske, who was their overseer under God."<sup>6</sup> They refused too to alter their time for keeping Easter, to suit the Roman custom;<sup>7</sup> and show no intention whatever of submitting to papal authority. Indeed, the only reasonable claim which the Roman Pontiff can put in, to a superiority over our English bishops, is derived from the mission of Augustine, A. D. 599. But it is to be observed that, as there was already a Church and several bishops in Britain, so there were Christians, before his arrival, even among the Saxons; that he converted only a small portion of England, namely, Kent, and a few adjacent counties; other parts being converted by Irish and Scots missionaries, not sent from Rome;<sup>8</sup> that he did not receive his appointment to the see of Canterbury from Gregory the Pope, but from Ethelbert the King.<sup>9</sup> Besides all this, the benefit conferred,

<sup>1</sup> Bevereg. *Synodicon. Annotat. in Can. Concil. Nic. Prim.*; Stillingfleet, as above; Bingham, ix. i. 9, 10.

<sup>2</sup> Stillingfleet, *Origines Britan.* ch. III.; Bingham, ix. i. 11; Dr. Allix (*Churches of Piedmont*, ch. XIII.) shows, that the diocese of Milan was independent of Rome to the middle of the 11th century.

<sup>3</sup> "Qui majores dioceses tenes." — *Zonc. Arlatens. i.*; *Epist. Synod. Concil. Tom. i.* p. 1426.

<sup>4</sup> Bingham, ix. i. 12; Palmer, *On the Church*, II. p. 543.

<sup>5</sup> Stillingfleet, *Orig. Britann.* ch. I. See

the Introduction to Soames's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, where in two pages a summary of the evidence for Britain's early conversion is given.

<sup>6</sup> Spelman, *Concil. Britan.* An. 601, Tom. I. p. 108; Bingham, ix. i. 11; Stillingfleet, ch. v., near the end; Bramhall, I. p. 160.

<sup>7</sup> Bede, *Hist. Lib.* II. c. 2, 19; III. 25; v. 16, 22; Bingham, *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> See Bramhall, *Works*, I. 266, 267 · II. 94, 133, 300.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* I. 132; Bed. *H. E.* I. 25.

of converting a nation, does not necessarily involve a supreme jurisdiction over it. Such a jurisdiction was not conceded by the earlier Saxon kings; and if it had been so, a power, which did not originate till the seventh century, whereas there had been a Church in Great Britain in the first century, cannot be a power of that inviolable character, that to throw it off is to separate from Christ, and from the communion of Christ's holy Church. We maintain, that Britain and British Churches were not within the patriarchal rule of Rome in the earliest ages, nor at the times of the four great general Councils. And we deny that, by right of conquest, the Bishop of Rome could obtain authority over them, since it was to Christ, and not to Gregory, that Augustine was sent to conquer the Saxons. We assert therefore that, by claiming patriarchal jurisdiction in England, the Roman Patriarch violates the eighth Canon of the third general Council, which forbids a bishop to intrude into any province which was not under his authority from the very beginning (*ἀνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς*).

If the Pope had been contented to exercise jurisdiction within his own patriarchate, and to take precedence of rank over all the other bishops of Christendom, without attempting to exercise an unwarranted control over bishops and Churches not within the limits of his own lawful government; it is probable that his privileges would never have been objected against, nor his precedence denied him. But when he wishes to be sole Vicar of Christ on earth, the head of the whole Church, and to be above all earthly power and dominion, we believe that he arrogates to himself a title which belongs not to any human being, and claims a power which is only Christ's.<sup>1</sup>

---

### SECTION III.

IT will be necessary to give but a small space to the concluding paragraphs of this Article. The first is, —

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Barrow, *On the Supremacy of the Pope*, is a complete storehouse of information and argument on this subject.

Crackanthorp, *Defensio Eccl. Anglic.* ch. xxii. contains an excellent summary of arguments. Palmer, *On the Church*, Part vii. has also much information in a small compass. For the antiquity and independence of the British Churches

see Usher, *De Primord. Eccl. Britan.*; Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicæ*; Bramhall and Bingham, as referred to above; Beveridge, Note on vi. Can. of the Nicene Synod, Tom. ii. *Annotat.* pp. 51–60; Hales, *Origin and Purity of the British Church*; Burgess's *Traits*; Williams's *Antiquities of the Cymry &c.*

I. "The laws of the realm may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences."

The chief arguments against capital punishments in a Christian state, must be drawn from general considerations of benevolence, and from the evil of taking away from the sinner the time for repentance. To these may be added our Lord's cautions against revenging ourselves, and His injunctions that we should not resist evil (Matt. v. 38, 45, &c.).

On the other side, it is truly said, that punishments inflicted by public authority are not for revenge, but for the suppression of evil. More benevolence is shown in punishing violence, and so repressing it, than in suffering it to prevail. We may not indeed altogether reason from Jewish precedent; because the character of the Jewish commonwealth was peculiar: and some crimes were then visited with capital punishment, which in any other commonwealth must be left almost without public condemnation. But, before the Law, God gave to Noah a command, which seems applicable to the whole human race: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man" (Gen. ix. 6). And under the Gospel, St. Paul maintains the authority of the civil sword. He speaks of the higher powers as ordinances of God, forbids Christians to resist them, and, speaking of the magistrate, says: "He beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God; a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil" (Rom. xiii. 1-4).

So then in the patriarchal ages, and under the Gospel, we have authority for capital punishments. Whether such sentence should be pronounced on any but murderers, or virtual murderers, is another question. But for murder, at least, there seems full Scripture authority, that nations should inflict the punishment of death.

II. The last paragraph in the Article is: "It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons and serve in the wars."

Tertullian, in his treatise, *De Corona Militis*, argues against the lawfulness of a Christian's engaging in the military profession.<sup>1</sup> But in his *Apology*, he says, that Christians were in the habit of enlisting both in the Roman armies and the Roman navies.<sup>2</sup> The well-known story of "The Thundering Legion" proves, that, in the year 174, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, there were many

<sup>1</sup> *De Coronâ*, c. 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol.* c. 42. See Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 364.

Christians among the imperial troops, even if we hesitate to believe that there was a whole Christian legion, or that their prayers brought down thunder and rain.<sup>1</sup>

When we come to Scripture, we find one or two passages in the new Testament which seem to some persons decisive against the lawfulness of war altogether, and therefore against the lawfulness of serving in war. They are especially, Matt. v. 38—41, where our Lord forbids us to “resist evil,” bidding us turn the left cheek to one who smites us on the right; and Matt. xxvi. 52, “All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.” What applies to individuals may be thought equally applicable to societies of individuals, and therefore to whole nations. Indeed we may justly apply the argument, so far as to say that no Christian nation or governor is justified in making war upon a principle of revenge. Revenge is an unchristian feeling, and therefore forbidden to nations as well as to individuals. Therefore, not only are wars for mere glory unquestionably wholesale murder, but wars for any end save necessary preservation, and protection of life, liberties, and independence, are clearly against the will of God, and the spirit of the Gospel of Christ. Yet we may press doctrines and passages of Scripture so far as to overturn the whole fabric of society. If Christian nations may never resist aggression, or defend the weak, civilization and religion would be hourly exposed to destruction from the invasion of barbarians and unbelievers. In such a case, the Gospel would have established the supremacy of the violent and the ungodly.

But He, who in the old Testament repeatedly calls Himself “the Lord of Hosts, the God of the armies of Israel,” can hardly have altogether forbidden just war. John the Baptist, when the soldiers inquired of him what they should do to prepare for the kingdom of Christ, did not bid them give up serving in the armies, but required them to do no violence, and to be content with their wages (Luke iii. 14). Nowhere in the new Testament is there any injunction against the military profession, although our blessed Lord and His Apostles are frequently brought into contact with soldiers, and are led to speak of war. Thus the centurion, whose servant our Lord healed, received high commendation for his faith,

<sup>1</sup> Concerning the Thundering Legion, see Mosheim, *De Rebus ante Constant. Mag.* sec. II. § 17; Lardner, VII. p. 438.

Many later sects, whose doctrines and practices were very rigid, seem to have

opposed capital punishments and the lawfulness of war; as the Waldenses (see Mosheim, Cent. XII. part II. sect. v. 12) and the Anabaptists. Mosh. Cent. XVI. sect. III. pt. II. ch. III. 16.

but no rebuke for his vocation (Matt. viii. 5-13). Cornelius, another centurion, has visions and miracles vouchsafed to him, and an Apostle is sent to instruct and baptize him; but no hint is given, that he ought to give up serving in the Roman armies after his baptism and adoption of the faith (Acts x.). Our Lord and St. Paul both refer to the customs of war, as illustrations of the Christian's warfare, and commend the prudence and wisdom of the worldly warrior to the imitation of the soldier of the Cross, without any reservation or intimation that this world's warrior is to be condemned for following his calling. (See Luke xiv. 31, 32. 2 Tim. ii. 4.) The rebuke to St. Peter, "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword," was evidently directed against an individual's voluntarily taking on himself to fight; and also against using carnal weapons in a spiritual cause. It is not therefore applicable to serving as a soldier, in defence of our country, and at the command of the magistrate, who, by God's own ordinance "beareth the sword," and "is a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil" (Rom. xiii. 4).