

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

Gilgal, and the next verse carries on the history and relates how the Israelites were encamped there and proceeded to keep a passover. But there is more to follow. Gilgal is described as being "in the plains of Jericho," from which the transition to ver. 13 (JE), which speaks of Joshua as being "by Jericho,"<sup>1</sup> is quite natural. There is thus nothing whatever but the necessities of a theory to support the idea that vers. 10-12 have been taken from another author, and every possible feature in the construction of the narrative to suggest the contrary hypothesis.

J. J. LIAS.

---

## ART. II.—THE PROTESTANTISM OF OUR GREAT ENGLISH DIVINES.

### I. RICHARD HOOKER.

WHEN the Tractarian movement first began, its leaders had no idea of going beyond the standing ground of the English seventeenth-century divines; but Dr. Newman, who resolutely seized on and held the direction of the movement, had not a mind that was evenly balanced. Full of enthusiasm, he embraced with all his heart certain principles of thought and action, and he carried them out to their extreme limit, regardless of other principles, equally true, which should have qualified them and restrained their application. Pusey followed Newman up to a certain point from personal love of the man, and so for a time did Keble, till he found and acknowledged that he was misled, and drew back. Newman's influence pushed the older Tractarian movement beyond its original aim; and as to the new medievalist party, it looks with as much contempt on the Anglicanism of the seventeenth century as on the Protestantism of the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, the defenders of medievalists, who, without being disloyal themselves, throw their shield over medievalism, are to a great degree induced to do so from a belief that ritualism, as it exists at present, is historically justified by being a legitimate successor to the Caroline school of divinity. It will be the purpose of the present short series of papers to show that this is a mistake; that the Caroline theology, while fighting Puritanism, was, nevertheless, Protestant to its core, and that, until the present day, there has never been any ecclesiastical party or any recognised theologian that did not firmly and thankfully stand by the

---

<sup>1</sup> ∩ must mean "by" or "near" in this passage.

principles of the Reformation, or hesitated to regard and proclaim the Church of England as a Protestant Church.

Of course, we must understand what the word "Protestant" means. Protestant is in no way opposed to "Catholic" in the proper sense of the latter term, as it is used in our Creed and prayers, but to Popery, which the true Protestant regards as the corruption of genuine Catholicism. Protestantism, as understood in the seventeenth century, was a positive faith, not merely a negation, as some would make it. It meant the Christian faith cleared from the accretions of medievalism. Owing to the growth of other Protestantisms beside those of the Church of England and of the Lutheran Church, the word has now a double meaning; but so also has the word "Catholic," and there is no more reason for our shrinking from one designation than the other owing to ambiguities to which they are both liable.

We shall begin with some proofs drawn from Hooker. Hooker belongs more to the sixteenth than to the seventeenth century; but the seventeenth-century divines, without exception, take their inspiration from him, and, indeed, after Cranmer, Ridley, and Jewell, he is the father of Anglican theology.

Hooker has no hesitation in speaking of "the heresy of the Church of Rome" and "Popish heresy"; and one of his sermons (Sermon II.) has for its object to show that Papists may be saved, just because they do not personally realize the heresy of their Church, or because, in spite of holding some of her heresies, they still cling to Christ as the foundation, and at the bottom trust to Him for salvation. It would be a healthy sign if we recovered this fashion of speech; if we were not afraid of applying the word "heresy" to Romish corruptions of the faith; and if we did not shrink from the terms "Popery" and "Papist," and substitute some gentler appellation for them. After the controversies in the Early Church on the person of Christ, there are none, says Hooker ("E. P.," v. 3), so important as "those questions which are at this day between us and the Church of Rome." Successful war cannot be waged by remaining always on the defensive, nor by an abundant application of rose-water. Dr. Newman has himself told us ("Loss and Gain") that always to "speak gently of our sister's fall" is to lose half the battle before it begins, and to give the attractive an overwhelming advantage over the repulsive power of a mighty institution which attracts by the truths that it still retains, and repels by the false doctrines by which it overthrows those truths.

In the sermon to which we have already referred, Hooker, without professing to enumerate them all, names the following as among the "Popish superstitions":

“In the Church of Rome it is maintained that the same credit and reverence which we give to the Scriptures of God ought also to be given to unwritten verities: that the Pope is supreme head ministerial over the universal Church militant; that the bread in the Eucharist is transubstantiated into Christ; that it is to be adored and to be offered up unto God as a sacrifice, propitiating for quick and dead; that images are to be worshipped, saints to be called upon as intercessors, and such like” (Serin. II. 11).

Here we have mentioned as “Popish superstitions” the Roman doctrines on (1) Holy Scripture and Tradition, (2) the Papal Supremacy, (3) Transubstantiation, (4) Adoration of the Host, (5) the Sacrifice of the Mass, (6) the Worship of Images, (7) the Invocation of Saints. To these elsewhere he adds (8) the Roman doctrines on Justification, (9) on Confession and Absolution, (10) on Satisfaction and Indulgences, (11) on the Immaculateness of St. Mary; and still he does not profess to have enumerated them all, for that was not the object that he had in view. On each of these, and on the right and duty of reformation, we will show what Hooker’s teaching is:

1. *Holy Scripture and Tradition.*

“When the question is whether we be now to seek for any revealed law of God elsewhere than only in the sacred Scripture; whether we do now stand bound in the sight of God to yield to traditions urged by the Church of Rome the same obedience and reverence we do to His written law, honouring equally and adoring both as Divine—our answer is, No. . . . What hazards the truth is in when it passeth through the hands of report, how maimed and deformed it becometh they are not, they cannot be, ignorant!” (“E. P.,” i. 13, 2).

“They are induced either to look for new revelations from heaven, or else dangerously to add to the Word of God uncertain traditions, that so the doctrine of man’s salvation may be complete, which doctrine we constantly hold in all respects, without any such thing added, to be so complete that we utterly refuse as much as even to acquaint ourselves with anything further. Whatsoever, to make up the doctrine of man’s salvation, is added, as in supply of the Scripture’s insufficiency, we reject it. Scripture, purposing this, hath perfectly and fully done it” (“E. P.,” ii. 8, 5).

“Two opinions there are concerning the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, each extremely opposite unto the other, and both repugnant unto truth. The schools of Rome teach Scripture to be so insufficient as if, except traditions were added, it did not contain all revealed and supernatural truth which absolutely is necessary for the children of men in this life to know, that they may in the next be saved” (“E. P.,” ii. 8, 6).

2. *Papal Supremacy.*

“What he (the Bishop of Constantinople) challenged, and was therein, in them, refused by the Bishop of Rome, the same the Bishop of Rome in process of time obtained for himself; and having gotten it by bad means, hath both upheld and augmented it, and upholdeth it by acts and practices much worse” (“E. P.,” vii. 8, 9).

“Jesuits and Papists, hear ye me! Ought ye not to know that the Father hath given all power unto the Son, and hath made Him the only Head over His Church, wherein He dwelleth as a husbandman in the midst of His vineyard, manuring it with the sweat of His own brows, not letting it forth to others. . . . Neither will ever any Pope or Papist under the cope of Heaven be able to prove the Romish bishop’s usurped supremacy over all Churches by any one word of the covenant of salt, which is the Scriptures. For the children in our streets do now laugh them to scorn when they force ‘Thou art Peter’ to this purpose. . . . Jesus said not, ‘The Pope is universal head of all Churches’; but *Tu es Petrus*”—‘Thou art Peter’ (Serm. V. 15).

3. *Transubstantiation.*

“It followeth that nothing of Christ which is limited, nothing created, neither the soul nor the body of Christ, and consequently not Christ as man, or Christ according to His human nature, can possibly be everywhere present. . . . The manhood of Christ can neither be everywhere present, nor cause the person of Christ so to be. . . . The substance of the body of Christ hath no presence, neither can have, but only local. . . . If His majestic body have now any such new property by force whereof it may everywhere really even *in substance* present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the majesty of His estate extinguished the verity of His nature. . . . We hold it a most infallible truth that Christ as man is not everywhere present” (“E. P.,” v. 55, 4-7).

“Nor doth anything remain doubtful but this, whether, when the Sacrament is administered, Christ be whole *within man only*, or else His body and blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated elements themselves; which opinion they that defend are driven either to *consubstantiate* and incorporate Christ with elements sacramental, or to *transubstantiate* and change their substance into His; and so the one to hold Him really but invisibly moulded up with the substances of those elements, the other to hide Him under the only visible show of bread and wine, the substance

whereof, as they imagine, is abolished and His succeeded in the same room. . . . The bread and cup are His body and blood because they are *causes instrumental*, upon receipt whereof the *participation* of His body and blood ensueth. The Real Presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the sacrament" (*i.e.*, the elements) "but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament. As for the sacraments, they *really exhibit*, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, *they are not really*, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow" ("E. P.," v. 67, 2-6).

Contrasting the Lutheran, the Popish, and the Protestant or Anglican views, he states the last as follows :

"The last exposition made of 'This is My body,' is 'This hallowed food, through concurrence of Divine power, is in verity and truth, unto faithful receivers, *instrumentally a cause* of that mystical participation whereby, as I make Myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as My sacrificed body can yield, and as their souls do presently need ; this is *to them and in them My body*" ("E. P.," v. 67, 12).

#### 4. *Adoration of the Host.* 5. *Sacrifice of the Mass.*

These being the necessary results of the doctrine of the objective presence in the elements which Hooker has (as above) repudiated, he is content with passing them by as "Popish superstitions" (Serm. II. 11).

#### 6. *The Worship of Images.*

This, too, is a "Popish superstition." It does not fall in with Hooker's purpose to dwell any more upon it (*ibid.*).

#### 7. *Invocation of Saints.*

"Against invocation of any other than God alone, if all arguments else should fail, the number whereof is both great and forcible, yet this very bar and single challenge might suffice : that whereas God hath in Scripture delivered us so many patterns for imitation when we pray, yea, framed ready to our hands in a manner all, for suits and supplications, which our condition on earth may at any time need, there is not one—no, not one—to be found directed unto angels, saints, or any saving God alone. So that if in such cases as this we hold it safest to be led by the best examples that have gone before, when we see what Noah, what Abraham, what Moses, what David, what Daniel and the rest did, what form of

prayer Christ Himself likewise taught His Church, and what His blessed Apostles did practise, who can doubt but the way for us to pray so as we may be undoubtedly accepted is by conforming our prayers to theirs, whose supplications we know were acceptable?" (Serm. VII. 1.)

#### 8. *Justification.*

This is the point on which the difference between the doctrine of the Church of Rome and our own is the greatest and widest, excepting, if we do except, the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and not excepting even Mariolatry. Hooker has written a treatise upon it, from which we make a few extracts. It is entitled "A Learned Discourse of Justification, Works, and how the Foundation of Faith is overthrown."

"Wherein do we disagree? We disagree about the nature of the very essence of the medicine whereby Christ cureth our disease. When they are required to show what righteousness is whereby a Christian man is justified, they answer that it is a Divine spiritual *quality*, which quality received into the soul, doth first make it to be one of them that are born of God, and secondly, endue it with power to bring forth such works as they do that are born of Him; that it maketh the soul gracious and amiable in the sight of God, in regard whereof it is termed Grace; that it purgeth, purifieth, washeth out all the stains and pollutions of sins; that by it through the merit of Christ we are delivered, as from sin, so from eternal death, the reward of sin. This grace they will have to be applied *by infusion*, to the end that as the body is warm by the heat which is in the body, so the soul might be righteous *by inherent graces*; which graces they make capable of increase, the augmentation whereof is merited by good works, as good works are made meritorious by it. . . . As grace may be increased by the merit of good works, so it may be diminished by the demerit of sins venial; it may be lost by mortal sin. . . . If they work more and more, grace doth more and more increase, and they are more and more justified. To such as have diminished it by venial sins, it is applied by holy water, *Ave Marias*, crossings, Papal salutations, and such like, which serve for reparation of grace decayed. To such as have lost it through mortal sin, it is applied by the Sacrament (as they term it) of Penance. This is the mystery of the man of sin. This maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread when they ask her the way of Justification. They make the essence of it a *Divine quality inherent*; they make it righteousness which is *in us*. If it be *in us*,

then is it ours, as our souls are ours though we have them from God. But the righteousness wherein we must be found if we will be justified is *not our own*; therefore we cannot be justified by any *inherent quality*. Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him. . . . You see, therefore, that the Church of Rome, in teaching Justification by inherent grace, doth pervert the truth of Christ, and that by the hands of His Apostles we have received otherwise than she teacheth" (Serm. II. 5, 6).

Hooker proceeds to point out the difference between the grace of justification and sanctification, the latter of which is inherent, and admits of increase and diminution, the grace of justification being "perfect but not inherent," that of sanctification "inherent but not perfect" (*ibid.*, 3), "the one without us, which we have by imputation, the other in us, which consisteth of faith, hope, and charity, and other Christian virtues" (*ibid.*, 21). God gives us "the one by accepting us for righteous in Christ; the other by making Christian righteousness in us" (*ibid.*). "Then what is the fault of the Church of Rome? Not that she requireth works at their hands that will be saved; but that she attributes unto works a power of satisfying God for sin, and a virtue to merit both grace here and in heaven glory. . . . If it were not a strong deluding spirit which hath possession of their hearts, were it possible but that they should see how plainly they do herein gainsay the very ground of Apostolic faith?" (*ibid.*, 32, 34).

Readily acknowledging that our forefathers who were led into error by ignorance may be saved (which the Puritans of his day denied), Hooker warns modern Romanists that "their estate is dangerous" (*ibid.*, 38).

### 9. *Confession and Absolution.*

Hooker devotes almost the whole of the sixth book of the "Ecclesiastical Polity" to the subject of confession and absolution, distinguishing between the public confession of the early Church and the private confession of the later modern Church, and between the judicial absolution which forgives sin and the ministerial absolution which declares its forgiveness by God. "Public confessions . . . being now not held by the Church of Rome to be sacramental, were the only penitential confessions used in the Church for a long time" ("E. P.," vi., 4, 6).

"If they did account any confession sacramental, it was surely public, which is now abolished by the Church of Rome" (*ibid.*, 13).

"That extreme and rigorous necessity of auricular and



private confession which is at this day so mightily upheld by the Church of Rome we find not (in the Fathers). It was not then the faith and doctrine of God's Church, as of the Papacy at present, (1) That the only remedy for sin after baptism is sacramental penitence; (2) that confession in secret is an essential part thereof; (3) that God Himself cannot now forgive sin without the priest; (4) that because forgiveness at the hands of the priest must arise from confession in the offenders, therefore to confess unto him is a matter of such necessity as, being not either in deed or, at the least, in desire performed, excludeth utterly from all pardon, and must consequently in Scripture be commanded wheresoever any promise of forgiveness is made. No, no! these opinions have youth in their countenance; antiquity knew them not; it never thought nor dreamed of them" (*ibid.*).

"We stand chiefly upon the true inward conversion of the heart; they move upon works of external show. We teach, above all things, *that* repentance which is one and the same from the beginning to the world's end; they a sacramental penance of their own devising and shaping. We labour to instruct men in such sort that every soul which is wounded with sin may learn the way how to cure itself; they, clean contrary, would make all sores seem incurable unless the priest have a hand in them" (*ibid.*, 6, 2).

"What is, then, the force of absolution? What is it that the act of absolution worketh in a sinful man? Doth it by any operation derived from itself alter the state of the soul? Does it really take away sin, or but ascertain us of God's most gracious and merciful pardon? *The latter of which two is our assertion, the former theirs*" (*ibid.*, 4).

"The sentence, therefore, of ministerial absolution hath two effects: touching sin, *it only declareth us free from the guiltiness thereof*, and restored into God's favour; but concerning right in sacred and Divine mysteries whereof through sin we were made unworthy, as the power of the Church did before effectually bind and retain us from access unto them, so upon our apparent repentance it truly restoreth our liberty, looseth the chains wherewith we were tied, remitteth all whatsoever is past, and accepteth us no less, returned, than if we had never gone astray. . . . It doth not permit that, in the use of power over voluntary converts, to bind or loose, remit or retain, should signify any other than only to pronounce of sinners according to that which may be gathered by outward signs; because really to effect the removal or continuance of sin in the soul of any offender *is no priestly act, but a work which far exceedeth their ability*" (*ibid.*, 5).

"The careless manner of their absolution hath made discip-

line for the most part among them a bare formality; yea, rather, a means of emboldening unto vicious and wicked life than either any help to prevent future, or medicine to remedy present, evils in the soul of man" (*ibid.*, 7).

#### 10. Satisfaction and Indulgences.

Hooker points out that satisfaction, which is "a work which justice requireth to be done for contentment of persons injured," has to be made (1) to God, and (2) to man. As to the first, he teaches that "satisfaction is made to God by Christ only." For "because God was to be thus satisfied and man not able to make satisfaction in such sort, His unspeakable love and inclination to save mankind from eternal death ordained in our behalf a Mediator to do that which had been for any other impossible" ("E. P.," vi., 2-5). Satisfaction to man is made by restitution and recompense when we have wronged others; and there are cases where the Church must also be satisfied, inasmuch as it has been wronged by the ill-deeds of one of its members. We may pass by the satisfactions made to man, but in respect to those made to God by man, on the Roman theory, the performance of penance is available. "They imagine, beyond all conceit of antiquity, that when God doth remit sin and the punishment *eternal* thereunto belonging, He reserveth the torments of hell fire" (the fire of purgatory being equal in intensity to hell fire), "to be nevertheless endured *for a time*, either shorter or longer according to the quality of man's crime. Yet so that there is between God and man a certain composition, as it were, or contract by virtue whereof works assigned by the priest to be done after absolution shall *satisfy* God as touching the punishment which He otherwise would inflict for sin, pardoned and forgiven. . . . If a penitent depart this life, the debt of satisfaction being either in whole or in part undischarged, they steadfastly hold that the soul must remain in unspeakable torments till all be paid. . . . So that by this postern-gate cometh in the whole mart of Papal indulgences, a gain inestimable to the priest, to others a spoil; a scorn both to God and man. . . . Such facility they have to convert a pretended sacrament into a true revenue" (*ibid.*, s. 9).

"A strange and a strong delusion it is wherewith the man of sin hath bewitched the world; a forcible spirit of error it must needs be which hath brought men to such a senseless and unreasonable persuasion as this is, not only that men clothed with mortality and sin, as we ourselves are, can do God so much service as shall be able to make a full and perfect satisfaction before the tribunal seat of God for their own sins, yea, a great deal more than is sufficient for themselves: but

also that a man at the hands of a Bishop or a Pope, for such and such a price, may buy the overplus of other men's merits, purchase the fruits of other men's labours, and build his soul by another man's faith. Is not this man drowned in the gall of bitterness?" (Serm. VI. 21.)

### 11. *The Sinlessness of St. Mary.*

"There neither is, nor ever was, any mere natural man absolutely righteous in himself—that is to say, void of all unrighteousness, of all sin. We dare not except, no, not the Blessed Virgin herself. . . . We must answer with Eusebius Emissenus, 'The Mother of the Redeemer herself, otherwise than by redemption, is not loosed from the bond of that ancient sin'" (Serm. II. 2). What would Hooker have said to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, arrived at in our lifetime?

### 12. *The Right and Duty of Reform.*

"They ask us where our Church did lurk, in what caves of the earth it slept, for so many hundreds of years together before the birth of Martin Luther, as if we were of opinion that Luther did erect a new Church of Christ. No, the Church of Christ which was from the beginning is and continueth unto the end. Of which Church all parts have not been at all times equally sincere and sound. . . . To reform ourselves is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were before. In the Church we were and we are so still. . . . The indisposition, therefore, of the Church of Rome to reform herself must be no stay unto us from performing our duty to God; even a desire of retaining conformity with them could be no excuse if we did not perform that duty. . . . With Rome we dare not communicate concerning sundry her gross and grievous abominations . . . and our hearty prayer unto God Almighty is that . . . they may at the length (if it be His will) so yield to frame and reform themselves that no distraction remain in anything, but that we 'all may with one heart and one mouth glorify God the Father of our Lord and Saviour,' whose Church we are" ("E. P.," III. 1-10).

Let it be remembered that the purpose of Hooker's Treatise and Sermons is not to counteract Romanist doctrine. The above arguments fell from him, as it were, incidentally. Looked upon in this light, they are a more striking indication of the sound, wholesome Protestantism pervading his mind, which looks for union, if union there is to be, not by our making light of "the gross and grievous abominations" of Rome, but by her "yielding to frame and reform herself" on the Primitive model.

F. MEYRICK.

## ART. III.—THE HOME AT NAZARETH.

THE plain of Jezreel intervenes between two low mountain ranges composed of limestone. The mass of hills to the south formed the land of Judæa, that to the north the land of Galilee, which word means "a circle," and was originally applied to the twenty cities which Solomon gave to King Hiram as a return for his having sent timber for the building of the Temple, but which Hiram in disgust termed "Cabul."

This district was early termed "Galilee of the nations." Its population was of a mixed character. There were Phœnicians, Arabs, and Greeks dwelling there, and the Greek language in Christ's time was generally spoken. Although the plain is a very rich tract of land, yet it now lies comparatively idle. It has been for ages the great battlefield of Palestine. Here Philistines, Midianites, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Jews, Crusaders, Turks, and French have fought; here oft has ascended the discordant battle-cry; here warriors have contended in sanguinary conflict; here the clash of weapons and the din of war has been heard for more than 3,000 years, and yet may be heard again.

When the traveller has crossed this historic plain, he arrives at the foot of hills of considerable elevation, then a steep ascent of some 1,000 feet is commenced. The pathway is narrow and rugged; huge boulders cross the road; loose stones of all sizes lie about; sheets of bare, smooth rock are met. Some parts are extremely steep. Grass and flowers of many hues embroider the way. Camels and donkeys with loads toiling slowly upwards are passed. After a while a plateau or tableland is reached, and on the right hand appears a small valley, which opens into an amphitheatre of hills, the appearance presented being that of the crater of an extinct volcano. A little onward to the west appears a pleasant little town, with its white houses clinging to the side of a hill which rises to a height of about 500 feet above it. In spring-time all around looks bright and captivating. The fields about are gay with many-coloured hues. Birds of different species send forth soft notes from amongst the trees, or flit about in constant activity. Above the town the hills are covered with thin pasture, whilst the upper end of the west summit is crowned with the domed tomb-shrine of some Mohammedan saint. In the valley fig-trees appear here and there, and crops of grain are cultivated. The hills encircling are not copiously covered with rich grassy slopes like those in this country. Trees of noble proportions, with umbrageous, outstretching branches, do not present themselves; no dense