Revelation or Reason?
The Different Perspectives on Church Polity Between Thomas Cartwright and Richard Hooker

Jong Hun Yoon

(Chongshin Theological Seminary, Assocoate Professor, Historical Theology)

[Abstracts]

This research challenges to Analyze the difference of church government between Presbyterian and Anglican in the eras of Tudor and Stuarts in England by research on Thomas Cartwright and Richard Hooker. The prime point of difference between Presbyterianism and Anglicanism was that Presbyterian conceived that the Scriptures revealed a model for church organization and for all human behavior, whereas Anglican understood the Scriptures as an authority for all things pertaining to redemption, but composed of many natural law. In particular, the architect of Anglican, Hooker regarded the form of the church as a matter beyond salvation's jurisdiction, and hence liable to considerations of expediency, so that experience and convenience were the appropriate yardsticks for a viable form of church government. Besides, one of the discrepancies between Cartwright and Hooker was in the understanding of human nature such as reason. Anglican understood that reason provided a way to define God's will. On this basis, Hooker was able to argue forcibly for the complete complementarity and interdependence of reason and Scripture, But Cartwright insisted that the total depravity of humanity was far more complete and thoroughgoing so that every faculty was deficient.

Revelation or Reason? The Different Perspectives on Church Polity Between Thomas
Cartwright and Richard Hooker / Jong Hun Yoon

83

Ⅰ. Introduction

Henry VIII, England Tudor King, decided to break from the Roman
Catholic Church which had bound England with medieval clericalism
and papism, and he instigated a new theological era in England by
establishing an Anglican Church government. The Anglicanism,
which was formed by Henry VIII, Edward VI and Elizabeth I, became
the only English style church in the history of England's Christianity.[1]
Although England began disengaging from the authority of the Roman
Catholic Church through Henry's English reformation movement, the
English could not be free from mediaeval Catholics theological
thought that had been maintained as the pride of Roman Catholics
for a 1000 years. Therefore many aspects of Anglican theology were
similar with Roman Catholic theology.

In this situation, the reformed orthodox theological thought which

---

* This essay was presented in "The Evangelical Theological Society Annual Meeting
at Providence Conference, U.S.A. "

1 Concerning the Anglican Theology see these books: Stephen Sykes & John Booty
& Jonathan Knight, *The Study of Anglicanism* (SPCK: Fortress Press, 1986); Isaac
Walton, *The Works of Richard Hooker with the Account of His Life and Death* (New
York: D. Appleton and Company, 1854); H. Hensley Henson, *Puritanism in England*
(New York: Burt Franklin, 1972); Victo R. Atta-Baffoe, *A Study of Richard Hooker's
Theology of Participation and the Principle of Anglican Ecclesiology* (M.A. Thesis,
Yale University, USA, 1993); Richard Hooker, *The Works of that Learned and
Judicious Divine, Richard Hooker, With an Account of His Life and Death* by Issac
Walton, ed. by John Keble, 3 Vols, 7th (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888); P. Lake,
Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church, CUP, 1982; H.R. McAdoo, *The Spirit
of Anglicanism: A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century*
(A.& C. Black, London, 1965); I.B. Bunting ed., *Celebrating the Anglican Way* (Hodder
& Stoughton, London, 1996); Henry Chadwick, "The Context of Faith and Theology
in Anglicanism" in A. A. Vogel ed., *Theology in Anglicanism* (Morehouse-Barlow,
Wilton CT 1984); A.E. McGrath, *The Renewal of Anglicanism* (SPCK, London, 1993);
K. Stevenson and B. Spinks, ed., *The Identity of Anglican Worship* (Mowbray, London,
1991).

was formed by Calvinists, permeated its influence into England through the Geneva religious leaders. Some church of England leaders of the days came forward to thoroughly criticize the problems of medieval catholic theology and faith. And those known as the Puritans[2] cried for a basic and drastic reformation against the semi-Reformed thought of the Anglican church and to return to upholding of the Early Christian Church tradition. Even though Anglican and Presbyterian are the products of the Reformation, these two denominations formed a different Ecclesiology and a different attitude toward the state. Both denominations held a different understanding concerning their theological framework and the function of human reason.

The aim of this article is to demonstrate that by cautious consideration of the historical primary sources, what are the different points of view, and what are the various causes of controversy between Presbyterian and Anglican church government patterns.

In order to do this analytical work, first of all, we need to look into the aspects of the theological differences by comparing the ecclesiology of Thomas Cartwright, called as the first man who gave tangible form and expression to Presbyterianism and contributed very much to Presbyterianism in England, with the Ecclesiology of Richard Hooker who was well known as a leader, architect of Anglicanism.[3]

---

[2] For an extensive explanation, see Walter H. Frere and Charles E. Douglas, eds., *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1907), vii-xxxi; Donald McGinn, *The Admonition Controversy* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1949)

[3] M.E. C. Perrott, "Richard Hooker and the Problem of Authority in the Elizabethan Church", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 49, No. 1, January (UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 59-60.

II. The First Admonition - Presbyterian Church Government

1. The Primitive Apostolic Church Patterns

Presbyterianism was the central force of the Puritan movement in England. It is evident that English Presbyterian church polity pattern was based on the rule of presbytery called "Zaqen," Presbuteros" which are written in Old and New Testament. The contours of this system started to be exposed as a result of the works of the medieval age man, Augustine, who converted Anglo-Saxons to Christianity, also through the efforts of the missionary known as St. Patrick, and by Waldensians' church polity, and through the activities and statements of John Wycliff, Johanus Huss who was influenced by Waldo and Wycliff's teaching.

These institutional works became the model of the modern Presbyterian system by sending a document titled: "An admonition to the Parliament holden in the 13 yeare of the reigne of Queene Elizabeth of blessed memorie" to parliament written by John Field and Thomas Wilcocks. Then more detailed biblical principles of Presbyterianism were made by the puritans: Thomas Cartwright who was called the father of English Presbyterianism, Walter Travers who was a second Presbyterian leader. In England, this government system was established firmly through the controversies among Cartwright, Whitgift and Hooker, after Cartwright had sent to the parliament the thesis entitled "A Second Admonition to the Parliament."

Cartwright wrote down in his "Admonition"[4] that "We must of

---

4 Originally the publication of the *Admonition* consisted of two treatises framed by the a preface and epilogue. In this articles, Cartwright argued for the rejection of the power of the episcopal hierarchy and the magistracy in church affairs, which was perceived as substituting for the reign of Christ. Jan Martijn Abrahamse, "Robert

necessity have the same kind of church government as that in the time of the apostles, and as it is expressed in the scriptures".[5] In particular, he declared that he had found the system of Church government called Presbyterian which is undoubtedly prescribed for the Christian Church in the New Testament. For him, scripture is a book of law containing the direction of all things pertaining to the church.[6] In every church community, this presbyterian church government is a very necessary system and is based on the commandment of God.[7]

Cartwright insisted that the apostle Paul divided the office of the ministry into two distinct parts: the one is the ordinary and the other the extraordinary on the basis of Ephesians 4 and 1 Corinthians 12. The extraordinary offices refer to the apostles, evangelicals, and

---

Browne as an Unwanted Child: Explaining Separatism from the Nursery of Presbyterian Puritanism," *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 40 no 4, (Baylor University Press, 2013), 354.

[5] John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1820), 363. However, Robert Browne who was called Separatists disagreed with Thomas Cartwright and conceived that the idea that Episcopalians and Presbyterians were both wrong, that either of the theories is unbiblical, and that according to the Bible, the government of the Church is neither Episcopal nor Presbyterial but Congregational. Eri B. Hulbert, *The English Reformation and Puritanism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908), 196; C. R .N. Routh, *Who's Who in History. Volume II England 1484 to 1603* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964), 339; R. G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church* (London, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1919), I: 68.

[6] Thomas Cartwright, *A Replye to an Answere Made of M[aster] Doctor Whitgift agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament* [sic], in William Thomas Lowndes, *The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature* (London: William Pickering, MDCCCXXXIV). 14. "A perfecte rule off all things publike or private necessarie to be done off a Christian man"(sic), *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer touching the Churche Discipline,* (Heidelberg: Imprinted by Michael Schirat, 1575). 24.

[7] John Hunt, *Religious Thought in England* (London: Strahan & Co. Publishers, 1870), 96; John Whitgift, *The Works of John Whitgift*, ed. J. Ayre, vol. III: 498.

prophets. He emphasizes the necessity of the extraordinary offices :

> As in time of wars it is necessary that there should be a general and lord marshall, but when that wars are ceased and there is peace, there needeth only to be a garrison and captain made for them; so whenas the great conquest of the gospel was to be made over the world, it was necessary there should be apostles s generals, afterward it was sufficient to have the pastors, doctors, and elders, as a garrison in the church of God, to keep and govern it(sic).[8]

The ordinary offices consists of pastors(bishops), doctors, elders(presbyters), and deacons(deaconesses). Cartwright asserted that the extraordinary offices were very necessary for a time while a permanent foundation was being laid for the church.

2. The Connection Between Soteriology and Ecclesiology

For Cartwright, the word 'priest' which was advocated by Roman Catholics and Anglicans, was so odious because there is no good reason for them to use this term.[9] He continued that some of the ordinary offices, pastors and doctors are appointed to govern, teach, and preach in church. The pastors were required to serve the church not only with preaching and administering the sacraments, but also admonishing each household in his church. In particular, pastors ought not to have a general calling but a definite calling from God. He insisted that with a general calling, a pastor could not feed his

---

8 Alexander B. Grosart, *A Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul written to the Colossians-- by Thomas Cartwright* (New York: Macmillan, 1910), 413.
9 Thomas Cartwright, *A Replye to an Answere Made of M[aster] Doctor Whitgift agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament* [sic], 198.

whole flock: "to doubt whether the pastor oughte to be resident amongste hys flocke/ is to doubte whether the watchman shoulde be in hys tower/ the eye shoulde be in the heade/ or the soule in the bodye/ or the shepheard amongst hys flocke"(Sic).[10] The pastor is called to be a shepherd; the admonishing of a watchman is not enough.[11]

The doctor, a second type of minster, is also necessary to teach church members, however in the case of the absence of the doctor, a pastor may assume the task.[12] Elders are those who govern the church excluding teaching. The task of elder is to aid the ministers by admonishing and assisting in ecclesiastical suspension and excommunication.[13] Deacons and deaconesses are dedicated to the care of the sick or poor or those who are engaged in other service duties in the church. This office is derived from Acts 6:1-6, during that time the apostles could not teach and take spiritual care of the church congregation including the works of distribution.[14] Therefore the church decided to commit these works to deacons or deaconesses who were selected by the church community.

In this manner, the Presbyterians led by Cartwright, made effort to recover the primitive apostolic church patterns. He did not hesitate

---

10 Thomas Cartwright, *A Replye to an Answere Made of M[aster] Doctor Whitgift agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament* [sic], 49.
11 Thomas Cartwright, *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer touching the Churche Discipline,* 340-342.
12 Thomas Cartwright, *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: against Master Doctor Vuhitgifts second ansvuer, touching the Church discipline*(sic) (Basel: Imprinted by Thomas Guarinus, 1577). 634.
13 Thomas Cartwright, *A Replye to an Answere,* 138-140.
14 Thomas Cartwright, *The Rest of the Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright [sic],* 101; Thomas Cartwright, *A Replye to an Answere Made of M[aster] Doctor Whitgift agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament,* 152.

to cite early church father's writings to build the presbyterian government system, especially Irenaeus, Tertullianus, Jerome, and Augustinus,[15] the reason being that these fathers' testimony was subordinate to scripture. Cartwright confirmed that these fathers convinced that scripture is inspired by the Spirit and is the only rule to construct the presbyterian government system: "All the godlie zealous learned men in the world are not able to authorise or displace any doctrine in the churche withowt the word of God"(Sic).[16] Cartwright would have the argument tried only by Scriptures and not by human custom and experience.[17] Even though he employed most of the documents of the fathers as a testimony of presbyterian government, however he convinced that the testimony of the primitive man should be subordinate to Scriptures.[18] It was his rule

---

[15] He cited Tertullianus's writings 24 times, Ignatius's writing 8 times, Justin Martyr writings 8 times, Irenaeus, 4 times, Jerome's writings 53 times, Ambrose's writings 37 times, Augustinus writings 59 times, Cyprian writings 57 times and so on. John K. Luoma, *The Primitive Church as a Normative Principle in the Theology of the Sixteenth Century: The Anglican-Puritan Debate over Church Polity as Represented by Richard Hooker and Thomas Cartwright*, Ph. D. Dissertation (Hartford, Connecticut, The Hartford Theological Seminary, 1974, Unpublished), 80.

[16] Thomas Cartwright, *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer toughing the Churche Discipline*, 18. Cartwright rebutted against his opponent who cited scripture and father's writings to advocate their own arguments: "This is once to be observed of the reader throughout your whole booke/ that toy have well provided that you shoulde not be taken in the trippe for misalledging the scriptures/ for that onlesse it be in one or two poyntes we heare continually (instead of Esay and Jerome/ S. Paule/ and S. Augustin and S. Ambrose/ kai to en te phake myron, Dionysius Arepagita/ Clememt, & c. and therefore I can not tel with what face we can call the papists from their antiquitie/ councelles / and fathers/ to the triall of the scriptures/ which in the controversies which rise amongst our selves flie so farre from them/ that it wanteth not muche/ that they are not banished of youre parte/ from the deciding of all these controversies [SIC]". Thomas Cartwright, *A Replye to an Answere Made of M[aster] Doctor Whitgift agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament* [sic] (1573), 17.

[17] John K. Luoma, *The Primitive Church as a Normative Principle in the Theology of the Sixteenth Century*, 73.

that the father's documents which he cited as proofs for presbyterianism, should not be contrary to scriptures, and if not that, the establishment of such independent traditions and customs would eventually lead to the words of man becoming more important than the word of God:[19] "whereby a gate is open unto the papostes to bring in under the colour of traditions all their beggary whatsoever(sic)."[20]

III. *Of The Laws* – Anglican's Church Polity

1. Thomistic Authority – Experience and Convenience System

Richard Hooker as an architect of Anglicanism, following Thomas Aquinas, had a positive view about creation and human nature.[21] All things exist in God and like God. Because all things have the nature of God in them, they also have the potential of being perfect.[22] The power of choice and the use of reason seem to go together in Hooker's scheme of things, and both are regarded by him as

---

18 Thomas Cartwright, *The Rest of the Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright [sic]*, 181.

19 John K. Luoma, *The Primitive Church as a Normative Principle in the Theology of the Sixteenth Century*, 75.

20 Thomas Cartwright, *A Replye to an Answere*, 18.

21 In his works, Hooker defined the ability of the reason of human being like this: "Reason is the director of man's Will by discovering in action what is good…, Without reason there can be no voluntary action, for Reason informs the Will not only as to the relative goodness of an object, but also of its possibility. Reason, the discursive or conceptual faculty, is here to be distinguished from the understanding, the perceptive faculty." Richard Hooker, *The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker*, arr. by John Keble, Seventh Edition, revised by R. W. Church and F Paget (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888), Preface to *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, vol. I.

22 John Booty, "Richard Hooker," William Wolf, ed., *The Spirit of Anglicanism* (Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow, 1979), 70.

essential to personal beings.[23] Hooker followed the teaching of
Aquinas's concerning about human reason: "There is within the
human being an inclination towards the good in keeping with the
nature of reason, which is proper to him, such that man has a natural
inclination towards this, that he know the truth about God."[24]

There is no doubt that John Calvin found all human reason,
judgment, and authority to be an inadequate basis for what Christians
believe about the Scripture. He was glad to point to the fact that
"learned men, endowed with the highest judgment…. see manifest
signs of God speaking in Scripture," and he argued instead that "we
ought to seek our conviction" that God is the author of the Scriptures
"in a higher place than human reasons, judgments, or conjectures….
that is, in the secret testimony of the Spirit."[25] Hooker, however,
insisted on reason as the interpreter of both Scripture and
experience, also emphasized the value of reason in support of
Scripture.[26] Hooker, in centering his interest on reason and the
conceptual, stands in the medieval tradition of St. Thomas Aquinas,
as distinguished from modern thinkers, whose concern has been
primarily with perception.[27]

John Whitgift, Cartwright's opponent, contended that there was

---

[23] Richard Hooker, *A Learned Discourse of Justification* (Oxford: Printed by Joseph
Barnes, 1612), 26.

[24] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, trans, William Barden (Cambridge University
Press, 1965), 1. 94.

[25] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* I.vii.4. ed. John T. McNeill, trans.
Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia, 1960), 78. quoted in Ranall Ingalls, "Richard
Hooker as Interpreter of the Reformed Doctrine of Sola Scriptura," *Anglican and
Episcopal History* vol.77. no.4. (New York: Historical Society of the Episcopal
Church, 2008), 366.

[26] Richard Hooker, *The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker*, vol. 3, 594-5.

[27] J.V. Langmead Casserly, *The Christian in Philosophy* (London: Faber and Faber,
1949), 258-259.

no one form of church government laid down in Scriptures and that in external matters the church was to be guided by the decision of the Christian magistrate.[28] He asserted that even though the Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, they were not designed as a standard of church discipline or government, but that this was changeable, and that the practices of the apostolic government were adapted to the Primitive church, when the church was under Roman Empire's persecution. In part, though Whitgift adopted the objectivity of some apostolic and patristic documents cited by Cartwright, he tried to demonstrated the fact that there was no united and universal method of voting for clergyman in the whole apostolic church: sometimes the clergyman was elected by the congregation, or else an apostle appointed a bishop to govern a whole realm.[29]

On the grounds of the request of Queen Elizabeth, Whitgift rebutted Catwright's Presbyterianism and regarded the form of the church as a matter beyond salvation's jurisdiction, and hence liable to considerations of expediency, and he found present exigency to be as pressing as apostolic example. Experience and convenience were the appropriate yardsticks for a viable form of church government.[30]

Following the direction of Whitgift's church government style, the

---

28 Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 13.

29 John Whitgift, *The Works of John Whitgift*, ed. J. Ayre, vol. I, 358-397, 261-264. Vol. III, 54.

30 John F. H. New, "The Whitgift-Cartwright Controversy", *Archiv fur Reformationsgeschichte*, 1968, 59(2), 205. "Anglicans could believe that the ceremonies, order of worship, discipline, and form of government of the Church were matters properly determined by experience, convenience, and reason" quoted in John Whitgift, *The Works of John Whitgift*, ed. J. Ayre, vol. I:175-295, recited in John F.H. New, *Anglican and Puritan, The Basis of their Opposition 1558-1640* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1964), 37.

Revelation or Reason? The Different Perspectives on Church Polity Between Thomas
Cartwright and Richard Hooker / Jong Hun Yoon

93

author of "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity", Richard Hooker,[31]
the traditionalist of Anglicanism, divided the office of the ministry
into three degrees: Bishops, Priests(Presbyters), and Deacons.
Contrary to the Presbyterians who asserted that "there ought not
to be in the church, Bishops endued with such authority and honour
as ours are",[32] Hooker argued that the apostles were of the first to
receive such authority from Christ, "and all those who have it after
them in orderly sort are their lawful successor.... For to succeed them,
is after them to have that Episcopal kind of power which was first
given to them."[33]

   He also contended that power is given to the bishops for the
common good of the church. Their particular charge was to proclaim
the Gospel of Christ to all nations and to deliver the ordinances
that they received by immediate revelation from Him, to all nations.[34]
According to Hooker, the word bishops were introduced to stand
in for the Apostles.[35] He claimed that the church of England's
episcopal church government does not contradict Scriptures. He
expressed great wonder at the Presbyterian argument for the lay
eldership, to him an attempt to establish the eldership as the true
pattern of the church is making mistake.

---

[31] Rudolph Almasy and J.K. Luoma have both argued that Hooker's primary polemical
     target was only Thomas Cartwright, "The Purpose of Richard Hooker's polemic,"
     Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. 39. no. 2 (University of Pennsylvania Press,
     1978), 251-70; "Restitution or Reformation? Cartwright and Hooker on the
     Elizabethan Church," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, xlvi
     (Historical Society of the Episcopal Church, 1977), 85-106.
[32] Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* VII. Title.
[33] Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, VII, 4.3.
[34] Dionysius the Areopagite, 1st Bp of Athen, *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, 1.5. quoted
     in Philip B. Secor, *Richard Hooker on Anglican Faith and Worship- of the Laws
     of Ecclesiastical Polity*: Book V (UK: Spck, 2003), 366,
[35] Philip B. Secor, *Richard Hooker on Anglican Faith and Worship*, 370.

2. Church Policy as a Concept of "adiapora"

Hooker insisted that presbyter is one "unto whom our Saviour Christ has communicated the power of spiritual procreation", and in heaven, according to St John, twenty-four presbyters are sitting around the throne of God, one half of them Fathers of Old and half of the New Jerusalem (Revelation 21:14; Matthew 19:28; 1 Peter 5:1). Hooker understood that the Apostles gave the twelve of New Jerusalem the same, and Christ Himself appointed twelve presbyters and seventy inferior presbyters.[36] For him, some presbyters had more power and some less according to Saviour's appointment of them. Those who received therefore the fullness of spiritual power was greater than those to whom less power was granted. We can find the reason why he claims two kinds of presbyters in that to him the office of presbyters and deacons are not by ordination consecrated unto places but unto function.[37]

Hooker asserted that the Apostles soon ordained deacons as the stewards of the Church, to whom were committed the duty of providing for the poor, widows, and orphans by distributing the gifts of the Church and they have the responsibility of assuring that financial affairs were dealt with in a religious and faithful manner. Their office was to assist the presbyters at worship services.[38]

However, according to him prophets, evangelicals, pastors,

---

[36] Cargill Thompson, "The Philosopher of the Politic Society." *Studies in Richard Hooker,* ed. W. Speed Hill (Cleveland & London: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1972), 75.

[37] Richard Hooker, *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Richard Hooker, With an Account of His Life and Death*, V: 80:2-8-II, 499-504.

[38] Richard Hooker, *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Richard Hooker, With an Account of His Life and Death*, V: 80:2-8-II, 367.

Revelation or Reason? The Different Perspectives on Church Polity Between Thomas
Cartwright and Richard Hooker / Jong Hun Yoon

95

teachers are not degrees of the clergy. He thought that in the process
of the interpretation of those scriptural phrases, the Presbyterian
made an error to distinguish the difference between services, offices,
and orders. For Hooker, services and offices may be executed by
laymen, but no one can have the orders but the clergy.[39] Accordingly,
he understood that in those phrases St. Paul referred the various
graces, gifts, and abilities, which Christ bestowed to gather the saints,
and to work and edify the body of Christ. He assumed that Paul
mentioned the offices of pastors and teachers in Ephesians 4:7-8
as not in respect of ordination to exercise ministry, but only as
examples of men who are especially enriched with the gifts of the
Holy Ghost.[40]

First of all, according to Hooker, the prophets had been working
in church expounding the Scriptures by receiving a special gift from
God and proclaiming the future. Agabus was this sort of man, as
were various others in Jerusalem. These prophets are not to be counted
with the clergy because no talents or gifts could make them ministers
of holy things unless ordination had given them that power.[41] Hooker
insisted that there was no mention in Scriptures that prophets were
created by means of ordination, however, ordained persons were to
serve as presbyters or deacons.

The evangelicals were presbyters of great ability whom the apostles
sent abroad to deal with matters of the church wherever there was
special need. They were used as agents in church affairs wherever
they saw a need. Those named in Scripture, like Ananias, Apollos
and Timothy, were employed in this way.[42]

---

39 Philip B. Secor, *Richard Hooker on Anglican Faith and Worship*, 371.
40 Philip B. Secor, *Richard Hooker on Anglican Faith and Worship*, 370.
41 Philip B. Secor, *Richard Hooker on Anglican Faith and Worship*, 368.

The pastors and teachers are simply presbyters but they differed from the evangelicals in that they were settled in a particular church.**43** Although Cartwright built up the Presbyterian government on the basis of the scriptures 1 Corinthians 12:28 and Ephesians 4:7-13, which were interpreted as a typical model of ministry for the primitive and modern church, Hooker understood that those verses do not indicate orders of ministry but of special gifts of the Spirit and gifts of instruction.

For Hooker, it is essential to separate between ordination and appointment to the particular church. It is ordination that imparts the power of ministry, whether exercised or not; appointment to a particular church is the placing, not the making, of a minister.**44** On the contrary to Hooker's opinion, Cartwright claimed that having been ordained by the church all minsters were therefore equal. that the system of the presbyterian government is supported by the teaching and the commandment of the Scriptures, and this church system is very necessary to carry out the church's outward social responsibility.**45** Cartwright charged that Hooker's argument had no foundation in Scripture, and that a system not commanded by God should not be tolerated. Therefore Hooker believed in the ability

---

42 These people were called as Evangelists and presbyters according to Hooker on the basis of the Scriptures, Acts 21:10; 11:28; 9:17; 18:24; 2 Timothy 4:5-9; 1 Timothy 3:15; 5:14:2:8.

43 Richard Hooker, *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Richard Hooker, With an Account of His Life and Death*, V. 78; 2-7, II. 469-478. John K. Luoma, *The Primitive Church as a Normative Principle in the Theology of the Sixteenth Century: The Anglican-Puritan Debase over Church Polity as Represented by Richard Hooker and Thomas Cartwright*, 181.

44 John K. Luoma, *The Primitive Church as a Normative Principle in the Theology of the Sixteenth Century: The Anglican-Puritan Debate over Church Polity as Represented by Richard Hooker and Thomas Cartwright*, 183.

45 John Whitgift, *The Works of John Whitgift*, ed. J. Ayre, vol. 3, 498.

of the human intellect.[46]

Ⅳ. The Crucial Issues of Difference between Presbyterian and Anglican

What was the prime point of difference between Presbyterianism and Anglicanism with regard to the system of church government based on Scripture? First of all, Cartwright conceived that the Scriptures revealed a model for church organization and indeed, for all human behaviour, whereas Hooker understood the Scriptures as an authority for all things pertaining to redemption, but permissive in matters indifferent to it. In other words, as John F. H. New pointed out, Cartwright was a Scriptural authoritarian,[47] meanwhile Hooker understood that Scriptures are composed of supernatural and natural law, and moreover scriptures contain many natural laws. Hooker regarded the form of the church as a matter beyond salvation's jurisdiction, and hence liable to considerations of expediency, so that experience and convenience were the appropriate yardsticks for a viable form of church government.[48]

Secondly, they have different understandings of the doctrine of the church that is the relationship between the visible and invisible churches. Including Cartwright, Puritans proceeded to nullify the difference by blandly equating the external Church with the spiritual church. Cartwright, agreeing with John Calvin, would not distinguish

---

46 John Whitgift, *The Works of John Whitgift*, ed. J. Ayre, vol. 1, 148.
47 John F. H. New, "The Whitgift-Cartwright Controversy", 206.
48 John F. H. New, "The Whitgift-Cartwright Controversy", 205.

between elect and reprobate when he considered the visible church. Calvin repudiated to distinguish between reprobate and elect in the visible church:

> Yet, to embrace the unity of the church in this way, we need not (as we have said) see the church with the eyes or touch it with the hands. Rather, the fact that it belongs to the realm of faith should warn us to regard it no less since it passes our understanding than if it were clearly visible. And our faith is no worse because it recognizes a church beyond our ken. For here we are not bidden to distinguish between reprobate and elect – that is for God alone, not for us, to do – but to establish with certainty in our hearts that all those who, by the kindness of God the Father, through the working of the Holy Spirit, have entered into fellowship with Christ, are set apart as God's property and personal possession; and that when we are of their number we share that great grace.[49]

Thus for practical purposes the visible was assumed to be the invisible Church. For Cartwright, the conception of the church was of a peculiar people, separated form the world, having been called out of its darkness to be a society of visible saints, and thereby testify to the world of the evidence of God's power and workmanship in the lives of the redeemed.[50] In consequence, we can find the fact that Cartwright's Ecclesiology was in harmony with his Soteriology. Cartwright regarded the church as a spiritual society of individual believers bound together as a corporate body. The Christian is a

---

[49] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* in two volumes, 1015-1016.
[50] Paul E.G. Cook, "The Church", *Anglican and Puritan Thinking* (The Westminster Conference, 1977), 37.

part only of the whole fellowship of believers.[51]

Whitgift and Hooker, on the contrary, insisted that there are two kinds of government in the church, the one invisible, the other visible: the one spiritual, the other external. The visible and spiritual government of the church is when God by his Spirit, gifts and ministry of his Word, governs it, therefore ruling the hearts and consciences of men, and directing them in all things necessary to salvation, and this can only be found in the church of the elect. The visible and external government is that which is executed by men and consists of external discipline, and visible ceremonies practiced in that church, and over that church, that contains in it both good and evil, which is usually called the visible church of Christ. Anglicans consciously stressed the distinction between the churches of grace and nature to combat Cartwright's opposite tendency.[52] In contrast with Cartwright's spiritual concept of the church, Hooker's position is institutional. The church can continue to exist even apart from its members mainly on account of the Anglican priesthood. Such a view of the church encourages formalism in its members, and leads to a highly individualistic view of the Christian life.[53]

The fundamental cause why Whitgift and Hooker insisted on the distinction between both churches, was to demonstrate that the present visible church government style, ritual and ordination belong to the natural sphere not to the sphere of grace. Furthermore, they wanted to acquire the objective evidences to institutionalize the

---

51 Paul E.G. Cook, "The Church", *Anglican and Puritan Thinking*, 38.
52 John Whitgift, *The Works of John Whitgift*, Vol. I: 183-184, quoted in John F. H. New, "The Whitgift-Cartwright Controversy", *Archiv fur Reformationsgeschichte* 59 (1968), 208.
53 Paul E.G. Cook, "The Church", *Anglican and Puritan Thinking*, 38.

church by means of sundry ways such as human reason which was produced by natural sphere, experience, expediency, and wisdom and so on.

Thirdly, one of the discrepancies between Cartwright and Hooker was in the understanding of human nature such as reason. For Hooker, reason is given a validity equal to that of scripture 'inasmuch as law does stand upon reason, to allege reason serves as well as to cite Scripture'. He argues that the possession and use of reason was a sine qua non for conversion, and Scripture was a message encoded in terms expressly designed for rational creatures. Reason provided a way to define God's will. On this basis, he was able to argue forcibly for the complete complementarity and interdependence of reason and Scripture, nature and grace.[54] He conceived the role of human reason as an instrument of God: "I therefore conclude that neither God's being author of laws for the government of His Church, nor His committing of them unto Scripture, is any reason sufficient whereof all churches should for ever be bound to keep them without change".[55] Hooker's conclusion is that there is no rule in Scripture concerning some particular form of church government which God has instituted for all time, so that by using the light of reason, the form of the church can be changeable depending on time and place.

Cartwright rebutted this argument by stating that the Scriptures revealed a model for church government style and for all human behaviour. He insisted that ecclesiastical order or government cannot

---

[54] Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*, 152.

[55] Richard Hooker, *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Richard Hooker, With an Account of His Life and Death*, III: 10. 7.

be decided by considerations of utility or efficiency or convenience, but only by obedience to the pattern plainly shown in God's Word.[56] He continued that human reason's total depravity was far more complete and thoroughgoing so that every faculty was deficient. He criticized Anglican's assumption: "There is some star or light of reason, or learning, or some other help whereby some act may be well done and acceptably unto God, in which the word of God was shut out and not called to counsel".[57]

Accordingly, those who tried to construct Presbyterianism, John Field, Thomas Willcocks, and Cartwright stressed that the true church government which God has established is in the sphere of grace, whereas John Whitgift and Richard Hooker put it under the sphere of human reason based on experience, knowledge, and wisdom.

V. Conclusion

Horton Davies estimated that the most decisive differences

---

[56] Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England, From Cranmer to Baxter and Fox, 1534-1690* (Cambridge: William B. Edermans Pub., 1996), 61. The debate on Ecclesiology between Puritan and Anglican is shown in A. F. Scott Pearson, *Church & State: Political Aspects of Sixteenth Century Puritanism* (Cambridge University Press, 1928). "Though the Holy Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, they were not designed as a standard of church discipline or government; but that this was changeable, and might be an accommodated to the civil government we live under; that the apostolical government was adapted to the Church in its infancy, and under persecution, but was to be enlarged and altered as the Church grew to maturity, and has the civil magistrate on its side."[sic], Daniel Neal, *Neal's History of the Puritans or the Rise, Principles, and Sufferings of the Protestant Dissenters, to the Glorious Aera of the Revolution* (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1811), I: 237; John Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, vol. I: 52-55.

[57] Thomas Cartwright, *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer touching the Churche Discipline*, 56.

between Anglican and Presbyterian concepts of the church concerned the pattern of church order or government.[58] As already mentioned above, these two denominations are represented by Thomas Cartwright and Richard Hooker.

Both men had quite different points of view concerning the doctrine of Scripture, Human reason or nature, and the writing of early Christian fathers. Travers and Cartwright stressed that first of all the church government system, discipline, and doctrine should be built on the reformed theology formed by Irenaeus and Augustinus, and John Calvin. On the contrary, Whitgift and Hooker argued that the human reason or nature needs grace, and grace also needs nature or reason, and reason is the instrument to understand and to interpret the word of God. Thus, the central point of all this is that revelation presupposes reason or nature. Hooker stressed the diversity of the functions of reason, while Cartwright called scripture itself as the touchstone of all patterns of the true church government, so that he was accused of being "a scriptured totalitarian".[59]

The main cause of these conflicting doctrines of scripture is based on a differing understanding of the doctrine of the human being.

Because Cartwright understood that natural man was thoroughly depraved and wholly incompatible with God including human reason, he came to the conclusion that it is sinful behavior to seek to implement various patterns of church government by using the function of human reason. On the contrary, Hooker believed human natural reason or wisdom unimpaired was fit to be God's handmaiden and were holy gifts from God, so that by the autonomic method

---

[58] Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England, From Cranmer to Baxter and Fox, 1534-1690*, 60.
[59] John F.H. New, *Anglican and Puritan, The Basis of their Opposition*, 91,

of human natural reason, it is recommended to seek to establish the diversities of church polity.

It is worth noting that the Anglican church revealed and pursued medieval Scholastic theology and traditions, while the Presbyterians contradicted Scholastic traditions and Roman Catholic Church patterns thoroughly, but showed the theological tendencies based only on the Reformed Orthodox Biblicalism. The former persisted the diversities of Church government pattern on the grounds of the lawfulness of philosophical thought, the latter tried to built up the church government system not by practical manipulation but by following the exact direction of scripture, without the use of the light of natural reason.

In conclusion, Presbyterians argued that the Presbyterian church government was designed not only by scriptural direction, but also by the teaching of the Apostles and the early Christian fathers. Anglicans demonstrated that there is not any external polity of the church in Scripture and that it is dependant on each era to define church government.

[Bibliography]

Abrahamse, J.M. "Robert Browne as an Unwanted Child: Explaining Separatism from the Nursery of Presbyterian Puritanism." *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 40 no 4. Baylor University Press, 2013.

Almasy, R. & Luoma, J.H. "The Purpose of Richard Hooker's polemic," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 39. no. 2, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978.

_____. "Restitution or Reformation? Cartwright and Hooker on the Elizabethan Church." *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, xlvi. Historical Society of the Episcopal Church, 1977.

Aquinas, T. *Summa Theologiae*. trans. William Barden. Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Atta-Baffoe, V. *A Study of Richard Hooker's Theology of Participation and the Principle of Anglican Ecclesiology*. M.A. Thesis. USA:Yale University, 1993.

Booty, J. "Richard Hooker," William Wolf, ed. *The Spirit of Anglicanism*. Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow, 1979.

Bunting, ed. I. *Celebrating the Anglican Way*. London:Hodder & Stoughton, 1996.

Calvin, J. *Institutes of the Christian Religio*, in two volumes. ed. John T. McNeill, Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, 1967.

Cartwright, T. *A Replye to an Answere Made of M[aster] Doctor Whitgift agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament* [sic], in William Thomas Lowndes, *The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature*. London:William Pickering, MDCCCXXXIV.

_____. *The Rest of the Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: against Master Doctor Vuhitgifts second ansvuer, touching the Church*

discipline(sic). Basel: Imprinted by Thomas Guarinus, 1577.

_____. *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer touching the Churche Discipline*. Heidelberg: Imprinted by Michael Schirat, 1575.

Casserly, J.V.C. *The Christian in Philosophy*. London: Faber and Faber, 1949.

Cook, P. "The Church". *Anglican and Puritan Thinking*. The Westminster Conference, 1977.

Chadwick, H. 'The Context of Faith and Theology in Anglicanism' in A. A. Vogel. ed. *Theology in Anglicanism*. Morehouse-Barlow, Wilton CT, 1984.

Davies, H. *Worship and Theology in England, From Cranmer to Baxter and Fox, 1534-1690*. Cambridge: William B. Edermans Publishing, 1996.

Frere, W.H. & Douglas, C.E. eds. *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1907.

Grosart, A.B. *A Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul written to the Colossians-- by Thomas Cartwright*, New York: Macmillan, 1910.

Hensley, H. *Puritanism in England*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1972.

Hooker, R. *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Richard Hooker, With an Account of His Life and Death* by Issac Walton. ed. John Keble, 3 Vols, 7th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888.

Hulbert, E. *The English Reformation and Puritanism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908.

Hunt, J. *Religious Thought in England*. London: Strahan & Co. Publishers, 1870.

Ingalls, R. "Richard Hooker as Interpreter of the Reformed Doctrine of Sola Scriptura." *Anglican and Episcopal History* vol.77. no.4. New York: Historical Society of the Episcopal Church, 2008.

Lake, P. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. CUP, 1982.

Luoma, J. *The Primitive Church as a Normative Principle in the Theology of the Sixteenth Century: The Anglican-Puritan Debate over Church Polity as Represented by Richard Hooker and Thomas Cartwright*. Ph. D. Dissertation, Hartford, Connecticut. The Hartford Theological Seminary, 1974, Unpublished.

McAdoo, H. *The Spirit of Anglicanism: A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century*. A.& C. London:Black, 1965.

McGrath, A. *The Renewal of Anglicanism*. London:SPCK, 1993.

Neal, D. *Neal's History of the Puritans or the Rise, Principles, and Sufferings of the Protestant Dissenters, to the Glorious Aera of the Revolution*. Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1811,

New, J. "The Whitgift-Cartwright Controversy", *Archiv fur Reformationsgeschichte*, 1968.

_____. *Anglican and Puritan, The Basis of their Opposition 1558-1640*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1964.

Perrott, M.E.C. "Richard Hooker and the Problem of Authority in the Elizabethan Church". *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* Vol. 49, No. 1, January. UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Routh, C. *Who's Who in History*, England 1484-1603 Vol. 2, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

Secor, P. *Richard Hooker on Anglican Faith and Worship- of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*: Book V. UK: Spck, 2003.

Strype, J. The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1820.

Stevenson, K. and Spinks, B. ed. *The Identity of Anglican Worship*. London: Mowbray, 1991.

Sykes, S. & Booty, J. & Knight, J. *The Study of Anglicanism*, SPCK: Fortress Press, 1986.

Thompson, C. "The Philosopher of the Politic Society." *Studies in Richard*

Hooker. ed. W. Speed Hill. Cleveland & London: Case Western
Reserve University Press, 1972.

Usher, R. *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, London, New York:
D. Appleton and Company, 1919.

Vogel, A.A. ed. *Theology in Anglicanism. Morehouse-Barlow*, Wilton CT
1984.

Walton, I. *The Works of Richard Hooker with the Account of His Life
and Death*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1854.

Whitgift, J. *The Works of John Whitgift*. ed. J. Ayre, vol. I-III.

[Abstract]

계시 또는 이성 ?
토마스 카트라이트와 존 후커 교회 정치론의 상이성 연구

윤종훈
(총신대학교신학대학원, 부교수, 역사신학)

본 소고는 잉글랜드 튜더왕조부터 스튜워트 왕조 당대에 활동하였던 장로교와 성공회의 교회정치에 대한 유사점과 차이점을 당대 대변인들이었던 토마스 카트라이트와 리차드 후커를 중심으로 분석하고 있다. 교회정치론에 대한 장로교주의와 성공회주의의 가장 두드러진 차이점으로서, 먼저 장로교는 성경이 모든 인간의 행동과 교회 조직체에 대한 진정한 모델을 제시하고 있다고 주장함에 반하여, 성공회는 성경은 교회 정치에 대한 구체적인 대안을제시하기 보다는 오히려 구원에 관련된 총 주제들을 다루고 있으며 자연법 사상까지 담고 있다고 강조하였다. 특히 성공회주의의 대변자이자 설계가인 토마스 후커는 교회의 조직 및 구성에 관한 문제는 구원론의 영역을 넘어선 인간의 경험과 필요성에 근거한 내용임을 주장하였다. 따라서 그는 교회조직 및 정치는 교회의 편리성과 유용성을 고려하여 제정해야 하며 다양한 경험과 유용성은 교회 정부의 다양한 형태를 구축하기 위한 적절한 도구라고 강조하였다. 교회 정치에 대한 카트라이트와 후커는 이성과 같은 인간의 본질에 대한 견해 차이를 가지고 있었다. 성공회는 이성을 하나님의 의지를 분별할 수 있는 매우 유용한 방법으로 해석하였다. 이에 근거하여 후커는 인간의 이성과 성경은 상호의존적이며 상보적임을 강하게 주장한 반면에, 카트라이트는 인간의 전적 타락 상태는 너무도 심각하고 철저하여 인간의 이성적 능력은 불충분함을 역설하였다.

Key Words: 튜더왕조, 장로교, 성공회, 교회정치, 토마스 카트라이트, 리차드 후커