

An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England

By Robert Louis Cloquet.

J. Nisbet, 1885

[Spelling selectively modernized. Bible citations converted to all Arabic numerals. Notes moved into or near their places of citation.]

Preface

A Protestant Exposition of our Protestant Articles, which shall fearlessly combat error from whatever quarter, and be at the same time sufficiently exhaustive for all ordinary purposes – such seems to be imperatively demanded in the present day of abounding Romish and Ritualistic encroachments. And as such we dedicate the following work to the student and general reader. A treatise, it is hoped, less or more complete in itself: adapted to the exact student who, preparing for examinations, shall be saved expense in the multiplication of books, and bewilderment in their selection; and to the general reader, who may be desirous of accurate information upon this portion of the Creed of the Church of England.

We have based our exposition on Holy Scripture, the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and the Reformers.

To specify all the earlier or modern writers from whom aid has been derived is needless. Suffice it to say that we have freely availed ourselves of every source of information within our reach; and that leading authorities, for the most part, are named as we proceed.

In conclusion we pray that our labour of love may be the humble means, under God's blessing, of supplanting to some extent the too numerous treatises destructive of "the faith once delivered to the saints," which have of late so insidiously crept into our seats of learning and theological halls.

In the Master's hands we leave the issue. We owe all to Him, and to His servants.

NOTE: To save in some measure multiplicity of references, we beg here to state that we have followed Alford in the main for the exegesis of New Testament passages; Mosheim and Neander in like manner for the History; Burton and Cary for the Testimonies of the Fathers (and the former

as well for the Heresies of the Apostolic age); Hardwick for the Sources and Objects, and Boulton for the Notes on the Text of the Articles; Schaff for the Confessions; and Dr. Charles Elliott in many instances for the line of argument.

Article I

Of Faith in the Holy Trinity. – There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be Three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

De Fide in Sacrosanctam Trinitatem. – Unus est vivus et verus Deus, aeternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, impassibilis; immensae potentiae, sapientiae, ac bonitatis; Creator et conservator omnium, tum visibilium, tum invisibilium. Et in unitate hujus divinae naturae, tres sunt Personae, ejusdem essentiae, potentiae, ac aeternitatis: Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.

Division.

Two Subjects. – 1. The Existence, Nature, and Attributes of God. 2. The Trinity in Unity.

1. The Existence, Nature, and Attributes of God.

There is, etc.]

(1.) The Existence of God – the fundamental truth of all other truths. Against Atheism.

“He that cometh to God must believe that he is” (Heb. 11:6).

(a) Revealed in Creation.

“Nature is but a name for an effect,
Whose cause is God.”

“For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead” (Rom. 1:20).

(b) But only savingly declared by Christ in and through the Scriptures.

“No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him” (John 1:18).

But one]

(2.) The Unity of God. Against Polytheism – the exoteric, or grosser form of Gentile worship, with its outcome of Arianism and Tritheism.

(a) Demonstrated by Reason. An effect argues a cause. There cannot be two or more First Causes. There cannot be two or more Infinite Beings.

(b) Expressly taught in Scripture.

“Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one God” (Deut. 6:4). “Besides me there is no God” (Is. 44:6). “God is one” (Gal. 3:20).

Living and true God]

(3.) The Personality of God. Against Pantheism – the esoteric, or more refined form of Gentile worship.

“Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true [αληθινός = verus: very, real, genuine.] God” (1 Thess. 1:9). “I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Exod. 3:6). “I AM hath sent me unto you” (Exod. 3:14). “Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come” (Rev. 4:8).

Everlasting]

(4.) God’s Eternity – that essential attribute of His nature, whereby He exists, without beginning, succession, or end of time.

“The everlasting God” (Gen. 21:23). “Even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God” (Psa. 90:2). “His eternal power and Godhead.” (Rom. 1:20).

Without body, parts, or passions]

(5.) God’s spirituality – that essential attribute of His nature, whereby He is an intelligent uncreated substance; incorporeal, impassible, and unchangeable. Against all merely anthropomorphic ideas of God in a literal sense.

“God is a Spirit” (John 4:24). “Whom no man hath seen nor can see” (1 Tim. 6:16). “God is not a man, that he should lie” (Num. 23:19). “For I am the Lord, I change not” (Mal. 3:6). “The Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning” (James 1:17).

Of Infinite power]

(b) God’s Omnipotence – that essential attribute of His nature, whereby He effects all things, and which is only limited by His sovereign will.

“I am the Almighty God” (Gen. 17:1). “With God all things are possible” (Matt. 19:26). “And he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth” (Dan. 4:35).

(a) Manifested in Creation.

“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth “(Gen. 1:1). “I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself” (Isa. 44:24).

(b) In Providence.

“Upholding all things by the word of his power” (Heb. 1:3). “A man’s heart deviseth his way: but the Lord directeth his steps” (Prov. 16:9). “Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (Matt. 16:18).

(c) In Redemption.

“Christ, the power of God” (1 Cor. 1:24). “The man of thy right hand ... the son of man whom thou madest strong for thyself” (Psa. 53:17).

Wisdom]

(7.) God’s Omniscience – that essential attribute of His nature, whereby he knows all things, by an eternal act of the Divine mind.

“His understanding is infinite “ (Psa. 147:5). “All things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do” (Heb. 4:13).

(a) Seen in creation: its beauty, order, and harmony; the subservience of parts one to another, and of all to wise and beneficial ends.

“The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge” (Psa. 19:1–2). “I will hear, saith the Lord, I will hear the heavens, and they shall hear the earth; and the earth shall hear the corn, and the wine, and the oil; and they shall hear Jezreel “ (Hos. 2:21–22). “O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all” (Psa. 104:24).

(b) In Providence.

“The Lord bringeth the counsel of the heathen to naught; he maketh the devices of the people of none effect. The counsel of the Lord standeth forever; the thoughts of his heart to all generations” (Psa. 33:10–11). “For he performeth the thing that is appointed for me, and many such things are with him” (Job 23:14).

(c) In Redemption.

“For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and

whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified” (Rom. 8:29–30). “Christ, the wisdom of God” (1 Cor. 1:24).

And goodness]

(8.) God’s Goodness – that essential attribute of His nature, whereby He is infinitely good in Himself, and the Fountain of all that is good in the universe.

(a) Absolute.

“None is good, save one, that is, God” (Luke 23:19).

(b) Relative.

“The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth” (Exod. 34:6).

(c) Displayed in Creation.

“And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good” (Gen. 1:31).

(d) In Providence.

“The Lord is good to all: and his tender mercies are over all his works.” “The eyes of all wait upon thee; and thou givest them their meat in due season” (Psa. 145:9, 15).

(e) In Redemption.

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should, not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16).

The Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible]

(9.) God’s Essential and Universal Sovereignty, as displayed in the works of Creation and Providence. Against all atheistic notions of the eternity of anything apart from God, and all stoic and unworthy views of indifference.

(a) Demonstrable by reason, and confirmed by experience.

Matter is non-intelligent, and therefore could not have projected the laws which govern it: much less exist, and from all eternity, with these self-constituted laws.

Its laws also are, as we see, uniformly sustained; and therefore bespeak a Preserver as well as a Creator.

Life or spirit too, in all its varied finite forms, is equally amenable to law, imposed *ab extra*; and therefore at least equally to be predicated of as created and upheld.

Nor does the theory of evolution help the argument. For the phenomena adduced are but illustrations of the graduated scale of creation; or of varieties of species, of no value to the contention.

(b) Clearly the doctrine of Scripture.

“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth” (Gen. 1:1; and see the chapter throughout). “And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul” (Gen. 2:7). “The Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh” (Num. 27:16). “Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all” (Neh. 9:6). “For in him we live, and move, and have our being” (Acts 17:28). “For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist” (Col. 1:16–17). “Upholding all things by the word of his power” (Heb. 1:3). “Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created” (Rev. 4:11).

2. *The Trinity in Unity.*

In opposition to Arians, Sabellians, Macedonians, Socinians, Tritheists, and all Polytheists.

And in unity of this Godhead there be Three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost]

(1.) There is One God.

“There is one God; and there is none other but he” (Mark 12:32). And see above.

(2.) The Father is God.

“This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true (ἀληθινόν) God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent” (our Lord addressing the Father, John 17:3). “One God and Father of all” (Eph. 4:6).

(3.) The Son is God.

“They shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us” (Matt. 1:23. Cf. Isa. 7:14). “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting

Father, The Prince of Peace” (Isa. 9:6). Read Isa. 9:1–7 with Matt. 4:12–16. “In the beginning was the word, and the Word was with God, and the word was God” (John 1:1). “Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am” (John 8:8). “For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 2:9). And we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true (ἀληθινός) God, and the Eternal Life (ἠζωῆ)” (1 John 5:20).

(4.) The Holy Ghost is God.

“And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35). “Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? ... Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God” (Acts 5:3–4). “The Eternal Spirit” (Heb. 9:14).

(5.) And yet they are not Three Gods, but One God, or Divine Essence.

(a) The Father is One with the Son.

“I and my Father are one – ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐσμὲν” (John 10:30). [“What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a One in essence, not person. Ἐν not εἰς. The words presuppose the homoousian doctrine. As Bengel, after St. Augustine, remarks: “Per sumus refutatur Sabellius, per unum, Arius.” See Bishops Wordsworth and Alford.] “He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father” (John 14:9).

(b) The Holy Ghost is One with the Father.

“What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God” (1 Cor. 2:11).

(c) The Son and the Holy Ghost are One.

“Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son” (Matt. 11:27). “The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God” (1 Cor. 2:11).

(6.) Finally, the Three are not one Person under different Names, but distinct Personal Agents.

(a) The Father sends the Son, and bears witness of Him.

“The Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me” (John 5:37). “Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee” (Psa. 2:7). “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (the Baptism, Matt. 4:17). “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear ye him”

(the Transfiguration, Matt. 17:6). “God sent his only begotten [Only-begotten – μονογενης. μόνος εκ μόνου, as St. Cyril explains it: “only” referring to the Father, as well as to the Son.] Son into the world, that we might live through him” (1 John 4:9). Read also Isa. 42:1–4 with Matt. 12:14–21.

(b) The Son proceeds from, and returns to, the Father.

“I proceeded forth and came from God” (John 8:42). “I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father” (John 16:28).

(c) The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. “The Spirit of your Father” (Matt. 10:20). “The Spirit of his Son” (Gal. 4:6). “The Holy Ghost whom the Father will send” (John 14:26). “Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father” (John 15:26).

(d) The Son intercedes with the Father.

“If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous” (1 John 2:1). “Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them” (Heb. 7:25). And see our Lord’s Parting Prayer, John 17.

(e) The Holy Ghost intercedes with the Father.

“Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered” (Rom. 8:26). “Another Comforter [Παράκλητος. Better rendered Intercessor or “Advocate,” as in 1 John 2:1, of Christ. Used by St. John alone: four times in his Gospel, of the Holy Ghost, and once as above of Christ.] ... even the Spirit of truth” (John 14:16–17).

(f) Again, in the forms of Baptism and Blessing, we have the Names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost joined, but plainly distinguished (by the article in each case in the original). [In the Blessing, the literal rendering of our “and the love of God” is, “and the love of the God” (or “our God”) – του θεου.] And at the Baptism of Christ the Three acted jointly, but yet took distinct personal parts, and thus declared by sensible signs a Trinity in Unity. The Son being in the baptized Jesus: the Holy Ghost descending in the form of a dove, and lighting upon Him: and the Father by a voice from heaven audibly “sealing” His Beloved Son.

The foregoing line of argument, in the main that of the Athanasian Creed, and adopted by Bishop Browne and others, contains some of the more indisputable proofs of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity. As the following, however, drawn out more after the model of the old Scottish divines, [See especially Erskine & Fisher's Shorter Catechism Explained: to which the writer is here and elsewhere much indebted.] may be equally acceptable, if not indeed somewhat clearer and more compact, it may be well to give it a place, though necessarily involving some repetitions of the above. Should further Scripture proofs be wanted, they may be collected from those already quoted, or from parallel passages.

(1.) There is but One God.

(a) Declared by Scripture.

“There is one God, and there is none other but he” (Mark 12:32).

(b) Demonstrated by Reason.

The phenomena or effects of Nature argue a cause. There can only be one First Cause. There can only be one omnipotent Being.

(c) Proved from the government of the world.

The unity of design observable in the works of creation and providence, argues the unity of the Designer.

(d) Indicated by some of the Divine perfections being expressed in Scripture in the abstract.

“God is Light” (1 John 1:5). “God is Love” (ch. 4:8). “The Strength of Israel” (1 Sam. 15:29).

(2.) In the Godhead, or Divine Essence, there are Three Persons, or Individual Subsistences, distinguished, but not separated, by personal properties; which personal properties or acts, are incommunicable to each other of these Persons: the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost; to whom the terms First, Second, and Third are applied, merely as terms of order, and not as implying any priority of nature or excellence.

(a) The personal property of the Father is to beget the Son, and that from all eternity.

“I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee” (Psa. 2:7).

(b) The personal property of the Son is to be eternally begotten of the Father.

“We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father” (John 1:14).

(c) The personal property of the Holy Ghost is to proceed eternally from the Father and the Son.

“When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me” (John 15:26).

(3.) Each of these Three Persons is truly and properly God – the Divine Essence, or Deity, or Godhead, being indivisible, and common to all.

Which proposition neither asserts nor implies, as has been alleged, that there are three Gods. But, on the contrary, simply declares, that the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all One.

(a) The Father is God. [Such expressions as Cause, Author, Fountain of Deity, applied to the Father, though used by the ancients, and adopted by many moderns, are perhaps best avoided. They have no warrant in God’s Word. They have been perverted by adversaries. And they seem to exclude the self-existence of the Son and the Holy Ghost.]

“To us there is but one God, the Father” (1 Cor. 8:6).

(b) The Son is God.

The same NAMES are ascribed to Him, as to the Father:

God. – “The Word was God” (John 1:1).

The great God. – “Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” (Titus 2:13). Better read: The glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

The mighty God. – “And His name shall be called, The mighty God” (Isa. 9:6).

The true God. – “And we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and the Eternal Life” (1 John 5:20).

The only wise God. – “To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen” (Jude 25).

Jehovah; a name not given to any, but the living and true God, – “The Lord (Jehovah) our righteousness” (Jer. 23:6).

The same ATTRIBUTES:

Eternity. – “But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting” (Micah 5:2).

Unchangeableness. – “Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever” (Heb. 13:8).

Omniscience. – “Lord, thou knowest all things” (John 21:17).

Omnipotence. – “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord (Jesus Christ), which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty” (Rev. 1:8).

Omnipresence. – “Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world” (Matt. 28:20).

Universal Sovereignty. – “Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever” (Rom. 9:5).

The same WORKS:

Creation. – “For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him” (Col. 1:16).

Preservation of all things. – “By him all things consist” (Col. 1:17).

Redemption. – “By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us” (Heb. 9:12).

Miracles. – “Tabitha eumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise” (Mark 5:41).

Forgiving of Sins. – “When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee” (Mark 2:5).

Raising the Dead at the Last Day. – “Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation” (John 5:28–29).

Judging the World. – “We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ” (Rom. 14:10).

The same WORSHIP:

“That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father” (John 5:23). “Again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him” (Heb. 1:6).

(c) The Holy Ghost is God. Proved by the same arguments which establish the Supreme Deity of the Son.

He is expressly called *God*.

“Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? ... Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God” (Acts 5:3–4).

Plainly also *Jehovah*.

“When Moses went in before the Lord (Jehovah) to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out” (Exod. 34:34). “But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty” (2 Cor. 3:15–17).

DIVINE ATTRIBUTES are ascribed to Him:

Eternity. – “The Eternal Spirit” (Heb. 9:24).

Omniscience. – “But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God” (1 Cor. 2:10).

Omnipotence. – “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35). “The same Spirit ... dividing to every man severally as he will” (1 Cor. 12:4, 11).

Omnipresence. – “Whither shall I go from thy Spirit’!” (Psa. 139:7). “Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?” (1 Cor. 6:19).

Divine WORKS:

Creation. – “And the earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” (Gen. 1:2). “By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens” (Job 26:13). “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life” (Job 33:4).

Sanctification. – “God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth” (2 Thess. 2:13).

Miracles. – “But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you” (Matt. 12:28).

Inspiration. – “For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (2 Pet. 1:21).

Resurrection. – “But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you” (Rom. 8:11).

Divine WORSHIP:

“Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 28:19). “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen” (2 Cor. 13:14).

(4) Further and direct proof of the Distinct Personal Agency of the Three Persons of the Godhead (especially against Sabellians).

(a) The Father ordains, the Son purchases, and the Holy Ghost applies Eternal Redemption.

“Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ” (1 Peter 1:2).

(b) Three Distinct Persons are revealed –

In the Institution of Baptism (as above).

In the Apostolic Blessing (as above).

At the Baptism of Christ (as above).

(c) Distinct personal acts are ascribed to each of the Three Persons.

The Father sends the Son. The Son proceeds from, and returns to, the Father. The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. And the Son and the Holy Ghost intercede, each with the Father. (See the proofs as above.)

Article II.

Doctrine and Scriptural Proof.

Of the Word, or Son of God, which was made very Man. – The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took Man’s nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.

De Verbo, sive Filio Dei, qui verus Homo factus est. – Filius, qui est Verbum Patris, ab aeterno a Patre genitus, verus et aeternus Deus, ac Patri consubstantialis, in utero beatae Virginis, et illius substantia naturam humanam assumpsit: ita ut duae naturae divina et humana, integre atque perfecte in unitate personae fuerint inseparabiliter conjunctae, et

quibus est unus Christus, verus Deus et verus Homo; qui vere passus est, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus, ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret, essetque hostia, non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.

Division.

Two Subjects. – 1. The Person of Christ. 2. The Atonement.

1. *The Person of Christ.*

Or the Hypostatical Union of the two distinct Natures of our Lord Jesus Christ, God and Man, in one Person, forever.

Against Arians, Eunomians, Photinians, and Socinians.

The Son]

(1.) The Sonship of Christ, as distinguished from His Mediatorial office.

“Grace be with you, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father” (2 John 3). “But I know him: for I am from him, and he hath sent me” (John 7:29). “From” – as to generation, “Sent” – as to office.

Which is the Word of the Father]

(a) Mode or nature of Christ’s Sonship, in relation to the Father. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God” (John 1:1). The *ην* or “was” showing a continued state of existence from “the beginning,” or everlasting.

(b) The “Word,” or Logos, not an attribute, or a personification, or the conceived (*λόγος ενδιάθετος*) or spoken word (*λόγος προφορικός*) merely of God, but a distinct Divine Personal Being.

“The Word was with God, and the word was God. The same was in the beginning with God” (John 1:1–2); “With” – *προς*. Not here simply *in – tv* (as ch. 10:38, etc.), but in reality both. “With because of “in”: and “in” because of “with”. God the Son, Personally “with,” because Essentially “in,” God the Father “in the beginning” *εν αρχη*, a “beginning” without beginning itself. “All things made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men” (John 1:3–4). The Creator of all things, and the Source of all life, must be a Divine Person.

Begotten from everlasting of the Father]

(c) His Eternal Generation.

“Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee” (Psa. 2:7). “This day” – the *nunc stans*, as it has been called, of eternity. Cf. Heb. 1:5–12. “The only begotten of the Father” (John 1:14). Only-begotten of only-One: in which sense the term (μονογενής) is exclusive of all other sons; and cannot be applied to men or angels. “The firstborn of every creature” (Col. 1:15). First-begotten, in dignity and precedence, of all creation. The term, so far from being derogatory to, is a strong proof of Christ’s Divinity; the Jews being accustomed to call God the Father, “The Firstborn of all the whole world.”

The very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father]

(d) His Essential Unity with God.

“I and my Father are one” (John 10:30). That is, of one and the same Godhead, essence, or substance, with the Father. εν – one Essence: not εις; – one Person (see above). “He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father” (John 14:9). The Divine Son is the only and true Exponent of the Divine Father. “The brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person” – or substance, υποστάσεως (Heb. 1:3); αταύγασμα της δόξης; – the effulgence or expression of the Father’s glory: begotten of and emanating from the essence of the Father; distinct from, but coeternal with, the Father. And the χαρακτηρ της υποστάσεως αυτου – the exact impression of the Father’s Essential Being. In the language of Philio: “The closest copy of him who alone truly is, since there is no separating interval between.”

Took man’s nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance]

(2.) The Incarnation of Christ, or the Assumption of Human Nature by the Son of God.

Against Gnostics, Arians, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Monophysites, Monothelites, and Socinians.

(a) Foretold under a variety of names, such as:

The *Seed* of the Woman. – “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt braise his heel” (Gen. 3:15).

The *Seed* of Abraham. – “And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession” (Gen. 17:8. See also ch. 13:15). Thus explained by St. Paul of “Christ”: “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed,

which is Christ” (Gal. 3:16). And in the fuller spirit of the prophecy, though perhaps not supplying the exact quotation of the Apostle: “And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed” (Gen. 22:18).

Shiloh, or the Peace-Maker. – “The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come and unto him shall the gathering of the people be” (Gen. 49:10).

Immanuel, or God with us. – “Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel” (Isa. 7:14). Expanded, ch. 9:6: “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.”

Messiah, or the Anointed. – “From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks” (Dan. 9:25).

The *Branch*, or exalted Descendant from the tree of David’s Royal Line.– “Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH” (Zech. 6:12). Probably contracted from Jer. 23:5–6: “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is the name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.”

The Messenger of the Covenant. – “And the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in” (Mal. 3:1).

(b) Abundantly testified and plainly asserted in the history and epistles of the New Testament.

Especially by St. John, as the keynote and ultimate design of his Gospel.

“The Word was made flesh” (John 1:14). “These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name” (John 20:31).

And in the Epistle to the Hebrews – a demonstration throughout that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ, or Messiah of God.

(c) Satisfactorily proved to Christians by this one argument of Christ Himself – that in Him, the suffering, crucified, but now risen Saviour, all the prophecies and promises concerning the Messiah, or Incarnate Son of God, were fully and exactly accomplished.

“And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me” (Luke 24:44).

(d) Fully proved as against the Jew, thus –

The scepter of civil government has departed from Judah: therefore the Messiah has come in the flesh.

“The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come” (Gen. 49:10).

The second temple, into which the Messiah was to come, is destroyed: therefore its “greater glory” can never be caused by the personal appearance of another Messiah.

“And the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple” (Mal. 3:1). “The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts” (Hag. 2:9). “And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary” (Dan. 9:26).

The sacrifice and oblation have ceased: therefore the Messiah has been “cut off.”

“Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks. ... And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off. ... And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease” (Dan. 9:25–27).

The family of David is extinct; therefore another Messiah can never be born.

So that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man]

(3.) The Nature of the Person of the Incarnate Son.

(a) The Hypostatical Union of Godhead and Manhood.

“Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen” (Rom. 9:5). “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory” (1 Tim. 3:16).

(b) The human nature and the Divine were united at the moment of conception or incarnation in the Person of the Son.

“The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35). “Shall be called” – κληθήσεται, be in fact and reality the Son of God. “When the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman” (Gal. 4:4). Not through a woman, but of her; and therefore “bone of her bones, and flesh of her flesh:” one with our common humanity.

(c) The human nature was thus assumed unto the Divine, but not a human person.

“For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed (σπέρματος – the semen) of Abraham” (Heb. 2:16).

(d) Yet each nature retains its own essential properties.

Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross” (Phil. 2:5–8). “Christ Jesus” – as truly God, as truly Man. As truly subsisting in the Divine nature as in the nature of man. The potentiality of the glory of the Godhead, which was in the preexistent Son, was that alone which enabled him to veil it (εαυτον εχένωσεν – empty Himself” of its manifested possession) by becoming Man.

(e) Though the acts or properties of either nature are to be ascribed by a communication of attributes or idioms (*communicatio idiomatum*) to the whole Person of Christ.

“Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.” (Acts 20:28). Though God has no blood, and cannot die. “No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven” (John 3:13). And yet the Omnipresent Son of Man was then also on earth. “Though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God” (2 Cor. 13:4). And yet again we read, that men “crucified the Lord of glory” (1 Cor. 2:8).

Hence Hooker: “As oft as we attribute to God what the manhood of Christ claimeth, or to man what his Deity hath a right unto, we understand by the name of God and the name of Man, neither the one nor the other

nature, but the whole Person of Christ, in whom both natures are.” (Eccl. Pol.)

(f.) Wherefore we conclude that Christ is the Messiah of God, uniting, in His One Anointed Person, true Godhead and true Manhood.

“Very God.” As has been sufficiently shown under this and the preceding Article. “Very Man.” He had a human *Body*. He was born, grew, was subject to hunger, thirst, weariness, had flesh and bones, was wounded, lacerated, crucified, dead, buried, and rose again – He had a human *Soul*. He increased in wisdom; it was possible for Him to be ignorant; He was tempted; He felt sorrow for “the city, and wept over it” (Luke 19:41); He felt sympathy for the bereaved sisters at Bethany, and “Jesus wept” (Luke 19:41); yea we read, “My soul (ἡ ψυχή μου – the human soul, the seat of the affections and passions) is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death” (Matt. 26:38); and lastly, His soul was separated from His body at death (“His soul was not left in Hades,” Acts 2:31).

(g) And as a corollary from the nature of the case, and the purpose of the hypostatic union, these two natures, thus joined together in the Person of the Son, are “never to be divided”.

“The nature of the case.” The human nature, and not a human having been assumed unto the Person of the Son, if that nature were to be separated therefrom, there must of necessity be a new person brought into existence, or else Christ’s Body and Soul suffer annihilation. “The purpose of the union,” being not only to reunite God and men, but also to be the continued bond of connection between them, it plainly follows that the union must remain forever indissolvable.

Plainly revealed in Scripture:

“Seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them” (Heb. 7:25). “An high priest forever” (Heb. 6:20). “But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God” (Heb. 10:12). “His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed” (Dan. 7:14). “Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? ... Neither death, nor life, ... nor things present, nor things to come “ (Rom. 8:35, 38).

2. *The Atonement.*

Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried]

(1) The Reality of Christ’s Sacrifice and Sufferings.

Against all Gnostic notions of an impassible or putatively suffering Christ.

(a) Begun at the moment of His Incarnation.

“Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me ... Lo, I come to do thy will, O God” (Heb. 10:5, 7).

(b) Continued throughout the whole of His life.

“He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted” (Isa. 53:3–4).

(c) Completed on the cross and in the grave.

“When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost ... One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water” (John 19:30, 34). “Blood and water”: if not indeed the separation already of the blood into placenta and serum, yet showing at all events a real body and a real death. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth” (Isa. 53:9).

(d) The crucifixion, death, and burial of Christ, not only historically attested in the closing chapters of the four Evangelists (with which all will be familiar); but both historically attested and doctrinally appealed to in the discourses and letters of the Apostles.

“Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain” (Acts 2:23). “And killed the Prince of life” (Acts 3:15). “And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree, and laid him in a sepulcher” (Acts 13:29). “Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body” (2 Cor. 4:10). “For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should

live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed” (1 Peter 2:21–24).

(2.) How, or in what, Christ suffered.

(a) Not in His Divine nature, because it is impassible and immutable. (See above). And since, moreover, that Divine nature is common to the Father and the Holy Ghost, then must also the Father and the Holy Ghost have suffered with the Son.

(b) And although we are to hold that all the sufferings of Christ were limited to, and confined by, Christ’s Manhood, yet we may not detach that Manhood from the Person of the Son, and thus say that it was the nature of man which suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, any more than we may detach that Manhood, and say that it was the nature of man which was born of the Virgin. For birth, suffering, and death are all personal predicates; and the human nature of Christ had not personality. And so Hooker quotes Paschasius: “There is a twofold substance (Divine and human), not a twofold Person (Person of God and Person of Man), because one Person extinguishes another, whereas one nature cannot in another become extinct.”

(c) But it is more proper to say that, as He who was born of the Virgin was not a human Person, but a Person both Divine and Human, so Christ suffered in His whole Incarnate Person of the Mediatorial Son of God. The Person of the Divine Christ it was which assumed human nature in the womb of the Virgin, and by that assumption of Manhood unto Godhead, was made capable to be born, to suffer, to be crucified, to die, to be buried: and yet neither the Godhead, in that Person of the Son, losing its potentiality, or suffering any diminution of its fullness; nor the Manhood losing its natural properties, or suffering any diminution of their distinctiveness in that union with God: but each Nature, in the one Person, “without any change, mixture, or confusion,” and still withal “indivisibly and inseparably”.

Hence, though the human soul of Christ was separated from His human body in death, yet neither was separated from His Deity; nor “was his soul left in Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption” (Acts 2:31). Hence, too, though the essential properties of Christ’s Manhood remained consubstantially human, yet it was endowed with all supernatural gifts and graces within the measure of the economy of redemption. And hence also, the infinite value of the sacrifice of the Incarnate Son of God.

Thus Scripture calls “that Holy Thing” which was “being born,” or “being begotten” (γεννώμενον), of the Virgin, “the Son of God” (Luke 1:35).

And thus the claims of our Lord, of the Apostles in their preaching, and in fact of Christianity itself, all center on the great cardinal doctrine, best formulated in the confession of Peter: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God” (Matt. 16:16). Which, in the full light of prophecy and accomplished prediction, we may now paraphrase –

Thou, Jesus of Nazareth, art He “of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write” (John 1:45); “the mighty God” (Isa. 9:6), coequal with the Father; the Anointed One, “set up from everlasting” (Prov. 8:23), and thus “fore-ordained before the foundation of the world” (1 Peter 1:20), but solemnly inaugurated into the Mediatorial Office, by the Father, with the unction of “the Holy Ghost and with power” (Acts 10:38). At baptism, when “Lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and to a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Matt. 3:16–17); and again and again accredited by the Father “by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you” (Acts 2:22); the one thing (τοέν) to which the Spirit, and the water, and the blood bear witness (1 John 5:8): “GOD MANIFEST IN FLESH” (1 Tim. 3:16): and in that manifested Person of the Anointed and Incarnate and coequal Son, “Jesus Christ, evidently set forth, crucified for the sins of the whole world” (Gal. 3:1; 1 John 2:2).

And thus, finally, the infinite value and efficacy of the sacrifice of our Redeemer, being no less than “THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST HIS SON” (1 John 1:7).

It is the *Ego*, the I, the Person which ennobles: “the altar that sanctifieth the gift.” It is human nature lifted up by and unto the Divine Person of the Son of God which makes the sacrifice of infinite value. The human nature may not be, is not, changed. The Divine nature may not be, cannot be, changed. The offering, in all its essentials, is not changed. The offerer, in all His essentials, cannot be changed. But the offering is infinitely enhanced, because of the Person by and unto whom it is assumed – by whom and through whom it is offered.

To reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men]

(3.) The Purpose of the Atonement of Christ.

Against Socinians and all other Humanitarian Heretics who, denying the proper Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, are led of necessity to deny the reality and value of His Propitiatory Sufferings and Death.

And here we shall best and more fully see the bearings of the subject, by examining the Scriptural usage of the word Atonement, and by tracing the Historic or Ecclesiastical Development of Christ's Atoning Sacrifice.

Scriptural Usage of *Atone*.

(a) Expiation for sin – from a verb to cover כָּפַר. [See Kitto's Cyc. Bib. Lit., S. V. Atonement. Also Smith's Dict., S. V. Sacrifice, etc.]

“Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin” (Exod. 32:30).

And the effect of that expiation: not only the removal or transference of the guilt of the offender, and his consequent exemption from punishment, but the appeasing of the offended.

“He shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him” (Lev. 1:4). “But the goat, on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him (rather, *to be atoned for* – that the atoned for iniquities of the Israelites might be laid upon him). ... And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat ... And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited “ (Lev. 16:10, 21–22). “I will appease him (lit, *cover his face*, or *make atonement before him*) with the present that goeth before me” (Gen. 32:20). That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth anymore because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord God” (Ezek. 16:63).

(b) But around this primary idea of *At-one-ment*, thus combining in itself both expiation and restoration to favour, we have ranged a whole group of other explanatory or complementary words, bringing out, in their several aspects, the great moments of the central truth. [See French's “Synonyms of the New Testament,” sect. 77.]

Redemption – απολύτρωσις, and its cognates. In its full sense, complete deliverance from sin, in its guilt, absolute dominion, and final power, by means of a ransom or price paid – the sacrifice of the Son of God.

From the guilt of sin. “His dear Son, in whom we have redemption (απολύτρωσις – complete deliverance by price) through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins” (Col. 1:14).

From the absolute dominion of sin. “Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed (λυτρουν – deliverance by price) with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation ... but with the precious blood of Christ” (1 Peter 1:18–19).

From the final power of sin. “Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption (απολύτρωσις) of the purchased possession” (Ephes. 1:14). “By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption (αιωνιαλύτρωσις – everlasting deliverance by price) for us” (Heb. 9:12).

The Vicarious Nature of the Price. “Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom (λύτρον – price of person) for (αντι – clearly marking the vicarious nature of the λύτρον) many” (Matt. 20:28). “Who gave himself a ransom (αντίλυτρον – vicarious price) for all” (1 Tim. 2:6).

Other words: are bought (αγοράζειν – purchase in the market, and here from bondage) with a price” (1 Cor. 7:23). “The church of God, which he hath purchased (περιποιεισθαι – acquired for himself) with his own blood” (Acts 20:28).

Reconciliation – καταλλαγή, and its cognates. The reconciliation of God to man, and of man to God. Once translated “atonement” in the New Testament (margin, “reconciliation”); and in the other three places where it occurs, by its equivalent “reconciliation” (2 Cor. 1:18–19), and “reconciling” (Rom. 11:15). “And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement,” – καταλλαγή in its two sides, as drawn out in the context, Reconciliation and Life (Rom. 5:11).

Its two sides – objective and subjective.

First, the objective side – God reconciled to us, by the expiatory sacrifice of His Son. “To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling (καταλλάσσειν) the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto

them” (2 Cor. 5:19). God being the offended party, and man the offending, the very first notion of reconciliation implies the appeasing of the offended – of God’s wrath against sin. And if any shade of doubt could arise on the matter, it is at once cleared up by the clause, “not imputing their trespasses unto them.” Thus this side of the atonement it is that “justifieth the ungodly” (Rom. 4:5). And thus God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Rom. 5:8).

Second, the subjective side – man reconciled to God. “Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God (του θεου – *this God*, this Christ-revealed and Christ-reconciled God) did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled (καταλλάσσεσθαι) to (this) God” (2 Cor 5:20).

Hence we read: “And that He might reconcile (αποκαταλλάσσειν – thoroughly reconcile) both (Jews and Gentiles) unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity (έχθρα – the real ground of separation between man and God, also, perhaps, and as a result of it, the separation of Jew and Gentile) thereby” (Eph. 2:16). “And, having made peace (ειρηνοποιήσας – a very word-picture of the Work of Redemption) through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile (αποκαταλλάσσειν) all things unto himself” (Col. 1:20).

Propitiation – ιλασμός, and its cognates. Christ, in and by his one merciful sacrifice of love, as a righteous satisfaction to Divine justice, Himself the Reconciler.

“And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation (ιλασμός – the reconciling sin offering Himself) for our sins” (1 John 2:1–2). And again: “Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation (ιλασμός) for our sins” (1 John 4:10). Here is the whole Plan of Redemption. God’s “Love.” Christ “the Righteous.” Christ the “Propitiatory Offering for sin.” Christ the all-prevailing “Intercessor”. “Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation (ιλαστήριον – a propitiatory sacrifice) through faith in his blood “ (Rom. 3:25). “Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation (ιλάσκεσθαι – to make propitiation by the offering of Himself) for the sins of the people” (Heb. 2:17). Here we have at once and expressly both the High Priest (αρχιερέυς) and the Propitiatory Offering (represented by ιλάσκεσθα)

meeting in Christ; as indeed less or more in the whole language of the Epistle to the Hebrews: “The two functions of priest and sacrifice, which were divided, and of necessity divided, in the typical sacrifices of the law, meeting and being united in Him, the sin offering by and through whom the just anger of God against our sins was appeased, and God, without compromising His righteousness, enabled to show Himself propitious to us once more” (Abp. Trench).

Ecclesiastical Development of the Atonement.

(a) The sacrifice of Christ was typified in various ways under the Old Testament Dispensation, especially by the sacred persons, places, things, and seasons of the Ceremonial Law.

Persons, as:

The ordinary priests. “And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God” (Heb. 10:11–12).

The High Priest. See the Epistle to the Hebrews throughout, the central idea of which is the infinite superiority of “the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus,” in His Dignity, Sufficiency, and the Perpetuity of His Mediatorial Office.

Places, as:

The Tabernacle and Temple, planned and devised by God himself, typified Christ’s human nature, “prepared” by God (Heb. 10:5) – “fitted” (as in the margin) unto the Divine Person of the Son, for the great Self-offering. “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. ... But he spake of the temple of his body” (John 2:19, 21).

Things, as:

The Brazen Altar, or Altar of Burnt Offering, typified the Divine nature of Christ in the Personal Union, which gave infinite worth and efficacy to His sacrifice the altar thus sanctifying the gift. “How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God” (Heb. 9:14).

The Ark of the Covenant, with its Mercy Seat covering the two Tables of the Law, foreshadowed the merits of the Redeemer, whereby God is rendered propitious unto sinners; the demands of the Law being covered by

the perfect obedience of Christ, and the penalty of its breach satisfied by His death: so that “there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Romans 8:1).

The Expiatory Sacrifices or Burnt Offerings. Being without blemish, typified “the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” (1 Peter 1:19). – The sins of the offerer being laid upon the head of the victim, typified the guilt of the world expiated by Him upon whom “the Lord hath laid the iniquity of us all” (Isa. 53:6). – Being slain, typified the blood of Christ “shed for many, for the remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28). – And being consumed, wholly or in part, with fire, typified the wrath of God, due to sin, as endured by Him whose “soul the Lord made an offering for sin” (Isa. 53:10); even “as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour” (Eph. 5:2).

Seasons, as:

The Passover. The lamb itself typified “Christ our passover sacrificed for us” (1 Cor. 5:7). “He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth” (Isa. 53:7). Being without blemish, typified (as in all other sacrifices) Him who in himself was “holy, harmless, undefiled” (Heb. 7:26); “a lamb without blemish and without spot” (1 Peter 1:19). The sprinkling of the blood upon the lintel and side posts, symbolized that “redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness” (Rom. 3:24–25). “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29). “Justified by his blood” (Rom. 5:9). “Made nigh by the blood of Christ” (Eph. 13). “Through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ” (1 Peter 1:2). And thus Moses through faith “kept the Passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the firstborn should touch them” (Heb. 11:28). – Slain, roast with fire, its flesh eaten wholly (for the Passover was a feast as well as a sacrifice) without reserve, and not a bone of it broken, typified the blood-shedding and exquisite sufferings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in His one and complete offering for sin on the Cross, who, received whole and undivided by faith, “is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption” (1 Cor. 1:30).

The Day of Atonement. As the Jewish high priest entered alone into the most holy place, so Christ “trode the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with him” (Isa. 63:3). – Again, the high priest entered, “not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost this signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present. ... But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us” (Heb. 9:7–9, 11–12). – And lastly the two goats, one “for Jehovah,” and the other “for Azazel,” or “for complete sending away”. The former being slain as a sin offering for the people, plainly represented “him whom God hath made to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him” (1 Cor. 5:21). The latter, or scapegoat, with the high priest laying his hands upon its head, confessing over it the sins of the people, and sending it away by a fit man into the wilderness, bearing upon it all their iniquities, shadowed forth the atoned-for iniquities of God’s true Israel carried away by Christ’s infinite sacrifice, and cast into the depths of God’s forgetfulness. “And thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea.” (Mic. 7:19). “For I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.” (Jer. 31:34).

(b) The sufferings of Christ were foretold by the Prophets.

“Searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.” (1 Peter 1:11).

Especially, the *Psalmist*, as:

“Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me.” (Psa. 41:9). [Christ omits (John 13:18) “mine own familiar friend in whom I trusted.” He knew what was in Judas, and therefore did not trust him. See Perowne *in loca*.] “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? ... But I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and despised of the people. All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him. ... Be not far from me, for trouble is near; for there is none to help. Many bulls

have compassed me: strong bulls of Bashan have beset me round. ... My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death. For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet. ... They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture” (Psa. 22:1, 6–8, 11–12, 15, 16, 18). “They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink” (Psa. 69:21). “He keepeth all his bones: not one of them is broken” (Psa. 34:20).

Isaiah, as:

“He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; ... he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. ... He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken” (Isa. 3, 5, 7–8). “I gave my back to the sniffers, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting” (Isa. 50:6). “And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death” (Isa. 53:9).

Zechariah, as:

“So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord” (Zech. 11:12–13). “And they shall look upon me whom they have pierced” (Zech. 12:10).

Christ Himself, as:

“From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed” (Matt. 16:22). Behold we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him” (Matt. 20:18–19). “And he shall be spitefully entreated and spitted on” (Luke 18:32).

Sum of the Argument

(1.) Scriptural usage of “Atonement” and its cognates. (2.) Acted type, at the command and institution of God. (3.) Prophetic foreshadowings. All dovetailed, so to speak, by the inspiring Spirit of God into the actual and historic sufferings of our Lord, give us the true meaning and only legitimate theological sense to be attached to the atonement of Christ – MAKING PEACE BETWEEN GOD AND MAN. The appeasing of God’s “wrath,” or moral sentiment of displeasure against sin; and the reinstating of man in the favour of God. In other words, a reconciliation involving a satisfaction. Or, as our article has it, “To reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice.”

And this is in perfect accordance with the three great aspects of the Atonement, as derived from the language of our Lord Himself:

Ransom – λύτρον. “Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for (λύτρον αντι – a vicarious price paid, definitely instead of) many” (Matt. 20:28). Christ’s life given as a price, satisfaction, or sacrifice, to redeem from the captivity of sin into the liberty of the sons of God.

Remission, or entire abolition of sin – άφεσις. The effect and mode of the λύτρον. “For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission (άφεσις – not merely pretermission or passing by, πάρεσις, as Rom. 3:25, wrongly rendered in our English version, “remission” – but complete release and discharge, as in the Jubilee or Year of Release, έτος της αφέσεως) of sins” (Matt. 26:28). Redemption from the cause of God’s wrath – the guilt and power of sin – by the expiatory and cleansing Blood of Christ.

Intercession – ερώτησις. The continued prevalence or extension of the λύτρον. Not petition, but request, as grounded not only upon the consciousness of equal dignity, but upon the right of Oblation. With its central object of sanctification, leading to perfection or “oneness” with God. “I pray (εγω ερωτω – I, even I, request) for them ... Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. ... I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. ... Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. ... And for their sakes I sanctify myself that they also might be sanctified through the truth. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all

may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us ... I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one” (John 17:9, 11, 13, 17, 19–21, 23). “And for their sakes I sanctify myself.” That is, for this great end, I offer myself an oblation.

But here, as in all teaching and thinking upon the Atonement of Christ, we must ever bear in mind that it is the One Sacrifice of the One Will of the One God. While in the Economy of Redemption, the Father ordains, the Son purchases, and the Spirit applies, yet salvation is still thus of the Trinity in Unity: unity of eternal design (as to the object); unity of external purpose (as to the means); unity of Eternal Love, as to the cause, the means, the end. “God is light,” and hates the darkness of sin. “God is love,” and offers salvation to the sinner, through the mediation of the Son, in and by the sanctification of the Spirit. But in all this Divine and Glorious work of Redemption, as elsewhere, we shall be in danger, if, too closely reading human analogies, whether employed by ourselves, or graciously adopted in Holy Writ for our help and understanding, we fail to feel that “God – is One.”

(4.) The Extent of the Atonement.

(a) The wording of our Article – “a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men” – has been taken to refer to a possible or developed error of admitting the Atonement to cover original guilt, but denying it to extend to actual sins. And here Scripture has been easily found to sustain the twofold expression of the Article, “original guilt” and “actual sins,” as comprehending, and equivalent to, ALL sin – that is, every species of sin (except the sin against the Holy Ghost).

“Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity” (Titus 2:14). “Christ died for Our sins (υπερ των αμαρτιων – a vicarious atonement on behalf of all the failings and missings of our chief end) according to the Scriptures” (1 Cor. 15:3). “And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins (παραπτώμασι και αμαρτίαις – sin in its outcome, and sin in its spring: sins of thought, word, and deed) ... and were by nature (φύσει – originally, inherently, and not merely by example or influence) the children of wrath, even as others ... even when we were dead in sins (παραπτώμασι – the whole death, not simply of ‘nature’ or original, but of actual and mortal sin) hath God quickened us” (Eph. 2:1, 3, 5). “The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin” (1 John 1:7).

(b) But if we compare the analogous and indeed almost synonymous words of the Thirty-first Article, where it is said that “the Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, we shall find it difficult to confine the meaning of this second Article within the limit exactly as above. And verily, unless we adjust Scripture teaching to our own narrow theories, we must conclude that Christ’s Death was an Atonement for the sins of all mankind – *sufficient* for all, *efficient* for some.

“For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again” (2 Cor. 5:14–15). Here we have plainly set out the *objective universality* of Christ’s death or atonement, in “that he died for all;” and the *subjective individuality* of the living power of that death, in “they which live unto him which died for them.” “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle” (1 Tim. 2:5–7). The One Mediator, and the Universality of His Mediation, were the great truths to proclaim which the Apostle was commissioned by God. The Divine note in which the whole scale of Christianity is written, and to which all the modulation of its expression are to be referred. “And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (1 John 2:2).

(c) Yet this assertion of Scriptural doctrine in no way shuts us up to the conclusion that all men will eventually be saved. God has given us a Revelation, which we are bound neither to add to, nor diminish from. And to the question, If Christ died for all, and all are not saved, *cui bono?* we can only answer with St. Paul, “Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?” We may, indeed, add that the good to the wicked has been great. If they have not accepted of the full salvation of that Death, yet all they enjoy of good on earth, flows from that “redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction”.

“The LORD (that is Jehovah, the Redemption or Covenant God) is good to all: and his tender mercies are over all his works. ... The eyes of all wait upon thee, and thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing” (Psa. 145:9, 15–16).

(d) There is yet another view of what has generally been considered the extent of the Atonement, not indeed touched upon here, but of which Scripture gives us something of a glimpse. Thus we read, for example, in Col. 1:19–20: “For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in heaven, or things in earth.” Strange, if not crude, and various have been the explanations offered here. But perhaps no more consistent and acceptable solution of this difficult yet most interesting subject could be given than the following – consistent, as it preserves the harmony of other and more fully revealed truth, and acceptable as it affords us a very precious and exalted view of the character and work of Christ: –

“Regarding Col. 1:20 and Eph. 1:10, my belief is this, that the apostle is not looking specially at what Christ accomplished by His death upon the cross. ‘The things in heaven’ *may* refer to the redeemed who have gone before, and the ‘things on earth’ to those now being or to be gathered; but the solution appears to me to be a feeble one. I prefer here, as in all cases, to look at the general scope of the passages, and it seems to me that St. Paul has just *Christ* in his view; not Christ as the Saviour of sinners merely, but Christ in his wondrous, infinite, and inexhaustible totality, the first and the last, the embodiment and the exemplification of the upholder of the universe, the revealer of the love of God to men. Of course he could not have been anything of this unless he had been all of it. Had any portion of his work failed, the whole must have broken down. And therefore the work of reconciliation, the recovery of the fallen race of Adam through the blood of the cross, may well be spoken of as if it were inclusive of everything else. It was part and parcel of the marvelous ‘goings forth from everlasting,’ by which the Son of God and Son of man obtained and exercises the right of headship over all creatures and things, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, and which in the fulness of times be shall gather together in one. We have only, I think, to notice some of the expressions he applies to Christ in order to see that he had something far more, comprehensive in his mind than Christ’s taking away of sin by the sacrifice of himself, unspeakably important as that aspect of his character and work is to us. He is described as ‘the firstborn of every creature’ (Col. 1:15). ‘All things in heaven and earth, thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, visible and invisible, were created by him and for him’ (verse 16). He was

‘before all things, and by him all things consist,’ or stand together (verse 17). The ‘things in heaven,’ then, I take to mean those superior orders of being, who equally with us owe their existence and preservation to the creating and sustaining power of Christ; and in that sense are upheld in the presence of God by him, as sinners saved by his death are upheld, and so both may be spoken of as reconciled or kept near to God by him. Atonement implies sin, and therefore the unfallen angels had no need of the sacrifice of Christ. Some of the angels indeed sinned, or, as Jude expresses it, ‘kept not their first estate,’ but the Scriptures afford us no warrant for supposing that the benefits of the death of Christ were meant to extend, to them. ‘Verily, he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham’ (Heb. 3:16).

“How precious is the thought of the perfect humanity of the Lord Jesus! Equally precious is the thought of his perfect divinity. Both are equally revealed in God’s holy Word, but the point at which they meet and harmonize belongs to the mystery of godliness which it is not for us to fathom. When we hear him saying, ‘I and my Father are one’; when we read that he ‘thought it not robbery to be equal with God’; and then learn that he wept, that he groaned, that he hungered and was weary, we can but bow our heads and acknowledge that this thing is too wonderful and excellent for us, we cannot attain unto it.’

“There is one scene in the Saviour’s life that brings the reality of his manhood before us in a very touching way. It is the scene in the garden of Gethsemane, on the night of his betrayal by Judas Iscariot. He went into the Mount of Olives to pray, taking his disciples with him. Three out of the number he chose to be nearer to him than the rest, and from these three he withdrew about a stone’s cast, charging them in his absence to ‘watch and pray’. The importance which he attached to this watching and praying may be judged from the disappointment he expressed when he thrice returned and found them overcome with sleep. ‘What! Could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray.’ May we not fairly conclude that the praying as well as the watching was for him? Watch *with me* and pray. Did he then need, their prayers? His own words supply the answer – ‘The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.’ Ordinarily these words are understood as referring to the condition of the disciples. But so applied they assume the character of a calm moral reflection, very little in accordance with the feelings of our blessed Lord at that moment. What were those feelings?

‘Oh! never, never canst thou know
What then for thee the Saviour bore,
The depth of that mysterious woe
That rent his bosom’s inmost core.’

“The whole scene was unlike anything else in the entire course of his life. It seems to have been the climax of his sufferings. We read that ‘being in an agony he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.’ This was not a time for moralizing. ‘Being in an agony,’ he cried to God. Knowing the power of prayer, he besought his disciples to do so likewise. The flesh was weak: ‘O my Father! let this cup pass from me.’ The spirit indeed was willing: ‘Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.’ This was the conflict in which he was engaged. The Prince of this world had come, and his soul was troubled. A horrible dread had overwhelmed him at the prospect of the load of human guilt which he had to bear; and in the struggle to overcome the shrinking of his pure spirit from the hateful burden – a shrinking which Satan was doubtless present to encourage – he felt his need of help. He received it not from man. But ‘there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him.’

“We delight in the thought of Jesus praying for us. Is there not also something delightful in the thought that he partook so truly of the weakness of our nature as to ask his disciples to pray for him? Does it not seem to bring him still more close to us? We know he could be wounded by human unkindness. ‘Will ye also go away?’ Might he not also be cheered by human sympathy? And in reliance on the truth he had himself taught – ‘If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven’ – might he not look for aid in human cooperation when engaged in offering up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death? And what a testimony has he thus left us as to the duty and efficacy of intercessory prayer! ‘In all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren,’ and the brethren ‘pray one for another’. We have the example of Abraham to encourage us to believe in one another’s prayers; we have the example of Moses; we have the example of Paul. But best of all is the example of Jesus.

“But when it is said to the disciples, ‘Pray, lest ye enter into temptation,’ does not this imply that they were to pray for themselves? Not

necessarily so, I think. There is a similar expression in Gal. 6:1, which may help us to a right apprehension of the meaning here. ‘Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself *lest thou also be tempted.*’ The liability to temptation on the part of the persons addressed is here made use of as an argument for the fulfillment of a Christian duty. Receive an offending brother with kindness, seeing the time may come when you shall yourselves offend, and need the forbearance to be shown towards you which you are now called upon to exercise towards him. So in the passage we have been considering. This, says the Saviour, is the hour of my temptation. Watch with me and pray, lest ye enter into temptation; in other words, lest your hour come, and you need the help from others which I am now asking from you.” (Charles Tinling, Esquire – *communicated*).

Article III.

History and Doctrine, With Spiritual Proof.

Of the going clown of Christ into Hell. – As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also it is to be believed that He went down into Hell.

De Descensu Christi ad Inferos. – Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est, et sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad Inferos descendisse.

Division.

Two Subjects. – 1. Hell. 2. Christ’s Descent into hell.

1. *Hell.*

(1.) The Meaning and History of the word.

(a) Our old Saxon word “hell” (from *helan*, to hide, or conceal), now generally used to denote the place or state of punishment for the wicked after death, and the abode of evil spirits, had formerly a wider signification, in accordance with its etymology, as the covered or concealed place, and therefore has been used, though somewhat unfortunately, in our English Version of the Scriptures, frequently to represent two perfectly distinct words – Sheol or Hades, and Gehenna.

(b) With the Hebrews, as represented by the Old Testament, Sheol (שְׁעוֹל – the hollow or subterranean pit, from שָׁוֹל, to be hollow) meant the general receptacle of the disembodied departed.

“What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave (sheol)?” (Psa. 89:43). Where “death” and “sheol” are evidently of the same universal meaning, and in parallelism.

This receptacle, however, they divided into two parts. The abode of the righteous: “But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave (sheol); for he shall receive me” (Psa. 49:15). And the abode of the wicked: “They (Korah, Dathan, and Abiram) went down alive into the pit (sheol)” (Num. 16:33). “The wicked shall be turned into hell (sheol)” (Psa. 9:17).

(c) With the Greek-speaking Christians, as represented by the New Testament, Hades (Αδης, most probably from ἀ privative and ἰδεν to see – the argument against which derivation, from the aspirate in the Attic, not being tenable) is also the receptacle of the dead, with its separate abodes of the righteous and wicked more clearly defined, as Paradise and Gehenna.

“O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?” (1 Cor. 15:55). Where “grave” literally is *Hades*, and being in parallelism with “death” (as “death” and “sheol” in Psa. 89:48, above), clearly intends the general receptacle of departed spirits, without reference to their condition of happiness or misery. “Today shalt thou be with me in paradise – εν τω παραδείσω” (Luke 23:43). The abode of the righteous. “It is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell (Gehenna)” (Matt. 5:29–30). The abode of the wicked.

(d) Other expressions used by the Jews to denote that part of Hades inhabited by the blessed dead; and which are less or more sustained in the New Testament.

“The garden of Eden,” which, according to the Hebrews, was in the upper part of Hades. The phrase without doubt is sanctioned in the “Paradise” of Luke 23:43: a word of Armenian origin, *Pardes*, applied to a park or garden adjoining the house, and replenished for use and ornament, but which had now passed, in the language of the Jewish schools, and so to the current phraseology of the day, to signify the abode of the faithful after death. “Under the Throne of Glory.” Perhaps parallel with “under the Altar” of Rev. 6:9, as the Hebrews considered the altar God’s throne. “In Abraham’s bosom.” This figurative expression, taken from the practice of accubation at meals, to indicate blissful rest and enjoyment with Abraham, is expressly used by our Lord Himself in the parable of Dives and Lazarus

(Luke 16:22). [Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae*. Kitto, *Cyc. Bib. Lit.*, S.VV. Paradise and Abraham's bosom.]

(e) With Latin Christians, as represented by Jerome's version, or the Vulgate, Sheol is for the most part translated by *Infernus*, and in the other instances by *Inferus*, with a preference for the plural *Inferi* (which Latin forms are most probably variations of digamated ἐνῦερος – that which is situate or dwells beneath or under the earth). And in the New Testament, Hades is everywhere translated *Infernus*, except Matt. 16:18, where for πύλαι ἄδου, the gates of Hades, we have *portae inferi*, the infernal gates. While Gehenna is simply used throughout for its equivalent Greek, Γέεννα.

(f) In our English Version Sheol equally is represented by “grave” and “hell,” thirty-one times each, and three times by “pit”. Whereas “hell” in the New Testament is the uniform rendering both of Hades and Gehenna, wherever they occur (probably twelve times each) in the original. [See Kitto's *Cyc. Bib. Lit.*, S. V. Hell.]

(g) And in accordance with this idea of the invisible state or place of departed spirits, were the mythologies of the heathen world; which, however simple and instructive amongst the early Egyptians, soon became overloaded with fiction by the Greeks and Romans; but were never able wholly to efface the broad marks of what we must conclude to have been the original impress of truth, derived from patriarchal and Divine sources.

Thus the ancient Greeks spoke of a “common Hades,” with its two receptacles, one for the souls of the good, and the other for the souls of the wicked. And Virgil, in the sixth book of his *Aeneid*, says: “This is the place where the path divides in two: the right, which heads to great Pluto's walls; by this our way to Elysium lies: but the left carries on the punishment of the wicked, and conveys to cursed Tartarus.”

(h) It is interesting to compare the descriptions given us of Sheol and Hades in holy Scripture with those in early heathen tradition.

Thus the Homeric Hades (including Tartarus) is the general receptacle of the *manes* of the departed. And Sheol is “the congregation of the dead” (Prov. 21:16). And see above.

The Homeric Hades is subterranean. And the Scripture Sheol and Hades are also beneath. “He that goeth down to the grave (sheol) shall come up no more” (Job 7:9). “Thou, Capernaum. which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell (hades)” (Matt. 11:23).

The great poet's Hades is a place of darkness, deep and spacious. And Sheol is "a land of darkness, as darkness itself" (Job 10:23). High as heaven ... deeper than hell (sheol)" (Job 11:8). While "Tophat" – which we may take as the parallel of Tartarus – "is ordained of old; he hath made it deep and large" (Isa. 30:33).

Homer speaks of Hades having strong gates. And Christ Himself of "the gates of hell – πύλαι ἄδου" (Matt. 16:18).

Homer peoples it, among others, especially with Giants and Titans. And the great prophet of the Hebrews says: "Hell (sheol) from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones (lit, the Rephaim or Giants) of the earth" (Isa. 14:9).

In the recesses of the infernal regions lay Tartarus, "where is an abyss most deep beneath ... as far below Hades as heaven is from earth" (Hom. Il. 8). "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell (sheol)" (Psa. 86:13).

This terrible prison is surrounded by the waters of Phlegethou, which emit continual flames, and its custody given to the furies, at once the gaolers and executioners; or by some traditions, to one fury, the avenger of all sin. "The lake of fire and brimstone" (Rev. 20:10). "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" (Mark 9:44).

And St. Peter uses the very word "Tartarus," and in the single line of his description, whichever reading be adopted, we have an allusion, at all events, not at variance with ancient mythology.

For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus (so the original), and delivered them into chains (σειραις – others read 'dens,' σειροις) of darkness" (2 Peter 2:4).

(i) The Romish view divides Hades into three different receptacles. (1) The most loathsome and dark prison, in which the souls of the damned, together with the unclean spirits, are tortured in eternal and inextinguishable fire." (2) "The fire of purgatory, in which the souls of the just are purified by punishment for a stated time." (3) "The receptacle (commonly called *Limbus Patrum*) in which were received the souls of the saints who died before the coming of Christ our Lord" (Catechism of the Council of Trent). The discussion of the distinctive features of this view will come before us under the Twenty-second Article.

ii.) Thus, then, all these views, except the last – Jewish, Christian, and Heathen, agree in their main and great features: A future state, immediately after death, with separate abodes, for the righteous and the wicked. In other

words, the New Testament picture is a copy of the Old Testament picture, with somewhat of more definite outline; while the Heathen picture traces out that of the Old Testament in the very outline of the New. What stronger proof could be wanted of a common origin? Of the fact of a Revelation, and of the original unity of the human race? that the Heathen Hades is not an invention outside and independent of Scripture revelation; and that the Sheol of the Old Testament is more than modern criticism would accord it – not simply the vague notions of Hebrew sages, derived from some indefinite source, but the truth of God originally conveyed to the one and common family of mankind?

(2.) The Place or Design of Hades in the Economy of Revelation.

(a) We are naturally prone to forget that the Bible only fully unveils the human family in their origin and probation, with a needful but partial note of their angel surroundings, and a mere glimpse at all or anything beyond. What that all beyond may be, in the hands of the Infinite Good, it must take eternity to scan, as it reads out the harmonies of Creation's Universal Song of Praise.

The Bible is neither more nor less than a special revelation, disclosing a gradually unfolded economy, or perhaps we should rather say, a series of closely interlinked economies, as "parts of God's ways," in a portion of His universe: concentric circles with man as their point of attraction, ever widening, and widening on, until they reach, without fully embracing, the unseen world.

It is often, we believe weakly, conceded by Christian commentators, that the early Israelites had dim – comparatively very imperfect notions of Sheol. But how account for the fact, as above, that time Elysium and Tartarus of ancient heathen mythology are, in their groundwork, the very facsimiles of the New Testament Hades? At all events, we feel assured, that even in the primeval and patriarchal ages, the fathers of the Old Testament saw enough of God's truth, for their Economy. And even yet we ourselves are not permitted to dogmatize; and know little beyond the broad outlines of the world beyond the grave.

A Paradise and a Gehenna, issuing in a heaven and a Hell, are affirmed. But the veil is not fully lifted. Curiosity is not gratified. But enough is revealed, to woo and to win us to the one, and to deter and save us from the other: as the first footfall or entrance, in either case, upon our eternal state.

(b) The Place or Design of Hades, therefore, in the Economy of Revelation, is not Probationary. “Where the tree falleth, there it shall be,” here, above anywhere else, is unexceptionally true; the whole bearing of Scripture being explicit and uniform on the subject.

“As the Holy Ghost saith, Today if ye will hear his voice” (Heb. 3:7; Psa. 95:7). “Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation” (2 Cor. 6:2; cf. Isa. 49:8). “Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave (sheol), whither thou goest” (Eccles. 9:10).

(c) But Hades, nevertheless, is a Transitional, and not a Terminal, State or Abode, with a fixed temporal function.

In the natural order of things, it could not be otherwise. The body and the soul together, have obeyed (in Christ and spirit) or violated (in Satan and the flesh) God’s laws. And so long as the former sleeps in the dust and is unconscious, it is clear there cannot be a full and final award.

“Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation” (John 5:28–29). “For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality” (1 Cor. 15:53). “And it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled” (Rev. 6:11). “And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (hades) delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell (hades) were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death” (Rev. 20:13–14).

(d) Paradise, therefore, is not the perfect Heaven; nor Gehenna, the proper Hell.

“Today shalt thou be with me in paradise” (Luke 23:43). But Christ did not go to Heaven till after His resurrection.

“Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels” (Matt. 25:41). But these words are spoken, on the day of the great Assize, to all the wicked of earth, “the quick and the dead,” and therefore to all who had been already in Gehenna. So that Gehenna clearly cannot be the final or proper Hell of the wicked.

(e) Yet in this transitional state or abode, the soul does not “die nor sleep idly,” but is in a state of activity – of blissful rest and enjoyment, or painful restraint and torment.

Hence the fortieth Article of Edward, somewhat unhappily expunged by Convocation in 1562, ran: – “The souls of them that depart this life do neither die with the bodies nor sleep idly. They which say that the souls of such as depart hence do sleep, being without all sense, feeling, or perceiving, until the day of judgment, or affirm that the souls die with the bodies, and at the last day shall he raised up with the same, do utterly dissent from the right belief declared to us in Holy Scripture.”

Though the soul of man is not absolutely immortal, “God only having immortality” (1 Tim. 6:16), yet being a spiritual and immaterial substance, without composition of parts, it cannot suffer dissolution; and therefore having no innate or constituent principle of corruption, must remain in a state of activity, even when separated from the body. Hence we read –

“And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom. The rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell (hades [The general term Hades is here restricted by “in torments” (ἐν βασάνοις).]) he lifted up his eyes, being in torments” (Luke 16:22–23). “Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise” (Luke 23:43). “And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit” – το πνευμα μου – my individual Personality (Acts 17:59). The human soul in union with the spirit: the πνευμα proper, or the responsible faculty, receptive of the Holy Spirit – the human highest nature, the principle or breath of ever active undying life breathed into man by God; and the responsive ennobled outcome of heavenly desires, the sanctified ψυχή – the creation afresh unto Christ Jesus.

And again – “We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord” (2 Cor. 5:8). “For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better” (Phil. 1:23). “I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. ... And white robes were given unto every one of them” (Rev. 6:9, 11).

2. The Descent into Hell.

(1.) Sketch of History of Opinions.

(a) As might be expected, the doctrine of the Descent into Hell was early and very generally maintained.

St. Jude, according to Eusebius, delivered it to the people of Edessa.

Irenaeus says: “Our Lord departed into the middle of the shadow of death, where the souls of the dead were.”

Clemens Alexandrinus: “Our Lord went down into Hades – εἰς ἄδου.”

Tertullian: “Christ underwent the form of human death in Hades – *apud inferos* – nor did He ascend to the higher parts of heaven, before He had descended into the lower parts of the earth – *in inferiora terrarum*” (*de Anima*, c. 55). Where *apud inferos* – whether we take it for Hades, as generally rendered, or for the inhabitants of Hades, as the older use will allow – is evidently synonymous, so far at least as local reference is concerned, with *in inferiora terrarum*, “the lower parts of the earth,” or underworld.

Origen: “The region of Hades – τα του ἄδου χωρία – whither God himself, the Word, alone descended and passed through.”

Cyril: “Christ descended to the lower parts of the earth – εἰς τα καταχθόνια.”

Epiphanius: “Christ’s divine nature descended with His holy soul to the lower parts of the earth – εἰς τα καταχθόνια.”

The Third Sirmian or Dated Creed, put forward by the Arians at the Council of Ariminum, 359: “Was crucified, and died, and descended to the lower parts of the earth – εἰς τα καταχθόνια – and ordered things there.” To this may be added the two cotemporary Acacian Creeds of Nice in Thrace and of Constantinople: both of which have the Burial as well as the Descent; and what is here chiefly to be noted, the Descent in the exact words as above, where the Burial is omitted – εἰς τα καταχθόνια.

(b) The first orthodox creed of the Church in which the Descent is found is that of Aquileia, as cited by Ruffinus, about 400.

“Crucified under Pontius Pilate, He descended into the lower parts – *Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, descendit in inferna.*”

Here a somewhat important discussion meets us. Bishop Pearson and others quote Ruffinus as the first writer who mentions the Descent as forming part of any creed. But if we may credit Eusebius, as above, it was in the exposition of faith delivered to the people of Edessa by St. Jude: it is expressly stated by the earlier fathers as quoted, with others of their age which shows that it must have been generally received: and it was plainly

inserted, as we have seen, in three Acacian Creeds, at the middle of the fourth century. It is clear, however, that Pearson falls into a confusion of dates as to these Arian Symbols.

But a more important point is that Ruffinus expressly states that the words “He descended into the lower parts” (*descendit in inferna*), in the Creed of the Church of Aquileia, signify the Burial of Christ, or the descent simply of His body into the grave (“vis verbi videtur, esse in eo quod *sepultus est*”). Now if we only bear in mind that the period of Ruffinus is about 400, and that the authorities which we have quoted above, all date before Ruffinus wrote – ranging in fact over the first four centuries; and declare by the Descent, expressed too in the identical or equivalent words of the Aquileian Creed, that they understood not that of the body of our Lord, but of His soul, we can hardly accept the exposition of Ruffinus, supported though it be by Bishop Pearson and later writers who follow him, as the meaning of the Aquileian Church.

It scarcely concerns us to know, save as a sort of circumstantial proof of our argument, what Pearson tells us: “Ruffinus, who first mentioned this article, did interpret it of the grave; but yet he did believe a descent distinct from that, in the Exposition of the Creed.” If so, why so? And why interpret the Descent in the Aquileian Creed of the Burial?

But further light is thrown on this subject by Cary: – “When Ruffinus first quotes this article of the creed of the Church of Aquileia, he omits the word ‘buried,’ and gives it thus – ‘*crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, descendit in inferna,*’ and afterwards he says that the force of the words ‘*descendit in inferna,*’ seems in the Roman creed to be contained in the word ‘*sepultus*’. If, therefore, the above is the original reading of the creed of Aquileia, it seems extremely probable that the descent *in inferna* was contained in that creed from the earliest times, possibly meaning something more than ‘burial,’ though occupying the same place that ‘burial’ did in other creeds. It must be observed, however, that the word *sepultus* also is in the Aquileian Creed, and is given by Ruffinus as part of the creed expounded; so in Bingham it is thus – ‘*sepultus et descendit ad inferna.*’ Unless, therefore, we come to the conclusion that ‘*sepultus*’ was inserted in the time of Ruffinus, it seems difficult to reconcile what he has said of its taking the place of the descent *in inferna* in other creeds, with the only version of the creed of Aquileia now extant.”

(c) The Roman or Apostles' Creed, before the time of Ruffinus, had the Burial (*et sepultus*), but after his time added the Descent, and that too in the very words of the Aquileian Creed as cited by Bingham – *descendit ad inferna*: a strong corroboration of our view of the Aquileian Creed; and at the same time clearly teaching that the soul of Christ did descend into the receptacle of the dead.

(d) Modern opinions, as quoted by Pearson –

Durandus, a schoolman, held the Descent, not as signifying local motion or real presence, but only including a virtual motion, and an efficacious presence. This is met on the ground of its being inconsistent with the Scripture, “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell”; and that, if the efficacy of Christ's death were His descent, then is He descended still.

Calvin and others held that the Descent into hell was the suffering of the torments of hell. But remorse, despair, and alienation from God, were far from Christ. And besides, all the sufferings of our Saviour were antecedent to His death; whereas the Descent was subsequent.

Others, in the words “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,” taking “soul” to mean body, and “hell” grave, as the same words in the original are elsewhere sometimes so used, have explained “He descended into hell,” in the creed to be no more than this, that Christ in His body was laid into the grave. But since, in the gradual formation of the Apostles' Creed, the Descent was inserted after the burial was expressed, such interpretation cannot be accepted at least as the sense of that Creed.

And again, some have held the Descent to Hades to mean continuance for a time in the state of the dead. But Hades never means, either amongst the ancient Greeks or ancient fathers, the condition of the dead, but a place. And besides, Christ's death is expressly delivered before, and separately mentioned in the Creed (“was dead”).

(e) But the general opinion of the Church in all ages has been that the rational and immortal soul of Christ, after a true separation from His body, was really carried into those parts below, where the souls of men before departed were detained. Nor is there any point in which the ancient fathers agree more than in this, which they urged against the Apollinarians – who denied that Christ had a human soul, affirming that the Word or Logos was to Him in the place of a soul – to show that as “this Descent was not made by Christ's Divinity, or by His body, but by the motion and presence of His soul, therefore that Christ had a soul, distinct both from His flesh and from

the Word.” [See Bishop Pearson’s “Exposition of the Creed,” pp. 360–374, for these opinions.]

(2) The Purpose of the Descent.

(a) Here the opinions of the early Church were various and widely different; but it may suffice to notice the leading varieties.

Two lines of thought especially seems to have divided the ancient fathers. That Christ descended to the faithful dead – that He descended only to the abode of the wicked.

Amongst those who inclined to the first, many believed that the condition of the souls of the saints was altered by their removal to a better and more glorious place; that Christ in fact thus opened the gate of the kingdom of heaven to all believers. Whilst others, and perhaps most of the fathers, for the first 500 years, held that our Lord did not so remove the departed saints, but descended to assure them of their completed redemption.

Those who looked upon the Descent as to hell in its proper sense, seem to have viewed the matter chiefly as another offer of salvation; which some of the damned, it was widely held, accepted, and were consequently loosed from the pains of hell, and translated to a place of happiness. But to believe, as a few did, that all in the torments of hell accepted this offer, and were delivered, was generally reckoned heretical.

(b) In the middle ages, the prevalent opinion coincided in the main with that of the fathers who believed in the translation of the just; but was delivered as an indisputable article of faith, and elaborated with the technicalities of the schools: so that it was held an infallible certainty that at the Descent of our Lord, all the souls of all the saved, from Abel downwards, were delivered from the Limbus Patrum, and instated in essential beatitude and the immediate vision of God.

(c) At the Reformation, in the Edwardine Formulary, the Third Article agreed upon in Convocation ran as follows: –

“As Christ died and was buried for us, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell. For the body lay in the sepulcher until the resurrection; but His spirit departing from Him was with the spirits that were in prison or in hell (*incarcare sive in inferno*), and did preach (*praedicavit*) to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify” (1 Peter 3:19).

But in ten years afterwards, in the Elizabethan Formulary, the reference to St Peter was withdrawn, and the Article reduced to its present limits. Some think, owing to the violent controversies to which the final clause had given rise, especially in the diocese of Exeter [Hardwick]; others, in deference to Calvin [Hey]; but more probably, according to Bishop Hursley, “this change of opinion, I fear, is to be ascribed to an undue reliance of the divines of that time on the authority of St. Augustine; for St. Augustine was, I think, the first who doubted of the literal sense of this passage of St. Peter. He perplexes himself with some questions, which seemed to him to arise out of it, of too great subtlety perhaps to be solved by man; and then he had recourse to the usual but dangerous expedient of abandoning the plain meaning of the passage, for some loose, figurative interpretation, which presents a proposition of no sort of difficulty to the understanding of the critic, because in truth it is a proposition of his own making” (Sermon 20).

It is to be particularly noted, that the MS. copy of the Edwardine Articles, in the State-Paper Office, signed by six royal chaplains, to whom they were submitted before their final publication, has the following sentence added to the Third Article as above. “But Christ the Lord by His descent liberated none from their prisons or torments – *At suo ad inferos descensu nullos a carceribus aut tormentis liberavit Christus Dominus.*” [Hardwick’s “History of the Articles,” Appendix III.]

(d) At present there is still very considerable diversity of opinion. While all who have given any serious attention to the subject conclude that our Lord descended into Hades, yet many think that, as the dying thief was to be with Him the same day in Paradise, the part of Hades to which He descended must have been the place where the souls of His people await the resurrection; and that He so descended, himself to herald the finished work of salvation. Some would strongly incline to the belief that our Lord first descended to Gehenna, to proclaim and assert His victory over death and hell, and then passed on to Paradise, to assure His expectant redeemed of the triumphs of His love. And not a few, unwilling to push their inquiries beyond what they suppose is fully revealed, are content to believe that our Lord’s descent to hell was simply to undergo the condition of the dead, and thus satisfy the law of our common humanity in death. While the Church of Rome holds, that “Christ descended into hell in order that, having seized the spoils of the devil, He might conduct into heaven those holy fathers (who

died before the coming of Christ our Lord, and who in the bosom of Abraham were expecting the Saviour) and the other just souls liberated from prison. His august presence at once brought a glorious luster upon the captives, and filled their souls with boundless joy and gladness. Unto them He also imparted that supreme happiness which consists in the vision of God” (Catechism of the Council of Trent).

(3.) What saith the Scripture?

The Descent is not mentioned in the Gospels, expressly and as part of the historic record; but is clearly implied in Luke 23:43: “Today shalt thou be with me in paradise.”

In Eph. 4:8–10, we read “When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts, τα κατώτερα, of the earth verse 9). He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.” Verse 9, and “the lower parts of the earth,” have, we think, been too often read detached, and the meaning more resolved into what the isolated “lower parts” might possibly in the whole range of Christology otherwise include than they seem fairly to do – as the incarnation, the descent on earth, the death, the burial. But we conceive, if it is possible to rescue any passage of Scripture from weak and erroneous gloss, this is one.

First. The Ascension is confessedly in contrast with the Descension. Therefore, we submit that whatever the height or nature of the one, must be the measure of the depth or nature of the other.

Second. In the Ascent Christ “led captivity captive” – Satan and his hosts. The warfare therefore must have reached, and conquered, Gehenna.

Third. This interpretation alone satisfies “that he might fill all things.” Christ’s Ascension could not “fill all things,” make the whole universe feel His now won Mediatorial Sovereignty, in its power and presence, unless He had first asserted it in and over the habitation of devils.

Fourth. Our argument is also strengthened by “he that ascended up far above all heavens.” He who ascended into the highest heaven, the same also descended into the lowest hell.

Fifth. All, or nearly all, the ancient fathers thus read the passage; and accordingly the earliest creeds adopt the words of the Apostle, or words similar to them, to express the doctrine of the Descent into Hades. The Apostle’s words are: τα κατώτερα μέρη της γης – “the lower parts of the

earth”; or as the Septuagint gives the force of the superlative to “lower” (for example, Psa. 63:9 – εἰς τα κατώτατα της γης), we may translate, “the lowest parts of the earth”. And the words of the earliest creeds are: τα κατώτατα – “the lowest”; τα καταχθόνια – “the lower parts” or “underworld”; and *inferna*, equal in the ancient Greek translation of it, τα κατώτατα. And although later on the creedal formula for the Descent settled down into *ad inferos* and εἰς ἄδου, yet we must remember that *inferi* is used not only for the souls of men in the earth, but also and most frequently for the underworld itself; and that Hades is simply another term, in the language of the Greeks, for the lower or unseen abode of the spirits of the dead: and therefore that, in fact, the whole three forms, *ad inferna*, *ad inferos*, and εἰς ἄδου, are synonymous. [See Pearson’s illustrations in his notes under Article 5 of the Creed.]

But the Scripture, upon which many divines mainly rely for the Descent, is that contained in Acts 2:25–31, where St. Peter on the day of Pentecost or rather the Holy Ghost by St. Peter, quotes the 16th Psalm, “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell” (*scil.* Hades or Sheol), and expressly applies it to Christ. And the plain argument is this, that since at the resurrection of Christ His soul was not left in Hades, therefore it must have been there at some period between His death and resurrection. Hence, as St. Augustine remarks here, “Who but an infidel will deny that Christ was in hell?”

Lastly, we come to the important passage (1 Peter 3:18:20): “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few – that is, eight souls were saved by water.”

As Alford remarks, “the literature of this passage is almost a library in itself.” We shall, therefore, content ourselves by exhibiting some of the more reliable results of criticism, with the opinions of one or two leading expositors.

In the first place, then, the words “flesh” and “spirit” are, in the original, without preposition and article; therefore “spirit” cannot apply to the Holy Spirit. The Received Text has the article τῷ (“the”) before πνεύματι (“spirit”), but it is not found in the best MSS. And even its

retention would not indicate the Holy Spirit, unless a preposition also were prefixed, as εν τω πνεύματι. Moreover, as “flesh” is in antithesis with “spirit,” the latter must evidently mean Christ’s own spirit or soul. “Quickened” (ζωοποιήεις) means to keep alive as much as to resuscitate to life. “Went” (πορευθεις) is local transference, an actual journey. “Preached” (εκήρυξεν), to be a herald, elsewhere predicated of Christ or His apostles, is to proclaim good news. The word for “spirits” (πνεύμασιν) always means departed souls. And “in prison” (εν φυλακη) means simply in ward or safe keeping. The reading, therefore, of the unenclosed portion as above will stand. “Being put to death in (or as to) the flesh, but alive in (or as to) the soul: in which (everliving soul) also he went and preached good news to the souls of men in ward (Syriac, in Hades or Sheol).”

If this rendering is correct, and it is based, we think, upon unanswerable arguments, it renders it altogether unnecessary to examine the views of those who have interpreted the apostle’s words otherwise than with reference to the Descent. But as we have before had occasion to speak of St. Augustine in connection with this passage, and as he has been followed in his unhappy perversion of it, less or more, by such men as Pearson and Barrow, we may again advert to him for a moment here. The preaching of the text, he thinks, was the preaching of Noah, inspired by the Spirit of Christ to his contemporaries. And the “prison” was that of their flesh and the darkness of ignorance. But the order of time followed by the apostle – Christ suffered, Christ put to death, Christ quickened – must surely keep the preaching of Christ in the same historical sequence. And as our Lord preached, not in the flesh, but in the spirit (πνεύματι), so also did He preach, not to men in the flesh, but to spirits (πνεύμασιν). Had the preaching been to the antediluvians, as men in the body, St. Peter would most probably have used the word ψυχαις here instead of πνεύμασιν, as he does in the phrase “eight souls” (οκτω ψυχαί).

Bishop Horsley writes: “The souls in custody, to whom our Saviour went in His disembodied soul and preached, were those ‘which sometime were disobedient.’ The expression ‘sometime were,’ or ‘one while had been disobedient,’ implies that they were recovered, however, from that disobedience, and, before their death, had been brought to repentance and faith in the Redeemer to come. To such souls He went and preached. But what did He preach to departed souls, and what could be the end of His preaching? Certainly He preached neither repentance nor faith; for the

preaching of either comes too late to the departed soul. ... But if He went to proclaim to them (and to proclaim or publish is the true sense of the word 'to preach') the glad tidings, that He had actually offered the sacrifice of their redemption, and was about to appear before the Father as their intercessor in the merit of His own blood, this was a preaching fit to be addressed to departed souls, and would give new animation and assurance to their hope of the consummation in due season of their bliss. ... But the great difficulty, of which perhaps I may be unable to give any adequate solution, is this: For what reason should the proclamation of the finishing of the great work of redemption be addressed exclusively to the souls of these antediluvian penitents? Were not the souls of the penitents of later ages equally interested in the joyful tidings? To this I can only answer that I think I have observed in some parts of Scripture an anxiety, if the expression may be allowed, of the sacred writers to convey distinct intimations that the antediluvian race is not uninterested in the redemption and the final retribution. ... It may be conceived that the souls of those who died in that dreadful visitation (the general deluge) might from that circumstance have peculiar apprehensions of themselves as the marked victims of Divine vengeance, and might peculiarly need the consolation which the preaching of our Lord in the subterranean regions afforded to these prisoners of hope. ... And a particular conference with one class might be the means, and certainly would be no obstruction, to a general communication with all. If the clear assertions of holy writ are to be discredited, on account of difficulties which may seem to the human mind to arise out of them, little will remain to be believed in revealed or even in what is called natural religion" (Sermon 20).

Bishop Wordsworth writes: "Christ then went in His human *spirit*, and preached (εκήροξε) to *those spirits in prison which were disobedient formerly*, and did not hearken to the preaching of Noah, *when the long-suffering of God was waiting for the space of one hundred and twenty years, in the days of Noe, when the Ark was preparing, into which only eight persons entered, and were saved by water; and the rest perished in the flood.* ... The apostle states the *fact*, but he does not declare the *subject* of the preaching, nor its *result*. Our duty therefore here is to receive with reverence what is revealed, and not to aspire 'to be wise *above what is written.*' ... It is a comfortable thing to know that the disembodied spirit of our adorable Redeemer was full of tenderness to *men*. That love extended

even to *bygone generations*, whose names are unknown to us. He *went and preached* – preached to spirits *in prison*, to those spirits which had been disobedient *formerly*, when the Ark was preparing, and which had not entered into the Ark, and which were now in a place of confinement. ... Let it not, however, be imagined that the Holy Spirit here gives any ground for presumption, that, if we do *not do well*, and are not ready to *suffer* for Christ, and if we die in disobedience and impenitence, there remains for *us* any message of comfort after death. ... The men of Noah’s age had only the example of a single godly family, and, as far as appears, Noah alone and his house had a direct invitation to come into the Ark. ... Thus the circumstances of the generation of those who perished *in the Flood*, differed *widely* from those of *all* generations since the coming of Christ even to the end of the world. There appears, therefore, to be special reasons for special mercy to them. ... St. Peter does not say, that when the Ark *had been prepared*, and when the Ark was *shut*, and when the Flood came, and it was too late for them to reach it, they all remained impenitent. Perhaps some were penitent at the eleventh hour, like the thief on the cross. Everyone will be justly dealt with by God. There are *degrees of punishment* as there are of *reward*. God does not quench the smoking flax. And St. Peter by saying that they did not hearken formerly, while the Ark was preparing, almost seems to suggest the inference that they *did* hearken *now* when One, greater than Noah, came in His human spirit, into the abysses of the deep of the lower world; and that a happy change was wrought in the condition of some among them by His coming” (Greek Testament *in loco*).

Dean Alford writes: – “From all then which has been said, it will be gathered that with the great majority of commentators, ancient and modern, I understand these words to say that our Lord, in His disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce His work of redemption, preach salvation, in fact, to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the flood was hanging over them. Why these rather than others are mentioned – whether merely as a sample of the like gracious work on others, or for some special reason unimaginable by us – we cannot say. It is ours to deal with the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations as far as vouchsafed to us. And they are vouchsafed to us to the utmost limit of legitimate inference from revealed facts. That inference every intelligent reader will draw from the fact here announced: it is not purgatory; it is not

universal restitution; but it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of the divine justice: the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it. And as we cannot say to what other cases this κήρυγμα may have applied, so it would be presumption in us to limit its occurrence or its efficacy. The reason of mentioning here these sinners, above other sinners, appears to be their connection with the type of baptism which follows. If so, who shall say that the blessed act was confined to them?" (Greek Testament *in loco*).

Conclusion.

Upon a review then of the whole subject we find – (1) That Christ, in the interval between his death and resurrection, did really descend to Hades, as is clear and unquestionable from Acts 2:25–31. (2) That in that descent He entered Gehenna, which we think is equally clear from Eph. 4:8–10; and probably to proclaim and assert His triumph over death and hell. (3) And most certainly did also graciously visit the souls of the penitents who perished in the Flood, to assure them, as we may only infer, and perhaps through them also all the faithful, of their completed redemption. But we must discard *in toto* the notion that offers of mercy as such were made to antediluvian or other souls in this descent to Hades, as being utterly at variance with the whole tone and teaching of Scripture besides; and as bordering upon, if not indeed directly encouraging and holding out, the dangerous view of a yet still possible repentance and salvation after death. And in arriving at these conclusions we have also seen that the intermediate state between death and judgment is to the righteous one of sensible and unspeakable gain in the blessed presence of the Saviour; yet incomplete, so far as the soul is waiting for the resurrection body. And a state to the wicked of restraint and misery. “There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary be at rest” (Job 3:17).

Article IV.

Doctrine and Scriptural Proof.

Of the Resurrection of Christ. – Christ did truly arise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man’s nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until He returns to judge all men at the last day.

De Resurrectione Christi. – Christus vere a mortuis resurrexit suumque corpus eum carne, ossibus, omnibusque ad integritatem humanae naturae pertinentibus, recepit: cum quibus in coelum ascendit, ibique residet, quoad extremo die ad judicandos homines reversurus sit.

Division.

Four Subjects. – 1. Christ's Resurrection. 2. His Ascension. 3. His Session at God's Right hand. 4. His Return to Judgment.

1. *Christ's Resurrection.*

Against the ancient heresies of the Sadducees, Essenes, Docetae, Manichees, and Eutychians, as well as the docetic notions of Anabaptists.

Christ did truly arise again from death]

(1) The Fact and Importance of Christ's Resurrection.

(a) The Resurrection of Christ is in one sense the very keystone of Christianity. Take it away and the whole fabric crumbles to pieces. Then is Christianity simply to be weighed as a political and perhaps hygienic institution against its competitors. And if so, we are free to admit, even with all its historic and general advantages, that its individual experiences, the idiosyncrasy of its life – its endurances, its negations, its intensity of love and disappointment of hope, must pronounce it one of the very worst of all possible superstitions for the human family at large. Even as the Apostle teaches: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ" – if the hope of our lives is to end there, then "we are of all men most miserable" (1 Cor. 15:19). "But" – blessed be God, and as the Apostle continues – "now (νυν – as matters or facts stand) is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept" (verse 20).

(b) It is therefore of the utmost importance to show the reality of Christ's resurrection. And we hold that it is possible to do this, to actual demonstration, equal to, if not indeed above, any other fact of recorded history.

We know nothing of the past, but from historical evidence – Monumental or Written.

First. The Monumental Evidence of Christ's Resurrection.

Here (1) Christianity is at least on a par with its competitors, and that in reality is all, from the nature of the case, that our argument requires. Christianity has its Church, its Polity, its Sacraments, *ab initio*; ALL FOUNDED UPON THE ALLEGED FACT OF THE RESURRECTION.

But (2) it is more than on a par. Whilst many superstitions have passed away, and are forgotten as living realities, and whilst others are waning, Christianity is covering, here more slowly, there more rapidly, the face of the globe: conquering, by its appeal to the human mind, all the families of the earth. *And its universal text is – A RISEN SAVIOUR.*

Now all this must, with fair and candid minds, go far to prove, over and beyond the actual requirements of the argument – not merely the fact but what gives immense force to the fact, *the Vitality of the Monumental Evidence of Christianity as founded upon the Resurrection of our Lord.* It means, sift the Resurrection as you will, and as full eighteen centuries have done and are doing, it stands out and progresses from age to age, clear and clearer still, as a LIVING REALITY.

Second. The Written Evidence of the Resurrection of Christ ranges itself under the following heads –

Argument From Prophecy.

“My flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption” (Psa. 16:9–10). Claimed by St. Peter for our Lord (Acts 2), and *inapplicable* to any besides. A prophecy penned probably some 1060 years before Christ.

“Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead (Isa. 26:19). To be studied with: “When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days” (Isa. 53:10). Prophecies some 712 years before Christ.

“From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day” (Matt. 16:21). Words spoken, unless we can otherwise damage the credit of the Gospel narrative, and “openly” (περρησία, Mark 11) – close upon a year before the crucifixion.

Argument From Type.

The restoration of Isaac to his father on Mount Moriah was, we are willing to believe with the majority of commentators, symbolical of the resurrection of our race; but it was we think still more even of the raising up

of Him who is the Resurrection and the Life. If God vouchsafed to Abraham in that wonderful hour a revelation of His will and purpose to raise the dead, it is not assuredly too much to suppose that He revealed to him the procuring ground and connecting link upon which that revelation rests – even the actual sacrifice of a dearer Son by a higher Father, and the restoration of that Son again unto life as the glorious First Fruits from the grave. And this we think only fully explains the language of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews: “By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac ... accounting that God is able to raise even from the dead, from whence he also received him back in a parable” [So the exact rendering of the original; and not, as our Authorized Version – “accounting that God *was* able to raise *him* up.” There is no “him” here in the Greek, and no *past* tense, or single case as of Isaac merely, indicated.] (εν παραβολη, Heb. 11:17, 19). A parable, or allegorical teaching, as we take it, of the *Resurrection of our race in Christ*. And thus in that Coming One of his line, slain and risen again, did the father of the faithful see the glimmer of the day whereof he was glad. And such a “parable” too, we speak with reverence, could, we think, alone justify the mysterious trial of the friend of God, contained in the command: “Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of” (Gen. 22:2). And this type was some 1872 years before Christ.

Again we read: “And Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights” (Jonah 1:17). A type appropriated and explained by Christ Himself: “For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth” (Matt. 12:40). And a type some 862 years before Christ.

Evidence of Professed Witnesses.

Not less than *four* historians, in *five* separate histories, attest the resurrection of Christ, as a fact, at Jerusalem, seen and known by men and women whose names are given; four of these histories (Matthew, Mark, Luke, Acts) published probably within some thirty years after the alleged event; the fifth (John) at a period sufficiently late to warn of the danger of further imposition, but which relates the story of the resurrection substantially in the same manner as the others, and that too without a note of defense, which shows that there existed no formal impugment of the

record: and all these histories put forth the very country, though happily at different centers throughout it, where the fact is said to have happened, or at some outside center of concourse and learning, such as Rome. While, on the opposite side, and as the late date of St. John's Gospel, probably towards the close of the first century, is of peculiar value as a witness, we have not one historical document of the age, even pretending to show that these widespread accounts of the Resurrection were a fabrication. Add, that one of these histories (the Acts) gives us all the details of Resurrection sermons preached at Jerusalem before the representatives of "every nation under heaven," as on the day of Pentecost, bare fifty days since the event; in the temple; before the Sanhedrim; throughout Asia Minor; on the Continent of Europe; and even for something more than three years at Rome: and yet neither bigoted Jew, nor prejudiced heathen, even with the matter thus brought home to them, have attempted, on the part of their religion, their name, or posterity, to join issue on the main question.

Argument From Martyrdom.

These missionaries attested the truth of the Resurrection of Christ as the basis of their preaching, in face of persecution, and at the risk of the loss of all things. "He that liveth and was dead, and behold he is alive for evermore," is the great text of Apostolic Sermons and Epistles. And the heralds of the risen Nazarene truly suffered. Their lot was persecution; martyrdom, in many, if not most instances, their crown.

Argument From Contemporary History.

In addition to the five histories above, we have the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the genuineness of which has never been disputed, written probably within twenty-four years after the alleged event; and the fifteenth chapter of which may be denominated an abstract of the preaching of St. Paul on the history and gospel of the Resurrection of Christ, with the heads of the general philosophic argument. The first of these here concerns us, and this is the testimony: "For I delivered unto you how that Christ rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that, he was seen of above FIVE HUNDRED BRETHREN at once, of whom the GREATER PART REMAIN UNTO THIS PRESENT, but some are fallen asleep; after that, he was seen of James; then of all the Apostles; and last of all he was seen of

me also, as of one born out of due time.” One of two theories alone can account for this preaching. Either that St. Paul was “beside himself,” or that he had really seen the risen Jesus, and so “spake forth the words of truth and soberness.” But madmen do not write as the Apostle wrote – with the same logic, the same coherence, the same diversity, the same definite appeal (as here), the same overwhelming powers of persuasion: whom even the heathen critic Longinus ranks among the greatest orators of ancient times. “Let the following men be taken as the summit of all eloquence and Grecian intellect – Demosthenes – Paul.”

Argument From Standing Miracle.

By Standing Miracle here we mean that in some seven weeks after the death of Christ, His disciples, a small band for the most part of peasants, begin to deliver to the world, and in the face of their enemies, a system of theology grounded upon the alleged fact of Christ’s Resurrection, and upon the ancient Scriptures, so matured and complete, that eighteen centuries have only been able to illustrate it: and this without its friends being able to add to it: and without its foes being able to invalidate it. Verily, there is nothing like this in the whole range of the world’s history. Let us examine it. Twelve men, ignorant all along of the meaning of the death and resurrection of Christ; cowards who forsook their Master; cold, if we may not indeed add scornful, unbelievers at the outset, who treated the account of the Magdalene and her sisters about the angels and the rolling away of the stone and the risen Lord as “idle tales”; despised, and in danger of their lives as having been associated with the crucified Nazarene; poor and without means to secure followers or command respect in a venal age; illiterate fishermen. For such a miserable band – miserable in number – miserable in courage – miserable in education – miserable in Scriptural knowledge heretofore, to beard their bloodthirsty victorious enemies, the rulers of the people and elders of Israel, in their homes; and above all, to elaborate a system of doctrine, in a day, which harmonizes God and man: all this, we say, is what the world has never besides witnessed: all this, we submit, implies a miracle: and that miracle is the resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, with the consequent shedding forth of the Holy Ghost. And all this demolishes the “mythic accretions” of Strauss; for accretions do not grow on pure and virgin soil, nor myths in seven weeks.

And took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature]

(2) The Nature of Christ's Resurrection Body.

Probably against the Ubiquitarians of Romish and Lutheran schools.

(a) A veritable human body, as before.

"Handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have" (Luke 24:39). "And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them" (Luke 24:42–43).

(b) The identical body.

"Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself" (Luke 24:39). "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing" (John 20:27).

(c) Endowed with the same rational and intellectual soul, as evinced by His discoursing with His disciples.

"These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me" (Luke 24:44).

(d) Yet at the same time, a glorified and "spiritual" body; that is, invested with certain supernatural qualities and attributes, so as to fit it for its incorruptible and heavenly habitation.

"The same day at evening, when the doors were shut, came Jesus and stood in the midst" (John 20:29). "And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight" (Luke 24:31). "He appeared in another form unto two of them" (Mark 16:12).

(e) And still in the same conjunction with the Divinity.

Hence, in the plenitude of His Divine power, He "opened the understanding" of His disciples (Luke 24:45), and breathed on them the Holy Ghost (John 20:22).

2. Christ's Ascension.

Against the various heresies of the Apellitae, Selenciani, Heroniani, Manicheans, etc.

Wherewith He ascended into heaven]

(a) The Ascension of Christ was typified by the High Priest entering into the holiest of all on the day of Atonement.

“But into the second (tabernacle) went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing. ... But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us” (Heb. 9:7–8, 11–12).

(b) Foretold by the Psalmist:

“Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men” (Psa. 68:18). Cf. Eph. 4:8.

By Micah:

“The breaker [“Breaker-up,” a Jewish title of the Messiah.] is come up before them: they have broken up and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it: and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them” (Micah 2:13).

By our Lord Himself:

“What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?” (John 6:62). “Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascended unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God” (John 20:17).

(c) Related in two of the Gospels:

“So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven” (Mark 16:19). “And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven” (Luke 24:51).

And in the Acts:

“And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight” (Acts 1:9).

(d) Witnessed by the eleven apostles, as seen in foregoing quotations.

(e) Testified by angels:

“And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven” (Acts 1:10–11).

(f) Although it was the person of Christ that ascended, yet since the Divine nature is everywhere present, ascension can only be properly predicated of Christ's human nature.

“No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven” (John 3:13).

(g) And the great end of the ascension of Christ into heaven was to carry in thither the merits of His oblation, and as forerunner to take possession of and prepare for His people the many mansions that are there; and make continual intercession for them.

“Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession” (Heb. 4:14). “Within the veil: whither the Forerunner (πρόδρομος; [πρόδρομος being without the article, is a predicate, and should be translated *as forerunner*.]) is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest forever” (Heb. 6:19–20). “In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also” (John 14:2–3). “Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them” (Heb. 7:25).

3. *Christ's Session.*

And there sitteth]

(a) By the Session of Christ at God's Right Hand is meant, not necessarily any corporeal posture or position, but the full and formal investiture of the Messiah with Mediatorial power and authority, as the reward of His obedience, sufferings, and victory.

While we are to believe that the ascended body of our Lord hath a local habitation, yet the Session of our Article mainly refers to the judiciary power with which the Divine Person of Christ, as “head over all things to the Church,” was now invested.

This Mediatorial authority, the Son, as the Second Person of the glorious Trinity, and the delegate of the Father, had exercised all along since the Fall; but it was only, and from the nature of the case, could only be, when the Divine Person of the Incarnate Saviour “through death had overcome him who had the power of death, even the devil,” that “all things were put under his feet.”

According to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church” (Eph. 1:19–22). “But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour” (Heb. 2:9). “And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him; and given him a name which is above every name” (Phil. 2:8–9).

(b.) And this Session at the Right Hand of God was foretold by the Psalmist:

“The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool” (Psa. 110:1). Cf. Luke 20:42.

By Zechariah:

“Behold the man whose name is The Branch ... he shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne” (Zech. 6:12–13).

By our Lord Himself:

“Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power” (Matt. 26:64).

Recorded in one Gospel:

“So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God” (Mark 16:19).

In the Acts:

“Being by the right hand of God exalted. ... For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool” (Acts 2:33–35). “But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God” (Acts 7:55).

And expressly also, as will have been seen in the Epistles. Other examples:

“It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God” (Rom. 8:34). “Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him” (1 Peter 3:22).

(c) The purpose of Christ's Session at the Right Hand of the Father, is (as will have been gathered) twofold: to be the glorious Head of His Church, and to make His enemies His footstool.

“And gave him to be the head over all things to the church” (Eph. 1:22). “Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool” (Psa. 110:1). “Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows” (Psa. 45:7). See the whole Psalm: The King – his Beauty – His Manhood – His Godhead – His Conquest – His Scepter of Righteousness – His Queen Consort, on the day of His espousals – Her Trousseau – the Issue of “the marriage of the Lamb.”

(d.) And this Session, or Kingdom of the God-Man Christ, is forever. Against the heresy of the Marcellians and Photinians.

“Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever” (Psa. 45:6). “Whose kingdom shall have no end” (*Nicene Creed*).

(e) But its present economy will be modified. On earth it is now administered by the dispensation of His word and sacraments, and by ruling over His Church in the midst of enemies; but in heaven hereafter, when all opposition shall have been subdued, and when the Church triumphant shall no longer see through the glass of ordinances darkly, but face to face, the present mediatorial service must of necessity cease, but only to assume a new and mending phase – the final and eternal economy of sustaining and developing the won kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ, and of the clearer display of the glory of the Three One God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

“Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. ... And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all” (1 Cor. 15:24, 28). “And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth” (Rev. 5:9–10). “For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of water: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes” (Rev. 7:17). “Now we see through a glass, darkly; but then

face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known” (1 Cor. 13:12). “We shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is” (1 John 3:2).

4. *Christ’s Return to Judgment.*

Against Gnostic and Anabaptist sects, whose docetic notions evidently sprang from the Sadducean heresy; and which has tainted, in modern times, the Swedenborgian school, so far at least as to deny the literal interpretation of Scripture concerning the Judgment, limiting it to a present church and dispensation.

Until He return to judge all men at the last day]

(a) A general judgment is necessary, on the ground of Divine justice.

Confessedly, as the world is ordered, universal justice does not reign. The wicked prosper, and the righteous frequently are oppressed. We have only to turn to the book of Job, and such Psalms as the 73d, to see how hard holy men of old found it to reconcile the government of the world as it is with the love and the wisdom of God. Nor have the further disclosures of Revelation much lessened, but in not a few cases perhaps have increased, the perplexity. Their main value and intention would only seem to be to give certain and future, though as to precise date necessarily indefinite, fixity to the words of the Preacher: “God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil” (Eccles. 12:14). They shift the Throne of Judgment from the general Hebrew conception – this world and in this life – to “the clouds” of heaven and the end of time; to that “Great Day” when “the earth and the heaven shall flee away, and there shall be found no place for them.”

(b) Believed in by the ancient Gentile world, and generally acknowledged by their writers. As may be seen in their mythologies, and as shown less or more at length by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Eusebius, and Theodoret.

Thus, as Pearson remarks, the principle of a judgment to come, as confessed by the heathen, was Justin Martyr’s great encouragement in his apology for the Christian religion; Tertullian quotes even their common conversation in proof – *Deus videt, Deo commendo, Deus mihi reddet*; and Theodoret, after citing several places, concludes – οὕτως ακριβῶς ἐπίστευεν ο Πλάτων εἶναι τὰ ἐν ἄδου κριτήρια.

And thus –

“Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled” (Acts 24:25).

(c) Fully and explicitly asserted in Holy Scripture, but especially in the New Testament.

Eccles. 21:14 (as above).

“I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery name, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened” (Dan. 7:9–10). “God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness” (Acts 17:31). “In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men” (Rom. 2:16). “And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works” (Rev. 20:12).

(d) The God Man, Christ Jesus, the Judge.

So far as regards all essential or legislative power and authority, a Three One God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is Judge; but in the Divine economy, the special exercise, or executive of that power, is delegated to Christ, the Mediator; and this not only as part of His exaltation, but also because of His peculiar fitness as the Son of man.

“For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son” (John 5:22). “The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels: and then he shall reward every man according to his works” (Matt. 16:27). “For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ” (Rom. 14:10). “And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man” (John 5:27).

(e) The Objects of the Judgment – all men, “quick and dead;” and the fallen angels.

“And before him shall be gathered all nations” (Matt. 25:32). “The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air” (1 Thess. 4:16–17). “And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which

was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead” (Acts 10:42). “And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day” (Jude 6).

(f) The Subject matter of the Judgment.

Thoughts. “Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts” (1 Cor. 4:5).

Words. “By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned” (Matt. 12:37).

Works. “For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad” (2 Cor. 5:10).

(g) The Books of the Judgment.

The Book of God’s Remembrance, or Omniscience.

“Lord, thou knowest all things” (John 21:17). “Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another: and the Lord hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name” (Mal. 3:16).

Without attempting to confound the omniscience of God with the laws and revelations of physical science, or in any way limit it thereby, we may remark that, according to the doctrine of mechanical reaction, it would appear that our words and actions are imprinted on the material universe forever; and not only so, but according to the doctrine of electric reaction our very thoughts are telegraphed to every part of the universe, and remain there woven into its texture for all future time: and that it needs only the neuter perceptions of higher beings to see all those actions thus recorded there, and to read all the thoughts of the heart of man. And it may be that Scripture itself refers to this wonderful law of nature in such passages as the following: “Behold, it is written before me: I will not keep silence, but with recompense, even recompense into their bosoms” (Isa. 65:6) – “Is not this laid up in store with me, and sealed up among in treasures?” (Deut. 32:34). “My transgression is sealed up in a bag, and thou sewest up mine iniquity” (Job 14:17). “For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God” (Jer. 2:23).

The Book of Conscience, with its appeal on the one hand to the light of nature, and on the other hand to God's written law.

“As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law. ... For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also hearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another” (Rom. 2:12, 14–15).

The Book of Life.

“And another book was opened, which is the book of life” (Rev. 20:12). “Rejoice, because your names are written in heaven” (Luke 10:20). “And there shall in no wise enter into it ... but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life” (Rev. 21:27). “And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire” (Rev. 20:15).

Article V.

History and Doctrine, With Scriptural Proof.

Of the Holy Ghost. – The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

De Spiritu Sancto. – Spiritus Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens, ejusdem est cum Patre et Filio essentiae, majestatis, et gloriae, verus ac aeternus Deus.

This Article, evidently inserted by Archbishop Parker to complete the dogmatic assertion of the Church's faith concerning the Holy Trinity, embraces two subjects – the Procession and the Divinity of the Holy Ghost: the latter of which, having been necessarily treated under the first Article, need not be again taken up.

We have, however, always considered it an oversight on the part of the compilers of our Articles that no formal mention whatever is here or elsewhere made of the work or Office of the Holy Ghost. We have the Son's work, or the Atonement, distinctly set forth even in this dogma of the Trinity. Why should we not also have the Spirit's, and, especially since this is the era of His Pentecostal mission on earth

It may be that owing to this omission it comes to pass that our pulpits are unconsciously Unitarian, and Englishmen, to a large extent,

Materialists. These, we feel, are serious charges. But let the reader ask himself, how often has he heard a sermon on The Present Administration of the Holy Spirit, or how many Churchmen has he met alive to the fact that the Holy Ghost is now on earth, in the extraordinary effusion of His power, just as verily, and to the eye of well-informed faith as sensibly, as the Saviour was for some thirty-three years; and the answer in each case will only too seriously sustain these solemn charges.

And this is a matter to which we would earnestly call the attention of Convocation. It needs no alteration whatever of the present wording of the Article, but simply an addition, such as that of the Nicene Creed, "The Lord and the Giver of Life," at the end of the Article, or of "The Sanctifier," after the words, "The Holy Ghost," at the beginning, or otherwise as might be agreed upon.

We shall therefore add a section on this proposed supplemental part, and our subjects consequently will stand thus: (1) the Procession of the Holy Ghost; (2) the Office of the Holy Ghost.

1. *The Procession of the Holy Ghost.*

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son]

It is a sad instance of the frailty of man that the nature of the Spirit who is Truth, and Peace, and Love, should have become the fierce battlefield, and been finally made the ostensible ground of separation between the Eastern and Western Churches; and that this rent in Christendom has now continued so many centuries.

Whatever may have been the origin of the Procession, it is clear that ultimately lust for power and aggrandizement, not zeal for doctrine, carried the schism. If we follow Pagi, the dispute "and from the Son" came to light in the counter-charges between the Latins and Greeks in the Iconoclastic war; the former accusing the latter of heresy for opposing images, and the latter retaliating by the cry of Filioque. But this at best only aims to date the contention, and tells us nothing how or when the faith "from the Father and the Son" came to life.

For our own part we are disposed to think that the doctrine gradually developed itself as the unity of the Christian consciousness of God permeated the Church. And this perhaps will be sufficiently clear if we look for a moment at the history of the completed conception of the Divine essence in the Trinity.

Thus Hilary of Poitiers, in the fourth century, while acknowledging, in an address to God, “Nulla te, nisi res tua, penetrat” – that nothing could be foreign from God’s essence which penetrates into its depths, yet was but able to see that the apostles and prophets affirm expressly of the Holy Ghost, only that He *exists*. And Gregory Nazianzen could write in 380: “Some of our theologians consider the Holy Spirit to be a certain mode of the divine agency; others, a creature of God; others, God Himself. Others say, that they do not know themselves which of the two opinions they ought to adopt, out of reverence for the Holy Scriptures, which have not clearly explained this point.”

On the other hand, Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century, was able somewhat strongly to assert the Procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son: “Each of the two names mentioned by me is inseparable and indivisible from the other. If I mentioned the Father, I also signified the Son in the Father, even before I introduced the name of the Son. Did I introduce the Son – although I had not spoken of the Father before, He would certainly have had His name anticipated in the Son. If I added the Holy Ghost, I at the same time subjoined both from whence and by whom He came (ἀμα και πόθεν και δια τινος ηκεν). But these persons are not aware that the Father, in His relation of Father, is not separated from the Son, for the name implies union; nor is the Son removed from the Father, for the appellation Father signifies community. In their hands also is the Spirit, which can neither be separated from the person sending nor from the person conveying (το Πνευμα, μήτε του πέμποντος, μήτετου θέροντος δυνάμενον στέρεσθαι). How then, while I make use of these names, can I conceive that these are divided and altogether distinct from each other? ... Thus we expand the Unity into the indivisible Trinity; and again we sum up the undiminished Trinity in the Unity.”

Still from all this, and from the fact that discussion as yet had not ripened on the Nature of the Third Person of the Trinity, but hinged, as will be gathered from the preceding extract, on the Divinity of the Son, we may see how it came to pass that the Nicene Creed, in 325, only expressed the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit in the very loose and timid terms – “And in the Holy Ghost.”

The Macedonian heresy brought out and advanced the truth by an important stage. While the Pneumatomachi, or “Fighters against the Spirit,” were able to accept the feeble utterance of the Nicene Creed, they held that

the Holy Ghost was a creation of God – an emanation from God, as the servant or minister of God, and not a Divine Person. Lamentable as was this blasphemy, it gave a healthy stimulus to the orthodox fathers, and ended in the adoption of a more distinct and definite formula into the Nicene Creed, at the Council of Constantinople, 381: “And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and the Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the Prophets.”

Thus Christendom was committed to another development of the faith. But a further question still was now naturally opened: If the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, what is His relation to the Son?

The Greeks used two words to express themselves upon the Nature of the Spirit – *εκπορεύομαι* and *λαμβάνω*, and said the Holy Ghost “proceeds” from the Father, and “receives” of the Son. Here taking their stand upon two passages of Scripture which we shall afterwards examine: “The Spirit of truth, which proceedeth (*εκπορεύεται*) from the Father” (John 15:26), and “He shall receive (*λήψεται*) of mine” (John 16:14). In other words, the Greek mind, persistently clinging to the idea that the Father is the sole Root (*ρίζα*), Cause (*αίτια*), and Fountain) of Deity, could not admit the Procession or Issuing Forth (*εκπόρευσις*) of the Holy Ghost from, but only by or through, the Son – thus guarding against the accusation of holding a second Fountain of Deity in the Son.

The Latins, on the other hand, only used the word *procedo* (“proceeds”), and concluded that to receive of the Son, and to proceed from the Father, are one and the same thing: since all things which the Father hath are the Son’s and therefore all things which the Son receiveth, He receiveth not from the Father alone, but also from the Son.

As Fulgentius expressly writes, that all things which the Father hath, and which the Spirit receiveth, are the Son’s, and therefore the Spirit proceeds neither from the Father alone, nor from the Son alone, but at the same time from both:

“De Filio ergo accepit, et omnia quae habet Pater Filii sunt, quae Spiritus Sanctus accepit: quia non de solo Patre, nec de solo Filio, sed simul de utroque procedit” (De Spiritu Sancto).

And Hilary before him, that since there is no difference between receiving of the Son and proceeding from the Father, certainly it is to be

accounted one and the same thing to receive of the Son and to receive of the Father:

“Quod si nihil differre credetur inter accipere a Filio, et a Patre procedere; certe id ipsum atque num esse existimabitur, a Filio accipere, quod sit accipere a Patre” (De Trin, l. 8, c. 20).

And Ambrose, that in the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, there is no separation from the Father nor from the Son; that He is not the Son, because He is not begotten, nor the Father, because He proceeds from both:

“Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum procedit a Patre et Filio, non separatur a Patre, non separatur a Filio. ... Sed non est ipse Filius, quia non generatur, neque Pater, quia procedit ab utroque” (De Spiritu Sancto, et De Symb.).

But it had remained for Augustine to give full and logical force to the argument, insomuch so that modern Greeks charge him with having invented the Procession from the Son. Thus he writes that inasmuch as the Holy Ghost is called in Scripture sometimes the Spirit of the Father and sometimes the Spirit of the Son, it cannot but be that He, the Spirit of both [not two different Spirits, one of the Father and the other of the Son], proceeds from both:

“Nec possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat, neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur” (De Trin., l. 4, c. 20).

And that, as the Son of God is in all respects identical in essence with the Father, and as the Father had eternally communicated all to the Son, who is therefore God of God, so likewise does the Holy Ghost proceed as well from the Son as from the Father:

“A quo autem habet Filius, ut sit Deus (est enim de Deo Deus), ab illo habet utique, ut etiam de illo procedat Spiritus Sanctus, ac per hoc Spiritus Sanctus, ut etiam de Filio procedat, sicut procedit de Patre ab ipso habet Patre” (Tract 100).

Hence we are not unprepared to find the Double Procession passing into the synodal articles of the Latin Church.

Thus in the Third Council of Toledo, in Spain, 589, the Western doctrine was asserted by the addition of Filioque, without any record of a dissentient voice.

At Heathfield, in 680, an English Synod, convened by Archbishop Theodore, and numerous attended, declared their belief in “the Holy

Ghost proceeding in an inexpressible manner (*inenarrabiliter*) from the Father and the Son.”

At the great (general?) Council, of Frankfort, 794, convened by Charlemagne, 300 bishops present, representatives of Italy, Spain, Britain, Germany, and Gaul, the Double Procession was once and again less or more emphatically stated.

The Council of Frinli, 796, assembled by Paulinus of Aguilieia, at once the most influential and probably most learned bishop of Europe, net only adopted the Filioque; but Paulinus defended the adoption at large in a vigorous letter to the king, which he sums up thus: “If, therefore, the Father is inseparably and substantially in the Son, and the Son in the Father, how can it be believed that the Holy Ghost, who is consubstantial with the Father and the Son, does not always proceed essentially and inseparably from the Father and the Son?”

The famous Council of Aquis-Grani (now Aix-la-Chapelle), 816, held by the emperor, not only of course affirmed the Procession from the Son, but has a history of its own which is too frequently half told, if we are to be faithful historians. It resulted in an embassy from the emperor to the Pope, Leo III, to obtain his authority in support of the doctrine. Now it is only for the most part narrated that the Pope protested against the insertion of the Filioque in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Confession, and ordered that creed to be engraved on two silver shields – one in Greek, the ether in Latin – and fixed in the Basilica of St. Peter. But it is not generally told that Leo admitted the truth of the doctrine in question, and strongly advised it to be inculcated.

But half a century passed away, and the equivocal tables of Leo were forgotten. Pope Nicholas I inserted the Filioque in the Roman Creed; and under Benedict VIII, in the eleventh century, it was sung in the Mass Service at Rome.

Thus we see how the conception of the Third Person in the Trinity advanced in the Church from the feeble embryo of Hilary – “exists”; and from the vague formula of the Nicene Creed – “And in the Holy Ghost,” to the more definite Niceno-Constantinopolitan dogma – “The Lord and the Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets;” and on in the whole Western Church to the Double Procession – “From the Father and the Son”.

We need not trace at any length the battle of the Filioque. Suffice it to say that the first stage in the conflict probably proceeded from personal “animosity between two bishops of the fifth century – Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret of Cyrus: the former having anathematized those who denied the Holy Ghost to be ἴδιον το Πνευμα του Χριστου (“own Spirit of Christ”); and the latter retaliating that if Cyril meant that the Spirit derived His being either from or through the Son, the saying was blasphemous and profane. Slumbering for a time, we find the clause brought out into relief in the eighth century, when Leo the Isaurian and his son Constantine Copronymus punished the Roman pontiffs (Gregory II and III) for their image worship by loss of revenue and possessions. And again, in the ninth century, the continued fight for territory between the Greek and Roman patriarchs, Photius and Nicholas, the Filioque was used as a pretext for the spoliation. But it remained for Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, and Leo IX, Bishop of Rome, in the eleventh century, to carry the war of earthly ambition and temporal aggrandizement, begun under cover of zeal for the truth, to the bitter end – when, in 1054, these heads of the two great Churches of Christendom solemnly excommunicated each other – the Western his antagonist upon the altar of God, and the Eastern his inhuman foe in public council, each thus wickedly rending the Body of Christ.

Can the schism be effectually healed? And on which side of the Filioque controversy does the truth lie?

We do not believe in compromise. It is neither more nor less than a drawn battle which time and circumstances are almost sure to renew. Of this we have a memorable instance in the Council of Florence, 1439, composed of Greeks and Latins, when this lamentable schism was relegated to the most distinguished individuals on both sides in order to reconcile their “two aspects of the same truth,” with the following result:

“The Latins and Greeks, meeting in that holy ecumenical synod, diligently laboured mutually that the Article of the Procession of the Holy Ghost should be most diligently and carefully discussed. Bringing forward testimonies from the Holy Scriptures, and very many authorities of doctors, both Eastern and Western, in some of which it was said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, in others from the Father by the Son, two aspects of the same truth; the Greeks asserted that when they said the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, they say it not to exclude the Son, but because as they say it seems to them that the Latins argue that the

Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, as from two principles and by two operations; therefore they abstained from saying the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son. But the Latins asserted that it was not with this mind that they said that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, to exclude the Father from being the Fount and Principle of all Deity – that is, of the Son and Holy Ghost; or this, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, the Son hath not of the Father; or that these are two principles or spirations. They assert, as they have always asserted, that there is one principle and one spiration of the Holy Ghost. When one and the same sense of the truth has thus been arrived at, they agreed in the following confession: That the Holy Ghost is eternally from the Father and the Son, and hath His essence and subsistent being from the Father and the Son together (*simul et Filio*), and eternally from Both, as from one principle and one spiration, proceedeth. Declaring that what the holy doctors and fathers say, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father by the Son, leads to this understanding: that by it is signified that the Son also, according to the Greek, is a cause, according to the Latin, a principle of the substance of the Holy Spirit, as in the Father; and since all things which are of the Father, He gave to His only-begotten Son, in begetting, save paternity; this also that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, the Son hath eternally from the Father, by whom from all eternity He is begotten.”

The decree is of value. It presents in the main the question between the Greek and the Latin. It is an example of what bare argument can do to effect a reconciliation, and therefore at the same time an example of perhaps inevitable ambiguity. Thus it affirms that the Son as well as the Father is the Cause and Origin of the Holy Ghost, and yet it professes not to exclude the Father from being the Fount and Principle of all Deity.”

But, however, no sooner had the Greeks returned to Constantinople than they found means to reopen the sore and build again the wall of partition.

Neither can we believe in the panacea here of the doctrine of double intention – that is, that when we Englishmen and Westerns recite the Nicene and the Athanasian Creed, or say the Litany, we are to use the word “proceeds” in the clause “the Holy Ghost, who proceedeth (or proceeding) from the Father and the Son,” in two senses: (1) In the sense of proceeding from the Father as a Fountain; and (2) in the sense of proceeding from the

Son as from a stream from the Fountain: that we are to use “proceeds” in the first instance, as “issuing forth” from the Father as a stream from its source, or a first link in a chain from its origin; and that we are to use the same identical word “proceeds” in the second instance, by some strange process of mental and double attachment, in a much wider signification, not as a stream from its source, but as a successive link from a previous link. In other words, that when we say, “I believe ill the Holy Ghost, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son,” we are to conceive of the Holy Ghost as flowing out of God the Father, and yet not out of, but through, God the Son. This doctrine, which we shall presently discuss, has, we regret to say, been lately advocated by the truly great and good Bishop Wordsworth, not only in a sermon preached in Lincoln Cathedral, but in the Upper House of Convocation.

The question then recurs, On which side in the Filioque Controversy does the truth lie, or can the schism be effectually healed.

Now the solution of this important and, so far at least as the interests of peace and unity are concerned, momentous question, depends, we think, altogether upon a calm, truthful, and correct view of the special development of the doctrine of the Triad in the Oriental Church. Here confessedly theology was too speculative; and while it laboured to throw off the grosser forms of emanative Gnosticism and Sabellianism, yet could not rid itself entirely of the incubus of Subordination. Nursed by Platonism in the Alexandrian school, and tutored by the religious metaphysics of Origen, we need not wonder that intellectualism rather than the realism of faith marked the Greek mind; that the main strain was to define as axiomatically clear what, after all, eternity must leave infinitely undefinable, the Essence of the Godhead, rather than to embrace what is revealed – the work and the history of Redemption. Hence the labour and the zeal about one efficient cause (μία ἀρχή) and Fountain of Deity (πηγή θεοτήτος) in the Father; and hence the ingenuity to explain, or fence – since the Son is consubstantial with the Father – the Issuing Forth (ἐκπόρευσις) or Procession of the Holy Ghost from that sole Fountain of the Father as a simple, and not a compound, act of production.

Now, in the first place, we submit that the Scripture knows nothing of these philosophical distinctions, or epithets of man’s ingenuity. They are simply remnants of Gnostic speculation, worked out into finer and more specious threads, plain elements of the subordination theory, only removed,

or aimed to be removed, from its temporal and sensuous anthropopathic representations.

The chief Scripture upon which they affect to stand, so far as they relate to the main question before us, the Procession of the Holy Spirit, are the two passages already quoted, “The Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father,” and “He shall receive of mine.”

Let us take the passages in their entirety:

First. “But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me” (John 15:26). Now, we think it is clear that two radically different things are here spoken of: (1) The Dispensation of the Spirit, or His Official Procession – “the Comforter, whom I will send unto you from the Father, he shall testify of me.” A future Procession from the Father and glorified Son, to be the Paraclete, and to testify of Christ and of God. And (2) the Essential Procession of the Spirit – “which proceedeth from the Father.” Here we have the verb *εκπορεύεται*, “proceedeth,” as an indefinite present, regard being had to the *act* (of the communication of the Divine essence) itself, rather than to the *time* – the Eternal Now of the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Otherwise “proceedeth from the Father” will be official also, and we shall lose the main Scripture for the ontological Procession, as Alford, following Luthardt, seems inclined to do. But if official, is it not a tautological Procession, devoid of force, coming immediately as it does after “whom I will send unto you from the Father”?

Second. “Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come ... he shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you” (John 16:13–14). Here manifestly the Procession is not ontologically at all, but strictly and only economically; and yet this is the key and the stronghold of the Greek position and controversy. “He shall receive of mine” is, without doubt, expressly and officially, that “he shall show it unto you.” Otherwise, and if Essential Procession were at all meant, as the Eastern Church so emphatically would have us believe, it could only be that the Holy Ghost had not yet received, but was about to receive – in the Greek phraseology – His mediate Essence through the Son. In other words, that His Godhead was not yet complete!

Let us add the complementary verse: “All things that the Father hath are mine therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, And shall show it unto you” (John 16:15). Here we have a Trinity in Unity, and at the same time,

and as an outcome of it, the Official Work of the Holy Ghost. “All things that the Father hath are mine” – the Son is Homousian with the Father; and by plain inference the Spirit with the Father and the Son, for as a consequent of that oneness of Godhead, He officially “takes” of the things of Christ and shows them, just as Christ, through the same oneness, had officially taken of the things of the Father and revealed Him.

Demonstrably, therefore, the “shall receive (λήψεται) of chap. 16:14 can only refer to the then impending and official mission of the Holy Ghost; and the “receiveth” or taketh (λαμβάνει) – not as our English Version following *Elz.*, “shall take”), of verse 15, to the continuation (so far here indefinite) of that Mission and Testimony. And demonstrably also, since “all things that the Father hath are the Son’s,” the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father, of chap. 15:20, must be the Procession also from the Son. But here Revelation closes. All beyond is vainly wise.

Hence we are not called upon to explain, If the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, and is consubstantial with them both, does He not therefore proceed from Himself further, perhaps, than we may say, that the very same argument would apply to His Procession from the Father alone, and would equally affect the Eternal Generation of the Son. Neither are we called upon to explain whether the Procession is a simple or compound act of production, with numberless like fruitless if not impious questionings. Here and along such lines is just where philosophy has shown its weakness, and without gaining a single atom of strength or of light, has enfeebled for a decade and a half of centuries, and darkened by its counsels, the Church of the living God. The revelations of the Bible were never meant to feed the futile theories and morbid cravings of the human mind, but are at once above as well as beyond philosophy. And the great duty of the Christian is to bring up his faith simply to the level of God’s revelations, as it is his greatest folly to try to bring down those revelations to the level of his finite understanding.

Again, the doctrine of double intention, – an adaptation of the teaching of time Greeks to explain away, and avowedly so, the obvious sense of our Creeds and Litany, – leads at once – to say nothing of its whole un-English aspect and bearing – into some of the most dangerous pitfalls of subordinationism. In proof, we have only to quote Bishop Wordsworth in his argument to induce us to attach to the word “proceeds” the restricted sense on the one hand, as he will have it, of the Greek *εκπορεύομαι*, to issue

forth, and “the much larger signification,” on the other hand, of the Latin word *procedo*, to proceed. He says: –

“Let us illustrate this statement by reference to the case of an epistle – St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans. *That Epistle issued forth* from the mind of the Apostle St. Paul, inspired by the Holy Ghost. It issued forth from that source, and from that source alone. But it proceeded not only from the mind of St. Paul, who dictated it, but from the pen of Tertius, who ‘wrote the Epistle’ at St. Paul’s dictation (Rom. 16:22), and it also proceeded to the Romans from the hand of Phoebe, the servant of the Church at Cenchreae,’ who was commissioned by St. Paul to deliver it to the Church at Rome (Rom. 16:1).

“So, again, in a chain it is the first link alone which *issues forth* from its origin; but any successive link in the chain may be said to *proceed* from the previous links in the series” [“Dr. Johnson defines the word *proceed* as meaning ‘to pass from one person or place to another’” (Bishop’s Note).] (Sermon on the Procession of the Holy Spirit preached in Lincoln Cathedral on Whitsunday, 1872, by the Bishop of Lincoln: Rivingtons).

Now we think it is difficult, if not indeed altogether impossible, honestly and legitimately to apply this mode of reasoning and illustration to the great doctrine before us, without arriving at the conclusion, if not that the Second Person in the Trinity is inferior to the First, yet that the Third is inferior to the other Two. And it is just such human analogies, as St. Paul, Tertius, and Phebe, or the first and successive links in a chain, that show the vanity of all men’s philosophy, to explain what God has not explained – to reveal to our finite understandings the infinite depths of the Essence of the Godhead.

Nor is Bishop Wordsworth unhappily altogether consistent with himself. For on the very same page where he states that the Greek Fathers taught the procession of the Spirit through the Son (*δια του υίου*), but not from or out of the Son (*εκ του υίου*), he quotes Cyril of Alexandria as speaking of the Holy Spirit *εκ της ουσίας του πατρος και του υιου* (“from or out of the Essence of the Father and the Son”). The fact is, the Greek mind, like all other minds, if it retained its orthodoxy of a Divine Trinity, was sure at times philosophically to stumble at the stumbling stone of the Procession.

We do not care to comment on these passages in his sermon where the good Bishop expressly speaks of “God the Father being the only original Fountain of Deity,” and “God the Son being mediately and derivatively a

fountain of the Holy Spirit.” But we rather turn to the more truthful – yet how different? – language of the Bishop’s Greek Testament (6th ed. 1868) on John 15:26, το Πνευμα της αληθείας, ο παρα του Πατρος εκπορεύεται. –

“*The Spirit of truth who proceedeth from the Father.* Someone may inquire whether the Spirit proceeds *also* [The italics throughout are the Bishop’s.] from the *Son*? The Son is the Son of the Father, and the Father is the Father of the Son alone. But the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of both Father and Son. Hence our Lord says, ‘It is the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you’ (Matt. 10:20); and yet the Apostle says (Gal. 4:6) God hath sent forth the Spirit of *His Son* into your hearts.’ And if the Spirit did not proceed from the Son, Christ would not have breathed on His Apostles and said, ‘*Receive ye the Holy Ghost*’ (John 20:22). Why then did He say, ‘The Spirit of Truth that proceedeth from *the Father*?’ Because He ascribes what is His own to the Father, from whom He, the Son, Himself is; as when He says, ‘My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me’ (John 7:16).

“The Son is of the Father alone; but the Holy Spirit *is of the Father and the Son.*”

In summing up then our argument, while we have no desire to endorse all that the Western Church and Fathers have written – or been *led* to write, either on the relations of the Trinity, or on the particular subject of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, yet we are free to confess that their symbol of that Procession has the clear balance of scriptural truth on its side; as it is, unquestionably, more in accordance with the great and cardinal doctrine of the Trinity in Unity. For, the question once opened, and *et Filis*, “from the Son,” is but the consistent and natural complement of *a Patre*, “from the Father”; if the Son is consubstantial with the Father.

And to our mind, the healing of the schism between the East and the un-Romanized West, can only be effected – not by hollow or ambiguous compromise, as at the Council of Florence, nor by the wresting of words from their historical, plain, and obvious meaning, as the Bishop of Lincoln so unhappily suggests, but by the cessation on both sides of merely philosophical speculation in matters of faith, and by a devoted attachment to the central point of Christianity – the redemption of a lost world by the Saviour. Let each Church, for the present at least, retain its own dogmatic assertion of the Procession – in the text thereof, and the legitimate exegesis of Scripture, as against the bewildering and unsatisfactory margin and exegesis of wisdom above that which written; but let them both unite,

forgetting the animosities of the past, on the broad ground of a free and open Bible, and a common salvation, to extend the kingdom of the Redeemer on earth. And this united front of consecration to God will gather round it strength from within and without – bringing down a fresh Pentecostal blessing of “tongues of fire sitting upon each of them,” to purify the incense of their own worship, and to evangelize the world. And will at the same time be at once both the only safe and lasting Irenicon of the churches that have not “denied the faith,” and the best practical protest against the apostate and pseudo-Catholic Church of Rome.

2. The Office of the Holy Ghost.

Against Pelagians and Socinians.

(1.) A Present Work.

While we are to believe that the Holy Spirit hath ever taken part in the work of human redemption, “striving with man” (Gen. 6:3), and “holy men of old speaking as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (2 Peter 1:21), yet we are to remember that ever since the departure of our risen Lord, the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity hath been specially and officially present on this earth, in the fullness of His power, revealing and applying that redemption. In other words, that over and besides His universal presence as God, we are living in the era of His special mission and veritable presence in our world – the Pentecostal Theocracy of the Holy Ghost.

“That he may abide with you forever” (John 14:16).

Looking back along the whole line of the history of the Christian Church since the days of the apostles and their immediate successors, this is a truth which seems strangely, if not indeed almost unaccountably to have been widely forgotten, or at best only confusedly remembered. Not but that the Church in some measure at least has formally embodied it in her creeds and confessions, and expanded it in her theology; and individual souls once and again have been impressed with the bliss of its reality. Yet still the broad fact remains, that Christians are not, and have not been, alive to the Spirit’s Actual Presence on Earth.

Could we bring the Churches and Christians in general to the full recognition and sense of this solemn yet glorious truth, what might not be the glorious results! Surely strife and contention, and the wars of brothers, would cease. For who could fight in the presence of God? Surely we

should soon cover the earth with the knowledge of the Lord. For who would not go forth into the wastes of sin, at home and abroad, a missionary at the side of God? With what glad and holy purposes and results would the Eastern Church and the Western Church embrace each other to join in this Procession of the Holy Ghost!

It may be we have forgotten the Holy Spirit, because of the withdrawal of His manifest and miraculous gifts. Or perhaps rather it is that Satan, true to his character of Deceiver, has imitated the work and the power of God the Holy Ghost, and blinded man by a counterfeit – the power of human reason. Thus infidel “reason” was the weapon with which the devil carried the Fall – ”Yea, hath God said?” And as we have seen in the former section, “vain philosophy” soon marred the fair face of Christendom. And, as we have often painfully felt, the pride of human reason it is today, which not only feeds the antagonisms of the faith, but to which we often virtually trust as our talisman for progress. Look practically at the case as it stands: we have Universities for science, and Colleges for theology, multiplied and multiplying in every land; but we have not a School of the Prophets for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost in all the world.

Need we wonder that “the fruit of the Spirit” is not so abundant – “love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance?” (Gal. 5:22–23).

(2.) A Work in the “World” – κόσμος. The unconverted world. (See John 16:8–11.)

(a) To “reprove” it – ἐλέγχειν τον κόσμον. To convince and convict the world. The Punitive Office of the Holy Ghost.

This ἐλεγχος of the world consists not only in the reputation of the sinner, but in bringing home to his conscience the conviction of wrong. It is punitive, inasmuch as it entails the sense of guilt; but it has a merciful side – to redeem the world.

And this ἐλεγχος extends even to the heathen world. Hence in Romans 2:15 we read: “Their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.” In other words, the law of God is written by the Spirit less or more plainly on the heart of man, as the conscience of every nation under heaven testifies.

Cui bono? Who has benefited? The answer is twofold. The Gentile world itself has benefited. Its conscience has contributed its ethics, whether

written or oral; and its ethics has been its life. And Christianity has benefited. For the conscience of the heathen world has been the first foothold of the Gospel.

(b) To “reprove it of sin” – αμαρτία. The missing of the true end of life – the knowledge of God. But especially does the Spirit “reprove” the gospel world of unbelief: convincing unto Life those who hear; and convicting unto Death those who neglect and despise His message.

“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. But he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed (μη πεπίστευχεν – deliberately chosen not to believe) in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” (See John 3:36 and 18.)

And thus the Holy Ghost, on the day of Pentecost, “filled” the apostles with His power, and Peter stood up with the eleven, and testified of a risen Saviour, declaring salvation in His name. “And the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls” (Acts 2). But when the proto-martyr Stephen, “full” also of the Holy Ghost, testified of the same Saviour, “standing on the right hand of God,” his murderers “stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord” (Acts 7).

Here we have a marked instance of the έλεγχος of the Spirit – and as it ever goes on – proving “to the one the savour of life unto life, and to the other the savour of death unto death” (2 Cor. 2:16).

(c) To “reprove it of righteousness” – δικαιοσμηνη.

Whose “righteousness”? First, the world’s own, demonstrating that it is but “filthy ways”. Second, Christ’s “righteousness” – His to-God, in-God, and for-God love; the value and acceptance of which was proved by the fact of his ascension and reception into glory – “because I go to the Father.” Third, the saint’s “righteousness” through faith in Christ – “because ye see me no more.”

(d) To “reprove it of judgment” – κρίσις.

At once the world’s “judgment” and God’s – “because the Prince of this world, is judged.” The estimate which the world forms under subjection to and the bondage of the devil is at once and clearly refuted by the very fact that its “Prince” himself is cast out and condemned. And so the polemical έλεγχος of the Spirit, as it reveals the condemnation and devices of Satan, ever points to the progressive judgment of God, in its summation for the final phrase of the Judgment to Come.

(3.) A Work in the Church.

No greater proof could well be wanted or given of the presence of the Lord the Spirit on earth, than the Church of the living God presents.

It is the Church of God Christ “purchased with His own blood,” of which as a flock the Holy Ghost taketh charge, and over which He setteth “overseers” (Acts 20:28).

Let us examine its polity, or Theocratic Regime (1 Cor. 12:13).

First of all its members confess “that Jesus is the Lord, by the Holy Ghost.” Here the first step towards visible churchmanship confession – illustrates the first step of initiation into the invisible Church, or covenant relationship with Jehovah Jesus – “that Jesus is the Lord.” Christ is thus made the great Foundation Stone – “The spirit of truth shall glorify me” (John 16:14).

Then by this “one Spirit are we all baptized into one body; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” Here again the outward rite of baptism typifies the inward washing and watering (εποτίσθημεν), or enlightenment (εφωτίσθημεν) – the gracious and abiding influence of the Spirit. Alford’s comment that the aorist of the Greek verb (denoting a *fact gone by*) is fatal to this interpretation, is singularly weak; for it is a self-evident and recognized canon of sound criticism that typical language must not be interpreted in minuteness of detail. Baptism is once, and indeed so is the seal of the Spirit; but the influence of that seal is “unto the day of redemption” (Eph. 4:30).

Next we have the “Manifestation of the Spirit” – His *modus operandi*:

“Diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit” – varieties of Endowments in the members, but bestowed or consecrated by the Holy Ghost.

“Differences of Administrations, but the same Lord” – varieties of Ministries, or channels of the gifts, ordained by Christ, the Founder of the Church, when on earth – “Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations” (Matt. 28:19), and so perpetuated in His name.

“Diversities of Operations, but it is the same God, which worketh all in all.” If we read this 6th verse of 1 Cor. 12, with verse 11 of the same chapter, “But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit,” and with the “Lord,” or Christ of the “Administrations” of verse 5, we have clearly a Trinity “working” in Unity. The Father, the Divine Architect of the Church, the Son the Ordainer of its varied Ministries, and the Holy Ghost the Builder of this Temple of God.

“Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ” (1 Peter 1–2).

Then we have the detail –

“For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom” – whether of the intellect or the heart, “sanctified in Christ Jesus.”

“To another the word of knowledge” – to discern what is the truth of God.

“To another faith” – in its varied practical workings energized by love.

And all these are “through” (διὰ – as to their medium) “according to” (κατά – as to their disposal), and “in” (ἐν – as their element, life, and power) “that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.”

Finally, passing over the temporary miraculous dispensation of the Spirit in the early Church, we come to the ever-abiding graces – implanted here, and bringing forth fruit, some thirty, some sixty, and some an hundredfold, but to bloom with ever-increased and perpetual vigour in the Church triumphant: “Faith, Hope, Charity.” Trust, with its outcome of confident Expectation of Good, and, as the root of all, Eternal Love.

And this Theocracy immeasurably surpasses the former, or Jewish theocracy.

(a) As to the grasp and nature of its Revelations. The Jewish was imperfect, and its “law a schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ” (Gal. 3:24). The Christian is the revelation of “all truth,” that its subjects “might receive the adoption of sons” (Gal. 4:5).

Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth” (John 16:13). Not all knowledge, not infallibility, but “all truth” adapted to human need and conception, as necessary to salvation. This promise was graciously fulfilled to the Apostles, in the inspiration of them by the Holy Ghost to unfold the doctrine and law of the Church, but like all God’s gracious promises, it has an ever-widening, undying circle. And therefore thus, and thus alone, can we account for the great truths of the Gospel being preserved in the Church, notwithstanding man’s sin and the world’s opposition.

(b) As to its Duration – Forever.

“For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance” (Rom. 11:29). “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of Truth” (John 14:16–17). This promise is parallel with, “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world” (Matt. 28:20). After which *end*, “Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory” (John 17:24). The Theocracy of the Spirit is the result of the ever-present Emmanuel; and the abiding Presence of our God-Man Elder Brother is the result of the good will of the Father: and this Triune God and Economy remains to all eternity.

“Another Comforter “ – Παράκλητος. Here, in this one word, we have all the manifold gifts and offices of the Spirit comprised. As Bishop Wordsworth beautifully narrates them: “Sanctifier, Teacher, Comforter, Exhorter, Remembrancer, Inspirer, Enlightener, Counsellor, Guide, Helper, and Advocate of the Church.” Or, as they may be reduced to two classes – Comforter and Intercessor. And these again to one – the Giver of Life. The Eternal Function of the Eternal Spirit.

(4.) A Work in the Individual Soul.

Here the lines of the Spirit’s Work in the Church are in many cases parallel. But an example gives us better the detail.

(a) To “sanctify” means to make *sanctus* or holy – separate from sin, and sharing in the purity of God. And for this reason the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity is called in Scripture the Holy Spirit – not but that the other Persons of the Trinity are also Holy Spirits, but because the special office of the Third Person is to impart holiness or transfuse spiritual life into the souls of men.

“And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God” (1 Cor. 16:11). “Because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth” (2 Thess. 2:13).

(b) Sanctification, then, or the working of the Spirit in the human soul, is a creation afresh, after the image of God. It is not, like justification, something done for us (*propter* – on our account), but something done in us. It is not therefore a work of merit in any way on our part or “on our account” before God, but a work altogether of grace. And this is a point which should be carefully kept in mind to guard, on the one hand, against

the Scholastic and Romish doctrine of merit *de condigno*, and, on the other hand, against the widely spread practical error of confounding justification and sanctification.

The Romish doctrine of *condignity*, though the Tridentine divines avoided the term, stands thus:

“Whosoever shall say that the good works of a justified man are in such a sense the gifts of God that they are not good merits of the justified man himself, or that a justified man by good works which are done by him through the grace of God, and the merits of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the actual attainment of eternal life; if he die in grace, together with increase of glory, let him be anathema” (Council of Trent, Session 6, Canon 32).

This at once flatly contradicts the force of our Saviour’s own words: “When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants” (Luke 17:10).

And the practical error of confounding justification and sanctification is that the Christian fails to feel the blessedness of, and consequently to live up to his true position before God – that of a “purged worshipper” (Heb. 10:2), and son and heir with Christ. And therefore, instead of living in the atmosphere of perfect acceptance before God, even as God’s own eternal and well-beloved Son, and intimate communion with God, he is overwhelmed with a sense of guilt – guilt which was utterly taken away on justification, or the day of his closing in with the offer of the Gospel; and this sense of guilt prevents him going forth and doing service unto the Lord.

Save sheer infidelity itself, we know of no more effective weapon of the armory of Satan – retailed and burnished, alas! as it is in too many pulpits – to eat out and destroy the life of Christendom, than this negation of the birthright of the child of God. As on the other hand, we know of no greater incentive to further and higher holiness and to increased good works, than to know and to feel that we are the accepted sons and daughters of the Holy and Almighty Lord God.

“For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure” (Phil 2:13). “Created in Christ Jesus unto good works” (Eph. 2:10).

“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all blessing of the Spirit (πνευματικός – not merely as the English version ‘spiritual,’ but the actual working of the Spirit) in heavenly

places in Christ” (Eph. 1:3). Here is an epitome of the whole of Salvation – of the “new heavens and the new earth,” of the creation of the Holy Ghost. God the Father blessing “according to the good pleasure of his will.” God the Spirit working the εὐλογία – all the blessings of His gracious influences. God the Son the connecting Personal God-Man link between us and the Godhead. And Heaven, the state to which we belong, and our final home.

“Where is boasting then” on the part of man?

Yet still, blessed be God, “there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. ... For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. ... And if children, then heirs – heirs of God, mid joint heirs with Christ” (Rom. 8:1–2, 15–16). “As he (the Eternal Son) is, so are we in this world” (1 John 4:17).

(c) Justification, or the righteousness of Christ imputed to the sinner, and in the order of nature preceding sanctification, alone gives a title, as such, to heaven; whereas sanctification, being the righteousness of a sinful creature, and imperfect in degree, though inwrought by the aid and grace of the Spirit, is powerless, and indeed not needed, to give a (second) title to heaven, but is only meant and needed to give a meetness for heaven – the plain and natural proof and evidence of our sonship. The former respects the whole person, the latter affects the whole man – “spirit, soul, and body” (1 Thess. 5:23). The one is God’s love to us, the other is our love to God.

“We love him, because he first loved us” (1 John 4:19). The one is a judicial act complete at once, freeing the soul from the law as a covenant of works; the other is a spiritual change, enabling the believer to “delight in the law of God after the inward man” (Rom. 7:22), gradual and progressive, yet never here completed – “a light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day” (Prov. 4:18). The one, in the Economy of Redemption, is the act of the Father, on the basis of the righteousness of his Son; the other is the work of the Spirit, “renewing” the whole man – the powers of the soul and the members of the body – “after the image of him that created him” (Col. 3:10). [For the Scriptural proof, and full consideration of Justification, see under Art. XI.]

As Hooker well says: “Now, concerning the righteousness of sanctification, we deny it not to be inherent: we grant that, unless we work,

we have it not: only we distinguish it as a thing different in nature from the righteousness of justification: we are righteous the one way, by the faith of Abraham: the other way, except we do the works of Abraham, we are not righteous. Of the one, St. Paul: 'To him that worketh not, but believeth, faith is counted for righteousness' (Rom. 4:5). Of the other, St. John: 'He is righteous which worketh righteousness.' Of the one St. Paul doth prove, by Abraham's example, that we have it of faith without works. Of the other, St. James, by Abraham's example, that by works we have it, and not only by faith. St. Paul doth plainly sever these two parts of Christian righteousness one from the other. For in the sixth to the Romans thus he writeth: 'Being freed from sin, and made servants to God, ye have your fruit in holiness, and the end everlasting life.' Ye are made free from sin, and made servants unto God: this is the righteousness of justification. Ye have your fruit in holiness: this is the righteousness of sanctification. By the one we are interested in the right of inheriting; by the other we are brought to the actual possession of eternal bliss. And so the end of both is everlasting life" (Discourse on Justification).

(d) Finally, sanctification is the Holy Ghost's new creation of the invisible Church on earth – the restoration of the soul, through the varied means of ordinances, providences, and intercommunion, to the likeness of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, by uniting us by faith to Christ, "till we all come unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" in the church triumphant.

"But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. 8:11). Here the whole life of the redeemed, from their quickening from spiritual death, even unto their new and glorious resurrection bodies, is covered by the agency of the Πνεῦμα ζωοποιουν – the Life-Giving Spirit. And in all this we are directly reminded of our everliving and mystic Head – "Christ." The One Spirit who dwelleth in all his members, raising them up in and with Him.

And this agency of the Spirit "helpeth our infirmities." For example, in the chief ordinance of prayer. "For we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. 8:26). And extends into the detail of all circumstances and events that can possibly befall us. For "we know that all

things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose” (verse 28).

And thus being “sanctified in Christ Jesus” (1 Cor. 1:2), we enjoy the “fellowship of the Spirit” (Phil. 2:1), and “put on the new man, which after God is created in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness” (Eph. 4:24, Col. 3:10).

All which blessings are summed up in the Apostolic Benediction:

“The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen” (2 Cor. 13:14).

Article VI.

History and Doctrine, With Patristic and Scriptural Proof.

Of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for salvation. – Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation.

In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

Of the names and number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis. Exodus. Leviticus. Numbers. Deuteronomy. Joshua. Judges. Ruth. The First Book of Samuel. The Second Book of Samuel. The First Book of Kings. The Second Book of Kings. The First Book of Chronicles. The Second Book of Chronicles. The First Book of Esdras. The Second Book of Esdras. The Book of Esther. The Book of Job. The Psalms. The Proverbs. Ecclesiastes, or Preacher. Canticles, or Songs of Solomon. Four Prophets the Greater. Twelve Prophets the Less.

And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following:

The Third Book of Esdras. The Fourth Book of Esdras. The Book of Tobias. The Book of Judith. Rest of the Book of Esther. The Book of Wisdom. Jesus the Son of Sirach. Baruch the Prophet. The Song of the Three Children. The Story of Susanna. Of Bel and the Dragon. The Prayer of Manasses. The First Book of Maccabees. The Second Book of Maccabees.

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.

De Divinis Scripturis; quod sufficient ad salutem. – Scriptura sacra continet omnia, quae ad salutem sunt necessaria, ita ut quicquid in ea probari potest, non sit a quoquam exigendum, ut tanquam Articulus Fidei credatur, aut ad salutis necessitatem requiri patetur.

Sacrae Scripturae nomine, eos Canonicos libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quorum auctoritate, in Ecclesia nunquam dubilatum est.

De nominibus et Numero librorum sacrae Canonical Scripturae Veteris Testamenti.

Genesis. Exodus. Leviticus. Numeri. Deuteronomium. Josuae. Judicum. Ruth. Prior Liber Samuelis. Secundus Liber Samuelis. Prior Liber Regum. Secundus Liber Regum. Prior Liber Paralipomenon. Secundus Liber Paralipomenon. Primus Liber Esdrae. Secundus Liber Esdrae. Liber Hester. Liber Job. Psalmi. Proverbia. Ecclesiastes vel Concionator. Cantica Solomonis. IV. Prophetae Majores. XII. Prophetae Minores.

Alios autem libros (ut ait Hieronymus) legit quidem Ecclesia, ad exempla vitae, et formandos mores; illos tamen ad dogmata confirmanda non adhibet – ut sunt;

Tertius Liber Esdrae. Quartus Liber Esdrae. Liber Tobiae. Liber Judith. Reliquum Libri Hester. Liber Sapientiae. Liber Jesu filii Sirach. Baruch Propheta. Canticum trium Puerorum. Historia Susannae. De Bel et Dracone. Oratio Manassis. Prior Liber Machabeorum. Secundus Liber Machabeorum.

Novi Testamenti omnes libros, ut vulgo recepti sunt, recipimus, et habemus pro Canonicis.

We here pass from the Catholic dogma of the Church to her polemical and Protestant teaching. In other words, while the preceding five articles cover the battleground of earlier Christianity, we are here brought, in this Sixth Article, into direct antagonism with the Church of Rome, and which appears less or more in sharpened detail as we proceed.

There is, therefore, no question about the true Protestant character of the Articles of the Church of England. We cannot explain them away. If the firm and decided wording of this Creed of the Church of England has any grammatical and historic meaning at all, Doctor Pusey and his school are simply dishonest and trifling when they attempt to read Romanism between the lines. There the Articles stand, unmistakably Protestant, either to be condemned and rejected, or proved by Holy Scripture and maintained.

And it is well in the present day that we should be alive to all this. If Popery be a development of the truth of God, why then let us by all means heartily embrace it. But we must cease to be English Churchmen. So long as our Articles remain in the front, or form any part of the formularies of the Church of England, the plain issue is the Bible and Protestantism

against Tradition and the Papacy – the Queen of this Realm of England *versus* the Bishop of Rome. We are not for the moment here arguing this issue – that will be abundantly brought before us in the sequel. We are simply pointing to the two hostile camps – to say, no honest man can profess to belong to the one and hold parley with the other.

Of course, if stratagem is lawful in religion there is at once a plea for eating the bread of the Church and undoing the work of the Reformation. But surely intrigue is as far from the spirit of the New Testament as it should be repugnant to the nature of an Englishman. If the triumph of our Christ is only to be won by Jesuitism, the sooner we cease to be Christians the better.

But the Church of England is first Catholic, then Protestant, which accounts for this Sixth Article, defining the Rule of Faith, having its place here, and not as in the Helvetic Confession, and the Irish Articles of 1615, at the outset. The latter clearly is the more natural place, as the basis of all religious truth is the Word of God. But the present order has this advantage, that it links us, in the very threshold of our Confession, to primitive and Catholic Christianity; and then proceeds, as by an historical protest, to pronounce against the great breach of Catholic faith and unity by the Church of Rome.

Division.

Three Subjects. – 1. The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture for Salvation.
2. The Canon of Scripture. 3. The Apocrypha.

1. *The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture for Salvation.*

Against Romanists and the Illuminati.

(1.) What the Church of England teaches.

“Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation” (Art. VI.).

“Although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation” (Art. XX.).

“Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? ... I am so persuaded” (Ordering of Priests; and Consecration of Bishops).

(2.) What the Church of Rome teaches.

“The most Holy Ecumenical and General Council of Trent, legitimately assembled in the Holy Ghost ... perceiving that the truth and discipline (as promulgated by Christ and his Apostles) are contained in the written books, and in the unwritten traditions, which having been received by the Apostles, at the mouth of Christ Himself, or at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have come down to us, transmitted as it were by hand ... receives and venerates, with equal pious affection and reverence, all the books of the Old and New Testament, since one God is the Author of them both, and also the Traditions, whether pertaining to faith or morals, as having been dictated, either by the mouth of Christ Himself, or by the Holy Spirit, and preserved continuous succession in the Catholic Church” (Council of Trent, Session IV, Can. 1, A.D. 1546).

(3.) To these direct and authoritative statements we may add the following as semi-authoritative or corroboratory.

(a) Church of England:

“Unto a Christian man there can be nothing either mere necessary or profitable than the knowledge of Holy Scripture; forasmuch as in it is contained God’s true Word, setting forth His glory, and also man’s duty. And there is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our justification and everlasting salvation, but that is (or may be) drawn out of that fountain and well of truth ... Let us diligently search for the well of life [John 4:14] in the books of the Old and New Testament, and not run to this stinking puddles of men’s traditions (devised by man’s imagination) for our justification and salvation. For, in Holy Scripture is fully contained what we ought to do, and what to eschew, what to believe, what to love, and what to look for at God’s hands at length” (Homily the First, Part First).

“The Popes, in not hearing Christ’s voice as they ought to do, but preferring their own decrees before the express Word of God, do plainly argue to the world, that they are not of Christ, nor yet possessed with His Spirit ... It is not then the duty and part of any Christian, under pretense of the Holy Ghost, to bring in his own dreams and fancies into the Church: but he must diligently provide that his doctrine and decrees be agreeable to

Christ's holy Testament: otherwise, in making the Holy Ghost the author thereof, he doth blaspheme and belie the Holy Ghost, to his own condemnation" (Homily the Twenty-eighth, Part Second).

"That the Holy Scriptures should be interpreted by their (the Fathers') decisions, we do not allow. For the Holy Scriptures ought to be to us both the rules and judges of all Christian doctrine. Nay, moreover, the Fathers themselves refused to be so honoured, frequently admonishing the reader, that he should only admit their interpretations and determinations as far as he should see that they were agreeable to the Holy Scripture" (*Reformatio Legum*).

"M. Dost thou then affirm that all things necessary to godliness and salvation are contained in the written Word of God? – S. Yea: for it were a point of intolerable ungodliness and madness to think, either that God had left an imperfect doctrine, or that men were able to make that perfect which God left imperfect" (Nowell's Catechism).

"We receive and embrace all the Canonical Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament; and we give our gracious God most hearty thanks, that He hath set up this light for us, which we ever fix our eyes upon, lest by human fraud or the snares of the devil we should be reduced to errors or fables ... They are the very might and power of God unto salvation; they are the foundations of the Apostles and Prophets, upon which the Church of God is built; they are the most certain and infallible rule by which the Church may be reduced if she happen to stagger, slip, or err by which all ecclesiastical doctrines ought to be tried" (Jewell's Apology).

"We are sure that what is so written and so transmitted is God's word; whereas, concerning other things, which were not written, we have no certain records, no evident proof, no sufficient conviction, and therefore it is not capable of being owned as the Rule of Faith or Life, because we do not know it to be the Word of God" (Taylor's Dissuasive).

(b) Church of Rome.

"The controversy between us and the heretics consists in two things. The first is that we assert, that in Scripture is not expressly contained all necessary doctrine, whether of faith or morals; and therefore that, besides the written Word of God, there is also required the unwritten Word of God, that is Divine and Apostolical Traditions. But they (the heretics) teach that all things necessary for faith and morals are contained in the Scriptures, and

that therefore there is no need of any unwritten Word” Bellarmine, De Verbo Dei non Scripto). (1.) What Reason teaches.

(a) Since “the world by wisdom knew not God,” if, therefore, and on that very account, God condescends to make a written Revelation of His will, that Revelation must, and only can, supply what, and all, that is needed to impart a saving knowledge of God. Otherwise, that Revelation is not only imperfect, and so unworthy of God, but fails *in limine* and *de facto* in the very purpose for which it was given and intended.

(b) If Scripture is incomplete, and Tradition incomplete, Salvation, or the Christian Faith, depends for its perfection upon two standards of acknowledged imperfection!

(c) In the early ages of the world, the life of man extended over many hundreds of years so that not only were the grandchildren of Adam contemporary with Noah, but Methuselah lived with Adam 243 years, and with Noah 600 years. Here then Tradition had a fair field. It could not be lost. It had only to travel, as it were, the family circle. But yet Tradition failed even to save that family circle. For we read that in the days of Noah – and 120 years we may observe before the death of Methuselah – “God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth” (Gen. 6:22). Shall Tradition be more powerful in the greatly altered, and infinitely more adverse circumstances of our race *now*?

(d) Precisely analogous in principle to the oral and so-called divine traditions, claimed by the Church of Rome, as handed down from the days of the Apostles, were the oral traditions of the Jewish Church, also accounted divine, and handed down through the Great Synagogue, from the time of Ezra. Both proceed upon the same avowed principle of the incompleteness of God’s Written word. If the only effect of the Jewish traditions was to “make the Word of God of none effect,” is that not likely to be the precise effect of the Romish traditions? Besides, if our Saviour had intended to supplant the Jewish traditions by Christian traditions, would He have condemned the former in terms which savour so very strongly of attacking the whole general principle of traditions? “Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders? ... Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye

hold the tradition of men. ... Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition” (Mark 7:5, 7–8, 13).

(e) Not only is it fair, but imperative to ask, Where are those Romish Traditions contained? where are they to be collected? or how developed and transmitted? And when ascertained, where lies the authority to pronounce upon them to distinguish between the possible and very probable – yea, the actually acknowledged accretions and alloy of the lapse of centuries, and the pure virgin gold of the deposit of Christ and his Apostles?

Now to the first of those questions – Where are these oral Traditions to be found? – Rome has no distinct, definite, or worthy answer. It is trifling to tell us that her Traditions are floating about in the bosom of her own Church. That is an answer which would at once damage business credit in the world; and religious credit should be at least just as tender. A floating capital of merchandise at sea, incapable of being reduced to any reliable figures, passes for very little in sound commerce. True, it sometimes gains currency on Change; but in the long run only ends in disaster.

Then as to their development and transmission. Who is conscious of it? Do they come *en masse*, and are they sensibly transmitted from popedom to popedom? Or do they lie as a dead and unknown treasure *somewhere*, to be drawn upon when exigency requires? What, in all earnestness, do the words of the Tridentine Canon – “The unwritten traditions, which have come down to us, transmitted, as it were, by hand, and, preserved in *continuous succession* in the Catholic Church” – explicitly and historically mean?

It is true we are told that there is an infallible authority vested in the Church of Rome, by which the truth or falsehood of Tradition may be tested; and an anathema is pronounced against those who dispute that authority. But without here anticipating argument upon Papal Infallibility, may we not ask, Is not this begging the whole question? The very claim, on the face of it, acknowledges, as we have said, the alloy of Romish Tradition. But there is a higher point. Does it look honest to claim a capital of Tradition and then, to enhance its value, set up a plea of Infallibility of the part of the owner, and anathematize all those who are unable and unwilling to endorse that plea and method of valuation?

It is true also that when pressed, Romanists and Tractarians tell us the inspired communications delivered by Christ and his apostles over and beyond the Word written, and orally conveyed from generation to

generation in the Church Catholic, i.e., in the succession of an Infallible Church, were ultimately enshrined in the tomes of the early Fathers. But if so, this at once clearly stamps out the special claim of Rome, or any other branch of the Catholic Church, to all manner and mode of tradition. To oral tradition, for we are concerned no longer with a Revelation handed down by word of mouth, but a professed tangible record – a second New Testament, or Third Scripture. And as obviously no longer with an additional New Testament belonging to Rome, but to the world.

And even when we approach this venerable storehouse of Christian antiquity, what do we find? Why, that the great bulk of its treasures have been swept away! And not only so, but the Benedictine editors, themselves Romish, frankly acknowledge that Patristic Tradition has been largely adulterated and interpolated. And as a proof at once of this their own confession, and against Papal Infallibility, we may mention that they have declared passages even in the Romish Breviary, calling the Virgin “the sinner’s only hope,” to be spurious, as “read under the name of Augustine!” (Tom. v. 323, App).

Indeed, if the mass of matter in the writings of the Fathers – the conceded shrine be it remembered of Romish Tradition – which these candid and painstaking scholars have marked “Doubtful or Falsely Ascribed” – that is, vitiated or forged by the Roman Catholic Church – be so, what, in all fairness, becomes of her honesty? what, in all honesty of argument or common sense, becomes of her boasted Infallibility? where existed, or how exercised – “talking, or pursuing, or in a journey, or peradventure sleeping” – was that Infallible Authority claimed by the Church of Rome, by which the truth or falsehood of Tradition may be tested? What becomes even of the canon of Vincentius – “*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus?*” Since we have only fragments of the Fathers, and if these have been mutilated, what portion of Tradition can we say was *always*? what are we sure was *everywhere*? and has the universal whole which Rome or Doctor Pusey would claim, the *consent of all* the known and unknown writings of all the *Fathers*? We say “unknown,” for however absurd the factor, it is of vital importance to the Canon. Never perhaps has argument been put forward, more vulnerable along the whole line, than this line of Romish Tradition.

(f) But the fact is, Rome has but vague notions as to what she herself actually means by, and should include under, her “Divine and Apostolical

Traditions”. As the Fathers are accessible to the world, the Hearsay Doctrines of Priests must be added to the Fathers! But Hearsay and the Fathers, and the Fathers and Hearsay – for such is reality Rome’s mode of argument in this slipping circle – is a Rule, not of any rational or well-informed Faith, but of Fantasy, at once absurd, impractical, inaccessible, yet viciously convenient.

The Bible, including the Apocrypha; written traditions, comprising one hundred and thirty-five folio volumes of bulls of Popes, decretals, acts of councils, acts of saints, and time writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers for one thousand two hundred years, to be interpreted by some living infallible judge, who has not yet been definitely pointed out in the Church of Rome, and about whom four conflicting opinions obtain to this day among Romanists; and the unwritten traditions or hearsay doctrines among the Romish clergy” [Crompton’s Questions on the Thirty-nine Articles.] – this, assuredly, is more than a safe and tangible “standard and beam to try the weight of truth and falsehood”: the Word of God mixed up with the inventions of man and the devices of Satan.

(g) The claim of Tradition therefore ceases, whether as a Rule of Faith or of Practice. It cannot lead us to Christ. That alone is the province of Holy Scripture. Nor indeed is even any ceremony to be contended for, beyond certain limits, which is not directly probable or fairly deducible from the Revealed Word. “The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible,” must be the Document of Appeal, and the sole Authoritative Teacher of Christians. The right use of Tradition then is wholly subordinate – that of a witness to the truth. Whenever and wherever it reflects the light of God’s Word Written, and just in proportion as it reflects that light, is it valuable.

(h) And this as will have been less or more fully seen, is the plain and unmistakable doctrine of the Church of England throughout her standards.

In the face of this Sixth Article, that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith” – it is simply unblushing perversion of plain language, on the part of Tractarians to say that while the Church may pronounce Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, yet she does not assert it to be the only Rule of Faith!

Even the Three Creeds are only “to be received and believed,” because “they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.”

Again, our Twenty-seventh Article declares that “the Baptism of young Children is in any wise to be retained in the Church.” But why? Because it is “most agreeable with the institution of Christ.”

And the Church of England holds, in her Preface to the Ordination Service, “that from the Apostles’ time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ’s Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.” Why? Primarily, because “it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture,” and secondarily and as confirmatory, “ancient authors”.

Here, and here only, is the true place and legitimate province of Tradition and the Fathers.

(5.) What the Fathers themselves teach.

Ignatius. – “The Gospel is the perfection of incorruptness.”

Irenaeus. – “We know most assuredly that the Scriptures are indeed perfect, because they are dictated by the Word of God and His Spirit.”

“And indeed we have received the economy our salvation by no other but by those by whom the Gospel came to us; which truly they then preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in the Scriptures, to be the pillar and ground of our faith.”

“We following the one and sole true God as our teacher, and having His words for the Rule of Faith, say always the same things concerning the same subjects.”

Clement of Alexandria – “We should not simply attend to the words of men, which it is lawful for us to gainsay. But if it be not sufficient only to say what we think, but what is said ought to be confirmed, let us not wait for testimony from men, but let us confirm what is questioned by the voice of God, which is more certain than all demonstrations, or rather is itself the only demonstration.”

“Perfectly demonstrating out of the Scriptures themselves, concerning themselves, we speak or persuade demonstratively of the faith. Although even they that go after heresies, do dare to use the Scriptures of the Prophets. But first they use not all, neither them that are perfect, nor as the whole body and contexture of the prophecy does dictate; but choosing out those things which are spoken ambiguously, they draw them to their own opinion.”

Tertullian – “Let the shop of Hermogenes [who held that matter was coeternal with God] show that it is written. If it is not written, let him fear the woe destined for those who add to or take from (the Word of God).”

But it is not lawful for us to bring in anything of our own will, nor to choose anything that other men bring in of their own will. We have the Apostles for our authors, who neither themselves chose to bring in anything of their own will; but the discipline (‘disciplinam,’ here = ‘doctrine,’ *Hooker*), which they received of Christ, they delivered faithfully unto the people.”

“But they (the heretics) will believe without the Scriptures, so that they may believe against the Scriptures.”

“Wherever a diversity in the doctrine is found, there it must be concluded that the Scriptures, and the expositions of Scripture, have been corrupted. They who purposed to teach otherwise, must needs have made another disposition of those instruments whence the doctrine is to be derived. For they could not else teach any other doctrine, unless they had wherewithal to teach otherwise. As the corruption of the doctrine could not succeed with them without the corruption of the instruments of proof; so with us also, the integrity of our doctrine could not be ascertained, without the integrity of those things by means of which the doctrine is arrived at. For what have we that is contrary to our Scriptures? what have we inserted of our own, so that we should remedy, by taking away, or adding, or changing anything that can be discovered in it contrary to the Scriptures? What we are, that the Scriptures are from the first. We are from them, before there was anything otherwise than we are.”

Notwithstanding these definite statements as to Scripture being the ultimate and only authoritative document of appeal, Romanists claim *Tertullian* especially as favouring their doctrine of Traditions; and accordingly glean from his writings passages which at first sight, but only by a very cursory reader, might seem to be on their side.

Thus in his book *De Corona Militis*, he says: “If you demand a law taken from the Scriptures for these and other matters of discipline of the same sort, you will find none; we must answer, tradition has established it, custom has confirmed it, and faith has caused it to be observed.” And again: “Even in civil affairs custom is admitted as a law, where the law fails” (*Ibid.*).

But it must be borne in mind that our argument here with Rome is not about “customs” of ritual and “matters of discipline,” but about *Doctrine*, as sanctioned by Tradition: things just as widely apart, as that which may be convenient is from that which is vital. And the argument of Tertullian in these and like passages does not exceed the argument of our own Thirty-fourth Article. Indeed it is fairly open to question whether even he goes so far: –

“If no Scripture has determined this observance, custom certainly has confirmed it, as having, without doubt, emanated from tradition. For how can any practice be observed, if it has not been first handed down? But you say, a written authority must be required to support a tradition. Let us ask, therefore, whether a tradition which is not written ought to be received. We must altogether deny that it is to be received, unless we can adduce examples of other observances, which without the sanction of any Scripture, on the ground of tradition alone, we vindicate on the authority of custom.”

Hippolytus – There is one God, whom, my brethren, we do not otherwise fully know (ἐπιγινώσκομεν), but from the Holy Scriptures. ... Whosoever of us would exercise ourselves in piety towards God, can exercise ourselves in it from no other source, than from the Oracles of God. Whatsoever things, therefore, the Holy Scriptures declare, let us know; and whatsoever things they teach, let us clearly learn. ... Not according to our own will, nor our own mind, neither do violence to those things, which have been given to us by God; but as He by the Holy Scriptures hath vouchsafed to teach us, so let us understand.”

Origen – “The two Testaments – in which every word that appertains to God may be sought out and discussed. ... But if there remaineth anything which the Holy Scripture doth not determine, no third Scripture ought to be recognized as of authority in knowledge. ... But that which remaineth, we must commit to the fire, that is, reserve it unto God. For God would not have us know all things in the present life.”

Cyprian – “Let nothing be innovated but that is delivered. Whence is that Tradition? Does it descend from the authority of our Lord and the Gospel, or does it come from the commands and Epistles of the Apostles? For that those things are to be done, which are written, God testifies and propounds to Joshua, saying, ‘The Book of this Law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate in it day and night, and thou shalt

observe all these things that are written in it to do them.’ The Lord, also, sending His Apostles, commands that ‘all nations should be baptized and taught, that they should observe all things whatsoever He commanded.’ If, therefore, it be either commanded in the Gospel, or in the Epistles of the Apostles, that they that come from any heresy should not be baptized, but that hands should be imposed upon them unto repentance, then let even this holy Tradition be observed.”

No wonder that Bellarmine pronounces these views “one of the errors of Cyprian”!

Constantine – Though not of course in the list of the Fathers, gives us most valuable testimony; whether we regard it in its completeness, or as the opinion of an Emperor, and that the first Christian and greatest of the early age, or as delivered before the Council of Nice: –

“The Evangelical and Apostolical books, and the divine oracles of the ancient Prophets, do clearly teach us whatsoever we are to believe concerning God. ... Let us take the solution of those things that are questioned from the divinely inspired Oracles; certainly accounting nothing as an Article of Faith, but what may be proved from thence.”

Athanasius – “The holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are of themselves sufficient to the enunciation of the truth.”

“Those are the fountains of salvation, that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the oracles contained in them. In them alone is the doctrine of godliness set forth. Let no man add to them, nor take from them.”

Cyril of Jerusalem – For nothing at all ought to be delivered concerning the divine and holy mysteries of the faith, without the holy Scriptures: nor ought we to be at all influenced by probabilities or prepared arguments. Nor in anywise believe me that say these things to you, unless you take the demonstration of the things that are declared, out of the Holy Scriptures.”

“Hold fast to that faith alone which is now delivered to you by the Church, and which is fortified by all Scripture. For since all cannot read the Scriptures; but some, incapacity, others, want of leisure, hinders from attaining knowledge; in order that poor souls may not perish through ignorance, we include the whole doctrine of the faith in a few lines, which I wish you to remember when read to you – engraving the memory of them in your hearts. ... But on a fitting opportunity, draw from the holy Scriptures the proof of everything that is laid down. ... Take heed, therefore, brethren,

that ye observe the traditions which ye have now received, and write them in the breadth of your hearts.”

As an instance of their readiness to grasp at the shadow of an argument, Romanists will have Cyril’s *memorial lines* to make for their Traditions! And consequently, as Cary informs us, here “in the old Paris editions, amongst the marginal notes, which stand as fingerposts to guide the reader to the true meaning of the author,” are the following: “Fides ecclesiae sola servanda,” which he somewhat ironically translates, “The Pope is Infallible!” And: “Traditiones suas servare jubet,” which we suppose he would likewise read, “Cyril’s *memoria technica* means Catholic Tradition.”

Basil – “Every word and action ought to be confirmed by the testimony of the divinely inspired Scriptures, to the full confirmation of the good, and the confusion of the evil.”

“Believe those things which are written; the things which are not written seek not.”

“It is a manifest falling away from the faith, and a proof of arrogance, either to reject any of the things that are written, or to introduce any of the things that are not written.”

Ambrose – “How can we use those things which we find not in the Holy Scriptures?”

Theophilus of Alexandria – “It is an instinct of the devil to follow the sophisms of human minds, and to think anything divine without the authority of the Scriptures.”

Jerome – “As we do not deny those things which are written, so we reject those things that are not written. That God was born of a Virgin we believe, because we read it. That Mary was married after her delivery, we do not believe, because we do not read it.”

Augustine – “In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture, all things are found, which embrace faith and morals.”

“When our Lord Jesus had done many things, they were not all written, as the same holy Evangelist testifies, that the Lord Christ had both said and done many things which were not written; but those things were chosen out to be written, which seemed sufficient for the salvation of believers.”

“Whether it be a question concerning Christ, or whether it be a question concerning His Church, or of what other matter soever the

question be, which appertains to faith, or our life; I will not say if we, but – If an angel from heaven shall preach unto you anything besides that you have received in the Scriptures, under the Law and the Gospel, let him be accursed.”

“If it be established, by the clear authority of the Divine Scriptures, those I mean that are called Canonical in the Church, it is to be believed without any doubt. But other witnesses or testimonies which are used to persuade you to believe anything, you may believe or not, just as you shall see that they have or have not any weight giving them a just claim to your confidence.”

Theodoret – “Bring me not human reasonings and syllogisms; I rely on the Divine Scripture alone.”

Vicentius Lirenensis – “The Canon of Scripture is perfect, and most abundantly sufficient in itself for all things.”

John Damascene – “All things, that are delivered to us by the Law, and the Prophets, and the Apostles, and the Evangelists, we receive, and acknowledge, and reverence, seeking for nothing beyond these.”

Here then is a *Catena* of the Fathers down even to the eighth century, valuable not only for its distinctness, but also for its *instinctiveness*. Had the claims of the later Church of Rome and the Council of Trent been set up, we could not have had fuller *Protestant* testimony. The plain historical fact is, Christendom knew nothing of a *Doctrina Tradita*, independent of and equal in authority with Scripture, till the exigencies of Rome created it, to support her pretensions. And yet the early Fathers especially were wondrously sensitive, and providentially so, about the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture.

It only remains under this head to note two exceptions which Rome takes against our argument.

The first is that some of the Fathers speak of a Rule, outside of and distinct from the Scriptures, by which they are to be interpreted. Thus Irenaeus speaks of “a Canon of Truth” (κανων της ἀληθείας); Tertullian “a Rule of Faith” (*Regula Fidei*); Clement of Alexandria “a Canon of Truth,” or “Ecclesiastical Canon” (κανων εκκλησιαστικός); and Vicentius Lirinensis of “the Rule of Ecclesiastical and Catholic sense.”

But the Rule of Irenaeus and Tertullian was simply the Baptismal Creed – an epitome of doctrine founded on Scripture, not a traditional Revelation. The Rule of Clement was in his own words “the argument and

harmony of the Law and the Prophets with the Covenant of our Lord.” And the Rule of Vicentius was neither more nor less than the received and orthodox collective judgment of Christians, as against “the turnings and twinings” of heretics – the Hermeneutics of the Church. All guards and guides, necessary and imperative; but by no means independent and authoritative parallels with Scripture.

Secondly, Romanists adduce instances where the Fathers preferred to argue from Tradition, in preference to Scripture. Thus Tertullian says: “No appeal must be made to the Scriptures, no contest must be founded on them, in which victory is uncertain. ... The grand question is, To whom does the Rule of Faith itself appertain? in whose keeping are the Scriptures? From whom, and through whom, and when, and to whom was delivered the discipline, by which Christians are made Christians? For where it shall appear that the truth of the Christian discipline and faith is, there will be the truth of the Scriptures, and of their meaning, and of all Christian traditions.

But we must remember that this appeal to Tradition was the only possible argument which the Fathers could use against their adversaries, the heretics. These had not only mutilated the Scriptures, rejecting whatever portion was opposed to them, but had also perverted those portions they did receive to support their own doctrines. This is clear from Tertullian’s own words. “That heresy does not receive certain Scriptures, and what it does receive, by adding and taking away, it perverts to support its own doctrine. If it does receive them, it does not receive them entire.” No other course therefore, under such circumstances, was open to the Fathers, but to appeal to the received doctrines and living voice of the Apostolic Churches. But this assuredly is a different thing altogether from that for which the Church of Rome contends – a new Revelation independent of Scripture. It is merely the historical argument; always legitimate, but of special value and force in the early age of the Church. It is the ever-laudable confirmation of Scripture: but not the awful venture and sin of adding to it.

(6.) What the Bible teaches.

(a) Its own Sufficiency as based upon its Divine Authority.

“And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them” (Exod. 24:12). “Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes, and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live. ... Ye shall not add unto the

word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you” (Deut. 4:1–2). “Ye shall observe to do therefore as the Lord your God hath commanded you: ye shall not turn aside to the right hand or to the left” (Deut. 5:32). “And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites. And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God” (Deut. 17:18–19). “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple” (Psa. 19:7). “Every word of God is pure. ... Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar” (Prov. 30:5–6). “Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man” (Eccles. 12:13). “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them” (Isa. 8:20). “They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them” (Luke 16:29). “Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me” (John 5:39). “These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so” (Acts 17:11). “Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope” (Rom. 15:4). “From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim. 3:15–17).

Now while it is true that all these passages refer primarily to Old Testament Scriptures, yet obviously in their wider and more complete meaning they include retrospectively and prospectively the whole Written word of God, as gradually revealed. For by restricting them to their primary reference – the Old Testament or portions of it – we thereby argue that such portions or the whole are sufficient for salvation; and that therefore no additional revelation was required. Each portion, indeed, was sufficient for its own Economy of the Church; and if so, the argument is abundantly enhanced, and beyond question conclusive, for the full sufficiency of the Completed Canon.

(b) The following passages stamp the New Testament Scriptures as part of God's all-sufficient Word Written:

“The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life” (John 6:63). “The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you” (ch. 14:26). “These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name” (ch. 20:31).

Here we have the all-important reason why St. John was led to write, and not to leave to Tradition, “signs which Jesus did in the presence of his disciples” – “that ye might believe, and have life through his name.” But we have more. If we admit the inspiration of the Apostles, here indeed directly asserted, and the Canonicity of their Books, here also virtually proclaimed, these passages cover not only the Gospel of St. John, but the whole Scriptures of the New Testament as the Recorded Christ Words of Spirit and of Life. And if we have His Life Words thus secured to us in Writing, it is absurd, as well as blasphemous, to add to them by Tradition.

“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book. If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And, if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book” (Rev. 12:18–19).

(c) St. Paul's “Traditions.”

“Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle” (2 Thess. 2:15).

From this and like passages, it is argued, that besides the Christian Scriptures, there was evidently an Apostolic deposit to be guarded in perpetuity – an oral tradition of the Church for all ages. But the argument at once breaks down, if we call to mind the actual circumstances of the case. For the fact is, the Christian Scriptures were not, when the Apostle wrote, either collected or completed, and therefore could not form at the time a standard of reference and appeal. The “word,” or oral sermons and inspired teaching of the Apostle, together with his “Epistle,” constituted the “traditions,” that is doctrines (παραδόσεις) in question; and were in reality all that existed to mold the faith, for example, of the Thessalonians, and so in other cases. It was thus a phase of the infant Church, miraculously

provided for a temporary need, supplied by men under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and which only could be supplied by such. The argument, to be of any permanent force, must produce continuous successors of the Apostles, “full of the Holy Ghost,” and of miraculous power; or, failing this, find us the traditions of St. Paul! To tell us that the Apostles left us traditions, a rule of faith and morals, and yet to be able to give us no catalogue of those traditions, is more than suspicious; it is an open and deliberate imposition upon the credulity of mankind – upon the weakness of men and women who have not courage or strength to think for themselves. The veil is so transparent, and the demand upon belief so gross, that one does wonder at the slavery of the human mind in the Church of Rome – at men not thinking, and at a priesthood “damning doubt”. But, above all, we wonder that the Oxford Divines, in the face of the enlightenment of the nineteenth century and the lessons of history, should attempt to unprotestantize our country, and seek to impose a yoke of tradition upon our necks, which Reason, and the Fathers, and the Bible, thus alike condemn.

Is it the Nemesis of wrong, or the naked impotency of the argument, that leads Dr. Keble and other eminent writers of the Rome-ward school, to build on the foundation of sand – “Traditions, if they can be anyhow authenticated, must necessarily demand the same reverence from us as Holy Scripture?” Yes! “if they can be anyhow authenticated,” then Rome and the Tractarians are right. But if they can’t! the battle of Tradition is lost, and God’s Word Written wins, all along the line!

2. *The Canon of Holy Scripture.*

(1.) The word Canon (κανών), originally used in classic Greek to signify a straight rod, or measuring rule; and so a standard; and in the New Testament, an apportioned line of life (2 Cor. 10:13–16), or rule of conduct (Gal. 6:16), came in the first three centuries to be applied in an ecclesiastical sense, as designating the Creedal Law of the Church, or traditional Rule of Faith, and then passed to denote decisions of discipline.

The transfer to Scripture itself was therefore easy: the sacred Books being first spoken of as canonized or canonical (“Canonical Scriptures,” “Canonized Books,” *Origen*), that is, admitted by rule; and then ultimately as setting forth the rule. Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium, in the fourth century, was the first who applied the word to a list of the Books of the

Bible, though still more definitively in the proper sense of a measure, rather than a catalogue: “This will be the most truthful Canon (i.e., testing Rule) of the Inspired Scriptures, which if you shall obey you will escape the snares of the world.” But the meaning of the word was thus extended to the collection or catalogue of books forming the Bible of the Christian Church.

(2.) Among the names of the Revealed Word, may be noted: –

(a) In Holy Writ.

“The Law,” “The Book of the Law,” “The Law of the Lord,” “The Law and the Prophets,” “The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms”. The latter being the equivalent of “The Law, the Prophets, and the (Holy) Writings” – the threefold division of the Hebrew title of the Bible: Torah, Nebiim, Cethubim (Gr. Hagiographa).

“The Covenant,” “The Book of the Covenant,” “The Covenant of the Lord God,” “The Old Testament” (or “Covenant”).

“The Scriptures” (the general form of quotation employed in the New Testament), “The Holy Scriptures.” The singular – “Scripture” – being used with reference to a particular passage.

“The word,” “The Word of God” (perhaps the most complete title), “The Oracles of God.” “Oracle” – in the singular – being used to denote the place where God was graciously pleased, under the old dispensation, to reveal His will.

So early as the days of St. Peter, the term “Scriptures,” as applied to the recognized Divine Word, would seem to have been given to St. Paul’s Epistles, *as he wrote them* (2 Peter 3:15–16). An important evidence to show that the writings of the Apostles were at once acknowledged by those to whom they came as the Inspired Word of God.

(b) In Christian Literature.

From the foregoing paragraph we may see how, in the sub-Apostolic Church, the New Testament writings, and those of the Old Testament, were incorporated into one common whole, under the appellation of “Scripture”: the writings of the New Testament being grafted, as it were, on those of the Old, and thus both becoming one growth; while, as in nature, the *graft* determined the kind of fruit.

The Christian Scriptures were thus received as Divine, and with the Law and the Prophets on which they were built, were read in the religious assemblies; and so the entire Record of God’s Revelation – the writings of the Old and New Testaments – were accounted, and received a collective

title, in the early Church, as “The Whole Scripture,” “The Two Testaments,” “The Divine Instrument”.

Passing to the fourth century, we find Jerome applying time term, “The Divine Library,” to the whole Bible – but not, as Dr. Westcott states, “the first collective title given”. For Tertullian long before had used in the very same collective sense the titles just quoted – Whole Scripture,” “Two Testaments,” “Divine instrument”. And the use of these terms by Tertullian was simply an embodiment of the thought and language of his own, and even of a still previous, age.

In this century also the Greeks adopted the title, “The Books,” τα βιβλία, plural (“The Holy Books,” *Chrysostom*), which the barbarism of the thirteenth century read in the Western or Latin Church, as a singular noun, *biblia*, “The Book,” or *Bible*. Strange that the confusion of language, indorsed by the common consent of Europe, should thus at last give us one of the most expressive titles to show the preeminence of God’s Word Written.

(3.) The Canon of the Old Testament.

(a) As a preliminary remark we may observe, that the historical evidence as such of Holy Writ is, and must necessarily be, identically the same in principle as the historical evidence of any other writings of a bygone age, while its very fullness demands the attention of every intelligent man. It is not a waif on the stream of time, it is an important stream itself –

“Though deep, yet clear –
Without overflowing, full”

Obviously, it might have pleased Almighty God, by a continuous extension or display of miracle, to support the authority of the books of the Bible, just as it pleased Him, by the miraculous inspiration of his Holy Spirit, to write them. But if we may reason from analogy, this “overflow” of evidence might have been attended with no more marked results than the visible and continuous puttings forth of Divine power in nature. What a very small proportion, even of those who professedly believe in a God, are struck with the proofs of His actual Presence in any one of the many fields of creation. But it does seem wisely ordained to foreclose, as it were, all objection, and so leave His rational creatures without excuse; that in nature on the one hand, and in grace on the other, these two great elements of moral evidence should be respectively vouchsafed to us – the “material work of His

fingers,” and the human testimony of history. Even thus is man raised to be a “worker together with God.”

(b) And this leads us at once briefly to state the grounds upon which the Canonicity of the Bible is based. We receive the Old Testament, or Jewish Scriptures, upon the authority of the recorded testimony of Christ and His Apostles – supplemented and aided by secular evidence. And we receive the recorded testimony of Christ and His Apostles, or the Christian Scriptures, upon the authority of the Primitive Church – the evidence of that Church being handed down to us in documents, customs, and institutions.

(c) Our Lord and his Apostles continually cite or refer to, as authoritative and Divine, a collection of sacred writings known in their days as “The Scriptures,” “The Law,” “The Law and the Prophets,” etc. The simple question, therefore, is, Of what was that collection of Scripture made up? What were the Books of the Jewish Bible? Now the first step in any such inquiry evidently is to take –

The Evidence of Contemporary Authority.

Philo, a contemporary of our Lord, and the representative of the Jewish Church at Alexandria on the Egyptian Dispersion, while laying particular stress on the Pentateuch, from its intrinsic and accidental value – being the keynote of Revelation, and, the first local biblical Greek volume – yet quotes almost every book of the Old Testament, as Divine or authoritative; but does not quote even one Apocryphal writing.

Josephus the historian, born A.D. 37, and surviving the destruction of Jerusalem, and therefore a contemporary of the Apostles, and who may be taken as the representative of the Jewish Church in Palestine, if not indeed a fair and legitimate representative of the whole Jewish Church, includes in his description of the Canon ALL the Books of the Old Testament, under an artificial arrangement of twenty-two, corresponding to the number of letters in the Hebrew Alphabet – but yet really in virtual and exact coincidence with our own list of thirty-nine. While he explicitly *excludes* the Apocrypha in these words: “Books written since the time of Artaxerxes have not the same credit as those before that time, because the succession of prophets has failed.”

He divides the sacred Books into three classes, thus: “We have twenty-two books, containing the record of all time, which have been justly believed to be Divine. Of these, five are the books of Moses, containing the laws and tradition of the creation of man up to Moses’ death – a period little

less than 3000 years. Next, the prophets wrote the acts of their times, from Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes [B.C. 450–410], the successor of Xerxes, king of Persia, in thirteen books. The remaining four books embrace hymns to God and admonitions to men for the conduct of their lives.”

Now, if we carefully mark these definitions, we have the following detail: –

Books of Moses – Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy – five books.

The Prophets. – Joshua, Judges with Ruth, 1st and 2d Samuel (one book), 1st and 2d Kings (one book), Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lamentations, Ezekiel, the Twelve Minor Prophets (one book), Daniel, Job, Ezra, and Nehemiah (one book), Esther, 1st and 2d Chronicles (one book) – thirteen books.

Hymns and Admonitions. – The Psalter, Canticles, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, four books – in all twenty-two books, counted differently with us, but including precisely the books of our present Canon.

This evidence is conclusive, and our argument strictly requires little beyond. But still on each side of this contemporary testimony there lies most important corroborative evidence, which it is therefore of value to trace. Thus, ANTERIOR TO THE CHRISTIAN ERA, we have –

The Evidence of the Apocrypha.

In the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, written by the grandson of the author of the Book, probably about 130 B.C., in the reign of Energetes II, we read: “And not only these things, but *the Law itself, and the Prophets, and the rest of the Books* have no small difference, when they are spoken in their own language.”

Elsewhere we find “The Law,” “The Law and the Prophets,” “The Book of the Testament,” “The Book of the Commandments of God,” “The Book of the Covenant of the Most High God, even the Law which Moses commanded for an heritage unto the congregations of Jacob,” “The Holy Books of Scripture in our hands,” etc.

Now, from all this it is clear that at a date considerably prior to the days of Christ and his Apostles, the Jewish Church had a sacred Code or canon of Scripture accounted Divine; and from the well-known tenacity and reverential care of the Jews in clinging to and guarding the oracles of God, we cannot but conclude that these early Scriptures were identical with the

Scriptures quoted and referred to in the New Testament, and set forth and defined in our Article.

The Evidence of the Septuagint.

Bishop Browne, in his *Exposition of the Articles*, falls into the common error of dating this Alexandrian Greek Version in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus; and assumes that “the Apocryphal books, when written, were in all probability inserted into the Septuagint”; and that our Lord and His Apostles thus cite from a volume containing the Old Testament and “all the Apocryphal books”; and so contends that, if the Apocrypha “were so mischievous, or so to be rejected, as some argue, it is scarcely to be accounted for that neither our Lord nor any of His Apostles gave any warning against them.”

Dr. Westcott also, in one part of his *Bible in the Church*, would incline to the opinion that in the time of Philo (contemporary of our Lord) the Septuagint at Alexandria “was already enlarged beyond the limits of the original Hebrew,” and that “the notion of a definite Bible was obscured” by the addition of “other books – for instance, 1st Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus,” etc. But he evades the conclusion of Bishop Browne as to our Lord’s sanction of a volume containing the true Scriptures and the Apocrypha, by assuming the existence of a Septuagint at Palestine, which threw out the Apocrypha – “a Palestinian Septuagint, revised by the Hebrew, the Greek Bible which was used by our Lord and the Apostles.” While in another part of the same work he distinctly states there is no indication that the enlargement of the Septuagint took place before the Christian era (see pp. 31–35, 124, and Appendix A).

But the truth is, the incorporation of the Apocrypha is one of the most obscure points in the whole range of biblical literature, which must excuse these seemingly negligent statements.

Now, in the first place, the difference of style in the Septuagint proves that it could not have been written in any one period; and critical research tends to show that the Pentateuch was translated first, probably about 285 B.C., in the reign of Philadelphus, and the rest of the Old Testament at successive but uncertain intervals. If, however, we may credit Aristobulus, in the second century before Christ, and the first writer who mentions a Greek version of the Scriptures, the Pentateuch was translated as early as the time of Plato, who he alleges was indebted to it; and Demetrius

Phalereus, the librarian of Philadelphus, promoted the translation of the remainder of the Old Testament during that king's reign.

But, from the "all of the Apocryphal books" which Bishop Browne would insert in the Septuagint in the time of our Lord, we must certainly exclude at least the Second Book of Esdras, which was probably not written, and certainly not completed as it stands, much before the close of the first century of the Christian era.

Then again, as to the existence of a Palestinian Septuagint revised by the Hebrew, we must freely confess that it is one of those hypotheses which are sometimes framed to bridge over a difficulty – the difficulty in this case being of course the Apocrypha and our Lord's sanction of them – without the shadow of a proof. For we need scarcely say there is no record of a revised Septuagint, no trace whatever of it in history. Melito's testimony, which we shall presently discuss, and upon which Dr. Westcott relies, is indeed valuable, but as a link in a higher chain of evidence to show that "the notion of a definite Bible" was never "obscured" by any section of the Jewish Church.

We are thus brought face to face with the inquiry, What were the contents of the Septuagint prior and up to the Christian period? The evidence is circumstantial, but we think nevertheless complete and overwhelming to show that the Septuagint contained, only and as Scripture, the books of the Old Testament. Let us not be misunderstood. We are not here inquiring into the value of the Apocrypha – that will come before us hereafter; nor when or how these writings first appeared and were circulated – an interesting subject, but not within the scope of our Article. We are simply affirming that the Canon of the Jewish Church, up to and during the time of our Lord and His Apostles, and as represented by the Septuagint, included, according to the evidence, only the true Scriptures, and excluded all Apocryphal pieces. And indeed, unless in the presence of the clearest and most direct proof, we do hold it to be most unjust to the Jew to insinuate even in the slightest degree his unfaithfulness to the trust committed him – that of "The Oracles of God".

Our circumstantial evidence in order is as follows: –

The author of the second Prologue to Ecclesiasticus wrote that preface in Egypt – the birthplace of the Septuagint and its alleged corruption – where he translated into Greek and published his grandfather's work, Ecclesiasticus – an expression pure and simple, without any

extraneous influence, of Palestinian theology. But here assuredly was an opening for Alexandrine influence and interpolation; or if filial faith and duty were too strong for this, here at all events was a temptation for a note or turn of expression to show the greater fidelity of the writer's fathers of Palestine. Yet this man, writing under these circumstances, deviates neither to the right hand nor the left, but keeps, as we believe, to the simple path of history, and apparently knows of no "enlargement of the Greek Bible beyond the limits of the original Hebrew Bible" – no other standard but "The Law and the Prophets". This brings us to 130 B.C.

Philo follows, the great representative of the Alexandrian Church, and he brings the evidence down to the very lifetime of our Lord. Now he must have been acquainted with all, if any, incorporations of the Apocryphal books in his own Bible. He never mentions them: never makes a single quotation from them. It is difficult, if not impossible, from his writings to show even that he was aware of the existence of the books in question. But this negative evidence is rendered still more cogent by what we must call his all but direct formal testimony on the point before us. He lived at Alexandria actually "in the midst of the confusion," and "surrounded by the disturbing influences," which Dr. Westcott is pleased to assume prevailed there as to the Word of God. Yet, instead of being moved by those "disturbing influences," he meets, and prophetically as it were, anticipates all unworthy imputations by most emphatic and, as we think, silencing words. For he declares that such was the intense veneration of the Jews for their Bible, that nothing would induce them "to alter one word of their Scriptures, and that they would rather die ten thousand deaths than suffer any alteration in their laws and statutes."

In the face of all this, we cannot but strongly protest against the language of Dr. Westcott, who first imagines he can "easily see" in Philo "a tendency to break down the boundaries of the Old Testament, by an undue exaltation of the Pentateuch in comparison with the other books," and then goes on bluntly to assert that "this tendency was restrained by a familiarity with the opinions of his countrymen in Palestine!" Philo, it is true, drew the bulk of his illustrations from the Pentateuch, and for the very natural reason that the Pentateuch formed the subject of his great work; but he by no means neglects the other portions of the Canon. And he had strength enough of mind distinctly to formulate and stand by his own opinion.

Let us now turn to what should ever be the central figures of every Christian picture – Christ and His Apostles; and see what Bible they read, and whether it is possible there was aught between the lines. The Bible of Christ and His Apostles, then, clearly, we think, was Greek – the Septuagint, *Philo's Bible*. Greek was the language spoken by the communities addressed. And the Old Testament quotations agree generally with the Septuagint, less or more closely. The Septuagint therefore most probably was not only the common Bible of Palestine, but occupied, though perhaps without any formal enactment, much of the precise place among all Greek-speaking Jews which our Authorized Version does among us; while the Hebrew copies of the Canon, and above all the Temple Copy at Jerusalem, would serve valuable purposes of reference and verification in the same way as our Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament. Now our Lord and His Apostles quote as authoritative and repeatedly every one of the three great Sections of the original Canon, and so in reality cover the whole in detail, and every separate book in our different arrangement of Thirty-nine – except six, Judges, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Solomon's Song – but they do not quote, either as authoritative or direct, one single book or sentence from the Apocrypha. Yea, moreover, it cannot be shown, except on the very slenderest evidence, that our Lord (humanly) or His Apostles were even so much as acquainted with the Apocrypha.

Again, our Lord and his Apostles, as they rebuke no Jew for tampering with the true Scriptures, or “obscuring the notion of a definite Bible,” so neither do they applaud any section of the Jewish Church for purging those Scriptures of Apocryphal pieces – for a revised Septuagint. Here they neither praise nor blame, counsel faithfulness, nor denounce unfaithfulness. If anything, the New Testament is on the side of Philo and, as we shall see, Josephus, who both declare the unalterable attachment of the Jews even to the letters of the law, and the oracles of God. “Ye do search the Scriptures” (Christ). The Bereans were “noble, in that they searched the Scriptures daily” (St. Luke).

Lastly, at the beginning of the Christian era, the Alexandrian Jews, though in great measure politically divided from the Palestinian party, and though long oppressed by their own taxes, still contributed to the temple service at Jerusalem. Jerusalem, “the Vision of Peace,” was still, though Grecized, “the Holy city” of the Jewish people. And the Alexandrians had a synagogue there, whose zeal for “Moses and God” stoned the protomartyr

Stephen. Add, Apollos; born at Alexandria, an eloquent [or *learned*] man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus” about, 54 A.D., and proceeded, as the loving “brother” of St. Paul, to water what the Apostles had planted. Now, all this looks very like a common faith, and, as the bond of it, a common Bible. On the other hand, if the Alexandrians had an interpolated Bible, and the Palestinians an expurgated Bible, on what rational principle can we suppose that *nobody knew it*? How explain that our Lord and His Apostles never once refer to it? that Stephen, in his life-defense, does not see that here is a main and triumphant charge against his murderers? that Apollos forgets it? that there was not internecine war.

Take then, at random, any one of these facts in connection with our Lord and the New Testament – and they are or must be universally admitted facts – take them all, and is not the individual and cumulative evidence a demonstration that the Jewish Church had but one faith – but one Canon – but one definite Bible – a Septuagint unobscured by the Apocrypha?

Two important witnesses remain, Josephus and Melito.

Josephus carries the evidence over the destruction of Jerusalem. His devoted attention to all the concerns of his faith and Church is proverbial. Not only is he the great historian of the Jewish people, but what is valuable in the present case, the minute *historian of Jewish details*. Now he never speaks a word, nor throws out a single hint, either about the strange doings and innovations at Alexandria, or about any sacred revise at Palestine. Granted that he had in his eye, and does actually refer to, the Apocrypha, in the brief and incidental words – “our history written since Artaxerxes” – it is only as we have seen to pronounce against the Divine authority of all such books; and the adjudication, be it observed, as in juxtaposition with the recital of the sacred Canon. If, then, the Apocrypha had been, to any extent, or in any way, incorporated with that Canon, is it at all likely that a circumstance of such moment could have escaped the notice of Josephus?

Then again, as in the case of Philo, the following testimony of Josephus is invaluable, as showing not only the improbability, but what we must rather call the utter impossibility of change, at any time, or in any quarter, in the Jewish mind with regard to the sacred writings: “That firm faith we have placed in those books [the twenty-two recounted above] of one nation, is manifest by our conduct. For during so many ages as have already passed, no one has dared to presume either to *add anything to them*, or to take anything from them, or to alter anything in them. But it becomes

natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem those books as the oracles of God, and to remain constant to them, and if occasion be, willingly to die for them. For it is no new thing for our captive countrymen, many of them in number, and frequently in time, to be seen to endure racks and deaths of all kinds upon the theatres, rather than utter one word against our laws, and the records that contain them.”

Melito, Bishop of Sardis, supposed by some to have been the Angel of that Church addressed in Rev. 3:1, but who most probably lived later on, in the latter half of the second century, is the earliest Christian writer who furnishes a catalogue of the Old Testament Scriptures, having expressly visited the East accurately to learn the number and order of the books; and he reports our present Canon. His words are: –

“Melito to Onesimus, his brother, greeting. Since you have often, from your zeal for the Word of God, begged of me to make selections for you from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and our whole faith; and as you, moreover, wished to learn accurately of the old books, how many they are in number and in what order they are written, I have taken great pains to do it, well knowing your zeal for the faith, and your great desire to learn of the Word of God; and that, through your earliest love towards God, you desire these more than all things, striving for your eternal safety. I went accordingly to the East, and coming to the very place where these things were preached and transacted, and having accurately learnt the books of the Old Testament, I have sent to you the subjoined list. Their names are as follows: Five Books of Moses, viz., Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy; Joshua, Nane, Judges, Ruth, four Books of Kings, two of Paralipomena, a Book of the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon – which is also called Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Job, the Books of the Prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve one Book, Daniel, Ezekiel, Esdras.”

Note. – “Four Books of Kings” = our 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings. “Two of Paralipomena “(or “things omitted”) = our 1 and 2 Chronicles. “Esdras” = Ezra; to which was commonly attached Nehemiah, and probably Esther. While Lamentations was joined with Jeremiah.

Now an all-important point in this testimony is that *Melito’s list is taken from the Septuagint* – without, of course, one trace of the Apocrypha. Our evidence thus at last ceases to be merely circumstantial, and becomes instead positive and direct. Whether Melito lived in the days of St. John or

of Marcus Antoninus, he gives us the Table of Contents of the Jewish Canon, as he found it – a facsimile in outline of the Septuagint of his day, handed down without a single Apocryphal piece to mar or obscure it. Somewhat long and anxious therefore as our inquiry has been, it is satisfactory to arrive at this unmistakable result, and that all the lines of evidence converge to it. Dr. Westcott does not fail to notice this “important feature” of Melito’s list – “evident from the names, the number, and the order of the books” – but to meet the difficulty in which he finds himself he unhappily invents, as we have seen, with pious purpose we doubt not, a Palestinian Septuagint revised by the Hebrews. We can only add – painfully, but imperatively as a Christian duty – that the interests of truth are not served in this instance at least by fiction; as indeed they seldom are by unwarranted deviation from the landmarks, the plain path and leadings of history. For granted there was a Palestinian revise, and we are inevitably driven to this very humbling conclusion, among others, that our Lord and Apostles, so the abrogators of the Jewish, and the founders and heralds of the Christian Dispensation, were, either ignorant of the spiritual and ecclesiastical status of an important section of the Jewish Church – of Alexandria and its Septuagint – or, connived at its corruption!

The value then of the subject of our argument – an uncorrupted Septuagint of the Jewish Church – is immense. It relegates the Apocrypha to their proper place. It vindicates our Lord and His Apostles. It is an unanswerable historical protest against Rome and the Council of Trent. It stops the sneer of the skeptic against all human accretions.

And the force of the evidence of the Septuagint itself as regards the Canon of the Old Testament is this, that it carries that Canon a marked stage higher in antiquity and value. For a long period before Christianity – wherever the Greek language was spoken, wherever Jews were resident, or Gentiles attracted to their history, there existed and was circulated the Septuagint Translation. Now what is the full bearing of this fact? This, that the Canon of Josephus, the Canon of Christ’s Bible and of the Jewish Dispensation, existed as a Written Published Book, long *before* the actual date of the Septuagint. A translation of course implies an original copy. And an original copy in this instance must have had a lengthened previous public existence, of acknowledged Divine authority. A nation does not accept a Rule of Faith in a day. And no nation, however anxious for a place in history, would have accepted the lowly pilgrim and slave-stained origin,

and the stiff-necked character assigned to the Jews in the Old Testament, unless it had been convinced of the supernatural claims of the Book.

Evidence from the Old Testament itself.

On the threshold lies the question, If the Jewish Scriptures were not written and published as they stand in their entirety, and at periods somewhat such as assigned, how account for them – how were they handed down, or how came they to be accepted by the Jewish nation?

This is a question of vast importance, for we conceive it has no fitting answer but one which carries us back with our Canon, as a completed whole, to the period of the Return; and down to that terminus, in successive and recognized stages of growth, from the days of Moses. Poetical and many historical pieces might be transmitted from generation to generation by memory. But the Old Testament is honeycombed with a very large amount of detail of personal names, numbers, places, and things which you cannot detach without hopeless confusion; and which no rational mind could memorize in their varied and intricate connection. Analysts and duly appointed historiographers there may and must have been, but publicity and popular instruction are indispensable factors in any rational solution of the problem. The law must have been an open book; and the Prophets could have had no mission unless known to the people. Nor is it possible to believe that the Jews would endorse as a whole a production like the Old Testament, even if it was possible on any reasonable grounds to suppose it appearing at once, and offered as their history and for their guidance.

And when we examine the book itself, we find abundant evidence of our argument. Once and again do we meet “The Book of the Law,” “The Book of Moses,” and explicit commands or references concerning the words of the Lord as *written* in an accessible (?) *book*. Daniel “understood by *the* books [the article is in the original] the number of the years.” And the burden of the Prophets is “Hear”. While the office of the Scribe – the index to the genius and character of the religions system of the Jews – in its great ideal was, “to seek the Law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments” (Ezra 7:10). Nor must we forget that a Psalter is a Book for the Public Service of God. How strikingly corroborative of these features are the words of our Lord: “All things must be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the [published and popular?] Scriptures” (Luke 24:44–

45). And the words of St. Paul: “From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures” (2 Tim. 3:15). And of St. James: “Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day” (Acts 15:21).

But again, POSTERIOR TO THE CHRISTIAN ERA, we have –

The Evidence of the Talmud.

This written judgment of the Babylonian Dispersion is invaluable, inasmuch as it reflects and embodies the opinion of the Jews on the Canon from, probably, a very high antiquity down to 500 years after Christ; and indeed, as it may be said, to the present day.

It consists of two Parts. (1) The Text, Mishna (*repetition*, or “second law,” δευτέρωσις), a digest of oral ritual law handed down, as the tradition is, from Moses on the mount, through the Sanhedrim, and ultimately to Rabbis of the second century (notably R. Judah, the Holy), or later, by whom, to guard against loss in the now unsettled state of the people, it was arranged and, completed; and so remains, an object of the highest veneration. (2) The Gemara (*supplement or perfection*), consisting of two commentaries – one compiled at Jerusalem between the third and fifth centuries, but little esteemed by the Jews; and the other at Babylon, in the fifth century, and most highly valued. The Mishna with the commentary of Jerusalem is styled the Jerusalem Talmud; with the commentary of Babylon, the Babylonish Talmud; while the word “Talmud” alone is generally used to denote the Mishna with both Gemaras.

Now a very valuable passage in the Talmud, Babylonish Gemara, is to the following effect: –

“Who wrote [that is, *composed or redacted*, as the case may be] the Books of the Bible? Moses wrote the Pentateuch and Job. Joshua his own Book, and the last eight verses of Deuteronomy. Samuel his own Book, and the Books of Judges and Ruth. David the Book of Psalms, but some were composed by the ten venerable Elders – Adam, Melchizedek, Abraham, Moses, Haman, Jeluthun, Asaph, and the three sons of Korah. Jeremiah his own Book, and the Books of Kings and Lamentations. Hezekiah and his college, the memorial Book Jamshak – that is, Isaiah, Proverbs, Solomon’s Song, and Ecclesiastes. The men of the Great Synagogue, the memorial Book Kandag – that is, Ezekiel, the twelve Minor Prophets, Daniel, and

Esther. Ezra his own Book, and the Chronicles down to his time. But who completed the Chronicles? Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah.”

It is only necessary to remark here that the Book of Nehemiah was commonly reckoned by the Jews, as noted above, with that of Ezra; and that both indeed formed an Appendix to the Chronicles.

Nothing therefore could be more satisfactory. Not only are the whole books, and only the books, of the present Canon included; but the tradition is one of the very highest possible antiquity – a landmark most probably just between the actual completion of the Canon and the development of the Synagogue. For there is no reference whatever to the usual threefold division of the Old Testament Scriptures – Law, Prophets, and Holy Writings – which there is every reason to conclude the Synagogue adopted for greater convenience in the services.

Finally, with the New Testament in our hands, it is unnecessary to examine in any detail the Testimony of our Lord and His Apostles to the Jewish Scriptures, as set forth in our present Canon of the Old Testament. Some of the chief heads have been already noticed. And it may suffice to add, that our Great Exemplar and His Inspired Followers ever refer to the Scriptures of that Canon, just as we refer to our own Bible – as a Book *sui generis* and Divine; that the quotations, references, and allusions, in the New Testament, in proof or illustration, are immense; and that if we could possibly cut away and extract the Old Testament from the New, we should have little or nothing left as a basis – a *permanent way* of Christianity.

Such then are the Contents of Christ’s Bible. Such the Canon of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament; received by the Jewish Church, and endorsed by our Lord and His Apostles, as of God. And such the trust handed over to the Christian Church. How that Church has kept the sacred deposit is an inquiry belonging more properly to the Section which treats of the use and abuses of the Apocrypha.

(4.) The Canon of the New Testament.

(a) We have already briefly adverted to the fact that the writings of St. Paul – and by fair and reasonable inference, the other books of the New Testament? – were accepted as authoritative amid Divine, when first published [see above]: that is generally by those to whom they were addressed, and among whom their circulation was directed. But a fact is simply an effect with a cause. Now the question which we think lies at the root so to speak of the Canon, and which has been too much lost sight of is,

How account for the reception of the books? We confess we cannot, unless on the lines of a supernatural influence.

Take the case as it stands. These books appealed on the one hand to the Jew, but blasted his earthly hopes; gave him the Nazarene for his Messiah and justification by faith instead of a covenant of works. And they appealed in like to the Gentile, but denounced his idols; gave him a Spirit to worship, Unseen as against his tangible gods, and One to replace an innumerable host.

No human process could carry conviction here.

Of course it may and must be alleged that the Gospel was first oral at the mouths of the Apostles, and then written and circulated by their hands. But this is just part, though not the whole; of the supernatural influence we contend for. It would in great measure secure the reception of the genuine writings in the East; but it could scarcely carry them, in plenary power and broadcast, to the West. Apostolic miracle would procure a certain amount of reverence for Apostolic teaching; and Apostolic teaching would procure a certain amount of reverence for Apostolic books. But the Apostolic area was limited, in time as well as in extent. And beyond it, as to extent, Apostolic power would be little of a vital force; and as to time, would decrease in a ratio rapid enough to leave, not an equal field for the genuine and the spurious writings, but a vantage ground for the latter, inasmuch as they pandered to prejudice and prevailing corruptions. Thus in the Apocryphal Gospels we have, besides evident heretical omissions, accretions, and divergences, Miracle not infrequently *prostrated* to selfish purposes; Prophecy and Parabolic Teaching alike ignored; history as a sort of stiffened corpse, without a single pulse of spiritual life connecting it with the past or typically with the future; and the pure atmosphere of the Morality of the Synoptic Gospels, and the Divine Wisdom of St. John's, clouded by the natural darkness and the wild or empty dreams of unregenerate man. The platform of the Canonical Gospels is that of the Spirit of Life in a Christ both God and Man; the role of the Apocryphal it is true takes in the main the same historic platform, but with a motley admixture of earthly characteristics – now frivolous, now fabulous, often immoral.

At this exact stage of our argument, we have little or nothing to do with the after judgment of Christendom. Its Homologoumena and Antilegomena had no place in the Apostolic Church. Nay rather, the very

distinction itself and its date is plain proof, (1) that there was handed down to the sub-Apostolic Church what we may call, and with little anachronism even of language, a definite and detailed list of New Testament Scriptures – the very Canon we possess; and (2) that the supernatural influence which first carried that Canon was now, comparatively, on the wane.

The full supernatural influence then which we claim alike for Apostolic oral and written teaching was the special “mighty power” of the Holy Ghost, working not only in and through, but *with* the Apostles – as One of them.

“For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you” (Matt. 10:20). “For he dwelleth *with* you, and shall be in you” – “He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you” (John 14:17, 26). “When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, *he shall testify of me. And ye also shall bear witness*, because ye have been with me from the beginning” (John 15:26–27).

No words more fully could show the joint and actual Agency of the Holy Ghost on the Apostolic Mission Field.

Here then, we conceive, we have the only and true key to the Formation of the New Testament Canon – a Divine influence which at once overcame Jewish antagonism, healed Gentile blindness, gave the Church of God an accepted and additional Revelation, and so bound up the New Testament in one volume with the Old.

(b) With this calculus we are enabled to pass to the post-Apostolic age, prepared on the one hand to find, as we have intimated, this supernatural influence relatively on the wane; and unshaken on the other hand by any ecclesiastical development. God designs, completes, and offers His gifts, but leaves man to test, accept, or reject them. Not that his guiding and gracious influence is ever taken away from the whole body of the Church of Christ, for that were to deny Himself, and forget His promise sealed in the Mediatorial Person of Emmanuel. “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world (Matt. 28:20); but the withdrawal in measure of the extraordinary operation of Divine power is necessary – as God is pleased to administer the general government of the world – to enlist man as an intelligent coworker, and constitute him a rational recipient of Divine grace and goodness.

We use the qualifying coincident terms “comparatively,” “relatively,” “in measure,” advisedly. For we are free to confess our belief, that the Bible – notwithstanding all its external and internal evidence, and as matter of argument the overwhelming force thereof – could not, because of its sharp and searching antagonism to the human heart, hold its way, even today, were it not for the still less or more sustained “energy of the might of the power” (Eph. 1:19) of God the Holy Ghost. This, we must ever bear in mind, is, in the Economy of Redemption, the New Covenant Dispensation of the Spirit – “The Spirit of Life,” breathing and brooding on the Church of God.

(c) The formation or ratification then of the Canon of the New Testament, like that of the Old, was the work directly of God, not only in and through, but with His chosen and appointed servants: on the Divine side, of the Holy Spirit’s special “mighty energy”; and on the human side of men under His inspiration. The final and formal settlement of the Old Testament Canon being the work, most probably of Ezra, in the lifetime of the last of the prophets, at the end of the fourth century before Christ; and of the New Testament Canon, doubtlessly of St. John, towards the close of his career, as chief pastor of the Asiatic Churches.

It is a low view – and the fruitful parent of much of the neology of our day – to suppose that it was left for the post-Apostolic age to dig out of the Apostolic churches and depositories our five histories and twenty-two epistles, and with varying vote pronounce them authoritative and Divine – the Canon of the New Testament – the perfection of God’s Work, and even still more were it possible, the perfection of God’s Word, is of God, and not of man.

The “documents of the primitive Church,” therefore, which we claim as part of our evidence of Christianity, are, first and especially, the *Books of the New Testament themselves*. The judgments and decisions of the Fathers and of Councils are valuable, but only of a secondary, and, as we shall see in some cases, feeble importance. Here as elsewhere these venerable representatives of Christian antiquity are indeed valuable as witnesses, generally agreeing; but their very doubts, though not perhaps on the canonicity of any of the books, yet on the genuineness even of a few, clearly stamps them as unfit to be judges of Holy Writ. Right willingly and thankfully do we accept their *testimony*, so far as it goes, and rejoice that it is so uniform in the main; but we cannot accept them as *authorities*. There

must be an infallible standard, infallibly ratified, above the fluctuations of fallible men and “councils liable to err”. And, that standard we hold to be neither less nor more than the Canon settled and completed by St. John, and finally sealed by the anathema of the closing verses of Revelation.

If we are asked for proof positive or probable that St. John affixes his seal to every book of the New Testament, we answer: (1) that the aged Apostle must have been intimately acquainted with the books which his Church handed down, and their pretensions; (2) that these books must have been before him in their entirety not less than thirty years before his death; (3) that as matter of fact, the post-Apostolic Church had no other books handed down for its acceptance but our Canon, as witness its Homologoumena and Antilegomena – its Notha, or unauthentic and apocryphal books, being of later date, or rejected by all except heretics; and (4) that as matter of fact also, open to verification by anyone who pleases to undertake the task, St. John in his last great work distinctly quotes or refers to almost every book in detail of the Canon, but does *not* once quote any spurious unapostolic writing that may have been extant in his time.

We must therefore protest not only against Rome’s dogma, that the Canon was first fixed by the Church, in its plenary authority, at the end of the fourth century; but also against the like erroneous, though somewhat diluted view, that the formation of a New Testament was “an intuitive act” of post-Apostolic Christianity. The one is the gross form of the proposition that the Church is the Judge of Holy Writ, and superior to the Scriptures, which we have already throughout sufficiently controverted; the other is a more subtle affirmation of the same doctrine, and needs some separate consideration.

Thus Dr. Westcott writes: “The Apostolic Fathers did not recognize a New Testament, but prepared the way for it.” And: “The formation of a New Testament was an intuitive act of the Christian Body, derived from no reasoning, but realized in the course of its natural growth, as one of the first results of its self-consciousness.”

This account differs only from that of the Church of Rome in this, that in the one case we are on the somewhat tangible ground of decretal judgment, however erring we may consider that judgment to be, and in the other case, in the at least theologically slippery domain of assumption without reasoning. But it is Man in both cases: Fallibility bringing forth Infallibility, or – nothing. For it is clear, as we have just seen, that the

Canon of the New Testament, equally with that of the Old, must be stamped with Infallible – that is, as we are bound to hold, Divine authority, otherwise it has no shadow of a claim to acceptance by the Church of God.

In the ninth chapter of his “Evidences of Christianity,” Foley arranges the historical testimony to the reception of the Canon of the New Testament under eleven sections, summarized from Lerdner. An outline of the whole is not necessary to our argument, and would unduly swell our pages; but the following selections, in clear refutation of Dr. Westcott’s theory, may be sufficient for the student, and interesting as well to the general reader. The “allegations” are quoted entire; the proof is considerably, but it is hoped not overmuch compressed, and follows with only some slight verbal or structural alterations the exact words of the Author.

I. The historical books of the New Testament, meaning thereby the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, are quoted, or alluded to, by a series of Christian writers, beginning with those who were contemporary with the Apostles, or who immediately followed them, and proceeding in close and regular succession from their time to the present.

Barnabas was the companion of St. Paul. In an Epistle ascribed to him, and bearing his name – which purports to have been written soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, and which bears the character of the age to which it professes to belong – we have the following remarkable passage: –

“Let us, therefore, beware lest it come upon us, *as it is written*, There are many called, few chosen.”

From the expression, “as it is written,” we infer with certainty, that at the time when the author of this epistle lived, there was a *book* extant, well known to Christians, and of authority amongst them, containing these words, “Many were called, few chosen.” Such a book is our present Gospel of St. Matthew, in which this text is twice found, and is found in no other book now known.

Further, the writer of the epistle was a Jew. And the phrase “it is written,” was the very form in which the Jews quoted their *Scriptures*.

Clement, bishop of Rome, whom ancient writers, without any doubt or scruple, assert to have been the Clement whom St. Paul mentions, Phil. 4:3, in an epistle addressed by him to the Church of Corinth, and acknowledged by all the ancients, has the following valuable passage: –

“Especially remembering the words of the Lord Jesus which He spoke, teaching gentleness and long-suffering, for thus he said: Be ye

merciful, that ye may obtain mercy; forgive, that it may be forgiven unto you," etc.

Again: "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, for he said, woe to that man by whom offences come; it were better for him that he had not been born, than that he should offend one of my elect; it were better for him that a millstone should be tied about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the sea, than that he should offend one of my little ones."

In both these passages we perceive the high respect paid to the words of Christ as recorded by the evangelists, "*Remember* the words of the Lord Jesus; – by this command, and by these rules, let us establish ourselves, that we may always walk obediently to his holy words."

We perceive also in Clement a total unconsciousness of doubt, whether these were the real words of Christ, which are read as such in the Gospels. This observation indeed belongs to the whole series of testimony, and especially to the most ancient part of it.

It is to be observed also that, as this epistle was written in the name of the Church of Rome, and addressed to the Church of Corinth, it ought to be taken as exhibiting the judgment not only of Clement, who drew up the letter, but of these Churches themselves, at least as to the authority of the books referred to.

It may be, and indeed has been said that, as Clement had not used words of quotation, it is not certain that he refers to any *book* whatever. But that no such inference can be drawn is proved thus: First, Clement, in the very same manner, without any mark of reference, uses a passage now found in the Epistle to the Romans (ch. 1:29), which, from the peculiarity of the words and from their order, it is manifest he must have taken *from the book*. The same remark may be repeated of some very singular sentiments in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Secondly, there are many sentences of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians standing in Clement's epistle without any sign of quotation, which yet certainly *are quotations*; because it appears that Clement had St. Paul's Epistle before him, inasmuch as in one place he mentions it in terms too express to leave us in any doubt: – "Take into your hands the epistle of the blessed Apostle Paul." Thirdly, this method of adopting words of Scripture without reference or acknowledgment, was a method in general use amongst the most ancient Christian writers. These analogies not only repel the objection, but cast the presumption on the other side, and afford a considerable degree of positive proof that the words in

question have been borrowed from *the places of Scripture* in which we now find them.

Hermas appears in the catalogue of Roman Christians saluted by St. Paul (Rom. 16:14). A work bearing his name, and in all likelihood rightly, is still remaining, called the Shepherd, or Pastor of Hermas. In this piece are tacit allusions to St. Matthew's, St. Luke's, and St. John's Gospels: that is, applications of thoughts and expressions found in these Gospels, without the place or writer from which they are taken being cited. There is also a probable allusion to Acts 5:32.

Ignatius became Bishop of Antioch about thirty-seven years after Christ's Ascension. In his smaller Epistles – generally deemed to be those which were read by Irenaeus, Origen, and Eusebius – are various undoubted allusions to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John; yet so far of the same form with those in the preceding articles, that, like them, they are not accompanied with marks of quotation.

In one place also Ignatius quotes St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians by *name*; while, in several other places, he borrows words and sentiments from the same epistle without mentioning it; which shows, that this was his general manner of using and applying writings then extant, and then of high authority.

Polycarp had been taught by the Apostles, and was by them appointed Bishop of Smyrna. We have one undoubted Epistle of his remaining. And this, though a short letter, contains nearly forty clear allusions to books of the New Testament; more frequently to the writings of St. Paul, but copiously also to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. The following is a decisive, though what we call a tacit, reference to St. Peter's speech in the Acts of the Apostles "Whom God hath raised, having loosed the pains of death."

Papias, a hearer of St. John, and companion of Polycarp, expressly ascribes the respective Gospels to St. Matthew and St. Mark; and in a manner which proves that these Gospels must have *publicly borne* the names of these authors at that time, and probably *long before*.

The writers hitherto alleged had all lived and conversed with some of the Apostles. The works of theirs which remain are in general very short pieces, yet rendered extremely valuable by their antiquity; and none, short as they are, but contain some important testimony to our historical Scriptures.

Justin Martyr follows not much more than twenty years after Papias. Although the nature of his two principal writings – one addressed to heathens, and the other a conference with a Jew – did not lead him to much frequent appeals to Christian books, as in a discourse for Christian readers; we nevertheless reckon up in them between twenty and thirty quotations of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, certain, distinct, and copious; if each verse be counted separately, a much greater number; if each expression, a very great one. [“He cites our present Canon and particularly our four Gospels, continually; I dare say, above two hundred times” (Jones’s New and Full Method).]

Moreover, what seems extremely material to be observed is that in all Justin’s works, from which might be extracted almost a complete life of Christ, there are but two instances, in which he refers to anything as said or done by Christ, which is not related concerning Him in our present Gospels: which shows, that these Gospels, and these, we may say, alone, were the authorities from which the Christians of that day drew the information upon which they depended.

All the references in Justin, too, are made without mentioning the author; which proves that these books were *perfectly notorious*. But although he mentions not the author’s name, he calls the books, “Memoirs composed by the Apostles and their companions”: which descriptions, the latter especially, *exactly agree* with the titles which the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles *now bear*.

Hegesippus came about thirty years after Justin. He relates that travelling from Palestine to Rome, he visited, on his journey, many Bishops; and that, “in every succession, and in every city, the same doctrine is taught, which the Law, and the Prophets, and the Lord teacheth.” This is an important attestation. It is generally understood, that by the word “Lord,” *Hegesippus* intended some writing or writings, containing the teachings of Christ, in which sense alone the term combines with the other terms “Law and Prophets,” which denote writings; and together with them admit of the verb “teacheth” in the present tense. Then, that these writings were some or all of the books of the New Testament is rendered probable from other passages in the fragment of his works.

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, had been a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John. He says: “We have not received the knowledge of the way of salvation by any others than those by whom the Gospel has been brought to us. Which Gospel they first preached and afterwards, by the will

of God, committed to writing, that it might be for time to come the foundation and pillar of our faith. Matthew, among the Jews, wrote a Gospel in their own language; and afterwards, Mark also, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that had been preached by Peter; and Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the Gospel preached by Paul. Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon His breast, he likewise published a Gospel while he dwelt at Ephesus in Asia." If any modern divine should write a book upon the genuineness of the Gospels, he could not assert it more expressly, or state their original more distinctly, than Irenaeus hath done within little more than a hundred years after they were published.

To the book of the Acts of the Apostles, its author, and credit, the testimony of Irenaeus is no less explicit.

Observe also the broad line of distinction between our sacred books, and the pretensions of all others: in an author abounding with references and allusions to the Scriptures, there is not *one* to any apocryphal Christian writings whatever.

The force of the testimony of the period which we have considered, is greatly strengthened by the observation, that it is the testimony, and the concurring testimony, of writers who lived in countries remote from one another. Clement flourished at Rome, Ignatius at Antioch, Polycarp at Smyrna, Justin Martyr in Syria, and Irenaeus in France.

II. The Scriptures were in very early times collected into a distinct volume.

Ignatius, who had lived and conversed with the Apostles, speaks of "the Gospel" and of "the Apostles" in terms which render it very probable that he meant by "the Gospel," the book or volume of the Gospels, and by "the Apostles," the book or volume of their Epistles. His words are: "Fleeing to the Gospel as the flesh of Jesus, and to the Apostles as the presbytery of the Church." That is, as Le Clerc interprets, "In order to understand the will of God, he fled to the Gospels, which he believed no less than if Christ in the flesh had been speaking to him; and to the writings of the Apostles, whom he esteemed as the presbytery of the whole Christian Church." It must be observed, that about eighty years after this, we have *direct proof* in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, that these two names, "Gospel" and "Apostles," were the names by which the writings of the New Testament, and the division of these writings, were *usually expressed*.

Quadratus and some others, who were the immediate successors of the Apostles, traveling abroad to preach Christ, as Eusebius relates, carried the Gospels with them, and delivered them to their converts. “Then travelling abroad, they performed the work of Evangelists, being ambitious to preach Christ, and *deliver the Scripture of the Divine Gospels.*” What is thus recorded of the Gospels took place within sixty, or, at the most seventy years after they were published: and it is evident that they must, before this time (and, it is probable, long before this time) have been in general use, and in high esteem in the churches planted by the Apostles; and the immediate successors of the Apostles, they who preached the religion of Christ to those who had not already heard it, carried the volume with them, and delivered it to their converts.

Irenaeus puts the *evangelic and apostolic writings* in connection with the Law and the Prophets, manifestly intending by the one a Code or collection of Christian sacred writings, as the other expressed the Code or collection of Jewish sacred writings.

Melito, at this time Bishop of Sardis, writes to Onesimus that he had procured an accurate account of the books of the Old Testament; which term certainly proves that there was then a volume or collection of writings called the *New Testament*.

III. Our Scriptures were publicly read and expounded in the religious assemblies of the early Christians.

Justin Martyr, who wrote in the year 140, which was seventy or eighty years after some, and less, probably, after others of the Gospels were published, giving in his first Apology an account to the emperor of the Christian worship, has this remarkable passage: —

“*The Memoirs of the Apostles, or the Writings of the Prophets, are read according as the time allows: and, when the reader has ended, the president makes a discourse, exhorting to the imitation of so excellent things.*”

A few short observations will show the value of this testimony.

(1.) The “Memoirs of the Apostles,” Justin in another place expressly tells us, are what are called Gospels: “and that they were the Gospels which are now use, is made certain by Justin’s numerous quotations from *them*, and his silence about any others.

(2.) Justin describes the *general usage* of the Christian Church.

(3.) Justin does not speak of it as recent or newly instituted, but in the terms in which men speak of *established customs*.

Tertullian follows in about fifty years, and in his account of the religious assemblies as they were conducted says: “We come together to recollect the Divine Scriptures; we nourish our faith, raise our hope, confirm our trust, by the Sacred Word.”

This writer also divides the Christian Scriptures into two parts, the “Gospels and Apostles,” as does his contemporary Clement of Alexandria in many allusions, and Ignatius, eighty years before; and calls the whole volume, the “New Testament”.

Who can rise up from the candid perusal of this masterly argument, curtailed and in outline though it be, and say that the Apostolic Fathers did not recognize a New Testament, or that the formation of our sacred Canon was left to the fitful and intuitive impulse of the post-Apostolic Church – the “intuition without reasoning” of Christians?

It remains for us only to trace in a few brief lines the fluctuations of the early Fathers and Councils – the feebleness of man on the one hand, and the grace of Divine guidance on the other.

Taking as round dates 200 A.D. to 400 A.D., the following catalogues may be enumerated: –

Deficient or Hesitating.

Caius (196?) – omits James, 2 Peter, 3 John, and Hebrews.

Origen (230) – omits James and Jude, but elsewhere owns them. Origen’s is the first regular Catalogue.

Eusebius (315) – marks James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Revelation, as doubted by some. He himself received Revelation, and considered it Canonical. Eusebius divides all the writings which claimed in his day to be Apostolic into three distinct classes: *ομολογούμενα*, Books universally Acknowledged, viz., the 4 Gospels, 14 Epistles of St. Paul, 1 John, 1 Peter, and Revelation (if its authenticity is admitted).

αντιλεγόμενα, books generally Received, but controverted by some, viz., James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John.

νόθα, Spurious Books, that is to say, those wanting in Authenticity or Apostolicity, as the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Teachings of the Apostles. To these he

adds Apocryphal or Heretical Books, “which no one of the succession of ecclesiastical writers has anywhere deigned to quote,” as the Gospels of Peter, Thomas, and Matthias, the Acts of Andrew, John, and the other Apostles.

Cyril of Jerusalem (340), the Council of Laodicea (364), and Gregory Nazianzen (375) – omit Revelation.

Philaster of Brescia (380) – omits Hebrews and Revelation, but elsewhere acknowledges them.

Jerome (392) – speaks of Hebrews as doubtful, but elsewhere receives it.

Amphilochius (395) – marks the Antilegomena.

Complete.

Athanasius (315), Epiphanius (370), Ruffinus (390), Augustine (394) and the Third Council of Carthage (397) – all give Catalogues exactly corresponding with our present Canon of the New Testament.

Of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.]

These words, which our Article applies to the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, we need scarcely say, can only refer, primarily at least, to the Catholic or Universal Church; for, as we have seen, doubts were entertained in particular churches as to several books of the New Testament, viz., the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude, the second Epistle of St. Peter, the second and third Epistles of St. John, and Revelation. But the words, if we mistake not, have a deeper meaning, or are worthy of it. The “authority” of the books of the Bible is, as we have endeavoured to show, the authority of the Holy Ghost and of the “holy men” of old who wrote them under His immediate inspiration, and handed them over as a deposit to the Church of God. The office of the Church therefore is simply that of a witness and keeper of Holy Writ. “Hence,” as it has been well said, “the historical demonstration of the Canon of Scripture consists, in point of fact, of a collection of the testimony of individual divines and Churches to the reception of the several books from the first age of Christianity downwards.” Or, as another late writer equally well puts it: “With respect to the Canonicity of the Sacred Books, the Church acted as a witness, not as a judge. It *received* the books from those who committed the words to writing under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, on the authority of the inspired writers themselves. It

kept them, jealously excluding all writings which could not be traced to inspired men, and handed them down as of Divine authority to the next generation. *Thus the inspired books have descended to our own time.* The Church never decided what books should be Canonical, but what were and had been from the beginning, according to the historical evidence of their having been written by inspired men.” Of course in this excellent passage, by “the Church,” we must understand also, as in the Article, the Catholic or Universal Church.

3. *The Apocrypha.*

(1.) The word Apocrypha (ἀπόκρυφα, pl., scil. βιβλία), primarily meaning hidden or concealed, seems to have been applied to the secret books containing the esoteric knowledge of the Greek mysteries and Gnostic sects; and in the early Christian Church to anonymous writings. In the time of Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, however, it had passed into a secondary and bad sense of spurious, or forged, being by these fathers used of heretical writings, which claimed to be authoritative.

With the exception of Cyril of Jerusalem and Jerome, the word does not appear to have been freely applied by leading writers to noncanonical books till the era of the Reformation, *ecclesiastical* being the term ordinarily used instead, whereas *apocryphal* denoted only such books as *might not be publicly read*. Thus the classification of Ruffinus runs: I. Canonical: II. Ecclesiastical; III. Apocryphal. And though he speaks of “Apocryphal Scriptures,” in deference probably to Jerome, yet he tells us that these were called “Ecclesiastical by most.” (*Libri qui non canonici sed Ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt.*)

(2.) The Non-canonicity of the Apocryphal Books is clearly proved as follows: –

First, By External Evidence –

(a) Not one of them is extant in Hebrew, which language, it is admitted by all, was the Canonical language of the Old Testament.

(b) They were posterior in time to the cessation of the Prophetic Spirit in the Jewish Church.

(c) They were never received into the Canon by the Jews.

(d) They are not once quoted by Philo, Josephus, our Lord, or His Apostles – at least, as Canonical.

Second. By Internal Evidence against their Inspiration –

(a) They nowhere claim, in direct terms, to be the word of the Lord. On the contrary, they sometimes acknowledge the departure (1 Macc. 9:27), or hope for the return (ch. 4:46), of the prophetic gift. And even when they simulate the prophetic tone, the solemnity and grandeur of the message of the Lord of Hosts is lost in the feeble and fallen cadence of the voice of man.

(b) They contradict the Canonical Scriptures –

In History:

Thus, the Story of Del and the Dragon contradicts the account of Daniel's being cast into the den of lions. In the Scripture account we are told that Daniel was cast into the den, because of continuing his usual practice of praying to God, against the Decree of Darius the Median, but was taken up out of the den early the following morning. In the Apocrypha we read that, because he had "destroyed Bel, slain the Dragon, and put the priests to death," he was cast into the den by (permission of) Cyrus the Persian, "where he was six days." Now, while we may reconcile the apparent contradiction as to Cyrus the Persian and Darius the Mede by concluding, as we are probably warranted, that the former appointed the latter as his viceroy over Babylon; we cannot on any rational grounds suppose that the author of Bel and the Dragon means the deputy Darius throughout his letter when he speaks of Cyrus and the close intimacy subsisting between him and Daniel, for no possible extension of the principle "Qui facit per alium, facit per se," could apply. Nor can we at all adjust the strangely opposite statements of the cause of Daniel's being cast into the den – to say nothing of some of the ludicrous elements imported into the pseudo-history. But, above all, we cannot *fit* "six days" into one.

Again, Baruch is said to have been carried to Babylon at the very time when Jeremiah tells us he was carried by Johanan into Egypt.

"And these are the words of the book, which Baruch the son of Nerias wrote in Babylon, what time as the Chaldeans took Jerusalem, and burnt it with fire" (Baruch 1:1–2). "But Johanan took all the remnant of Judah, and every person that Nebuzar-adan the captain of the guard had left with Gedaliah, and Jeremiah the prophet, and Baruch the son of Neriah. So they came into the land of Egypt" (Jer. 43:5–7).

It is also alleged that no prophet was living at the time of the Babylonish Captivity.

“Neither is there at this time prince, or prophet, or leader, or burnt offering, or sacrifice, or oblation, or incense, or place to sacrifice before thee to find mercy” (Song of the Three Children, 15).

In Doctrine:

The Efficacy of Prayers *for* the Dead is taught.

“And when he (Judas Maccabeus) had made a gathering throughout the company to the sum of two thousand drachmas of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin offering, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection. For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And also in that he perceived that there was great favour laid up for those that died godly, it was an holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin” (2 Macc. 12:43–45).

The Efficacy of Prayers *by* the Dead is taught.

“O Lord Almighty, thou God of Israel, bear now the prayers of the dead Israelites, and of their children, which have sinned before thee, and not hearkened unto the voice of thee their God: for the which cause these plagues cleave unto us” (Baruch 3:4).

The Transmigration of souls is taught.

“For I (Solomon) was a witty child, and had a good spirit. Yea rather, being good, I came into a body undefiled” (Wisdom 8:19–20).

Justification by Works is taught.

“Alms doth deliver from death, and shall purge away all sin” (Tobit 12:9). “Whoso honoureth his father maketh an atonement for his sins” (Ecclus. 3:3). “To forsake unrighteousness is a propitiation” (Eccles. 35:3).

(c) They contradict well-known ancient History.

Thus we read that the Romans had but a single magistrate yearly.

“And that they committed their government to one man every year, who ruled over all their country, and that all were obedient to that one, and that there was neither envy nor emulation among them” (1 Macc. 8:16). True, it is only said that Judas had heard these things. But their relation in Maccabeus is equal to an historical statement, for it is asserted that Judas sent Eupolemus and Jason to Rome, and that the senate made a league with the people of the Jews, “written in tables of brass,” and the articles of which are given.

Again, Daniel is said to have destroyed the temple of Belus (Bel and the Dragon), whereas it was pulled down by Xerxes; and the Babylonians are represented as worshippers of living animals (*ibid.*), which they never were at any period of their history – their idolatry being invariable, astral, and heroic.

(d) They contradict themselves.

Thus no less than three widely different accounts, and each with a considerable amount of detail, are given of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes. In the 1st Book of Maccabees (ch. 6:1–16) he is said to have died of grief in Babylon. In the 2d Book (ch. 1:13–16) he is said to have been slain in Persia. And afterwards, in the very same Book a whole chapter (2 Macc. 9) is devoted to a description of his death from a loathsome disease “in a strange country in the mountains”.

(e) They approvingly narrate, or strongly commend, gross Immorality, on the part not only of man, but of an Archangel of God.

Lying. Some seven of the fourteen chapters of Tobit are devoted to the exploits and in most instances unwholesome counsels of Raphael, who declares himself at the outset to be “Azarias the son of Ananias,” and at the winding up, to be “one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the holy One.”

Magical Incantation. The same angel of God is reported as teaching Tobias to drive the Devil away with the smoke of the ashes of perfume, and the heart and liver of a fish (Tobit 6:7, 16–17).

Assassination, cold-blooded Murder, and Deceit. Judith is painted a heroine to be adored, at once beautiful and bold, ritualistic and heartless, of ferocious courage and deceitful lips, who enters upon her own murderous task with a prayer to God justifying the assassination of the Shechemites, which is condemned in Genesis (Judith 8:16, Gen. 34, and 49:5–7).

Suicide. Razis is highly praised, and said to have died “manfully,” for destroying himself in a manner the most determined, and revolting beyond precedent (2 Macc. 14:41–46).

(3.) The Use of the Apocrypha.

(a) If these (specimen) charges are true – and the proof is patent – we honestly confess it does seem strange to teach that the Apocryphal Books are to be read in the Church “for example of life and instruction of manners (as Hierome saith).” If we must plead antiquity, let us go back some centuries further than Jerome: to Justin Martyr and his “Memoirs of the

Apostles and Writings of the Prophets”; but above all, and any merely human precedent, let us go back to Christ and His Apostles, and if we cannot find our Great Teacher and His Disciples reading the Apocrypha in the Church, then, we submit, the sooner we set aside the plea of any *subsequent antiquity* the better.

Again, we cannot but consider it weak to plead for the reading of Apocryphal Books, which *do* contain error, because we allow sermons, etc., which *may* be erroneous – to argue from that which is *possible, for* that which is *positive!* There is no analogy. Moreover, pulpits and hymns which run counter to the teaching of Scripture, sooner or later find their level with Christians. And you see them all: there is nothing dangerous in the background, to tempt curiosity: they are whole wags, as a rule, or no wags.

Nor does it much strengthen the case that the more objectionable portions of the Apocrypha are not read of late: that Tobit and its superstitions; Judith and its admixture of impieties; Susanna and its detail of indelicacies; and Bel and the Dragon and its direct contradictions of Scripture, are at present suppressed. It is humiliating to cull, for a Lectionary of the House of God, passages from writings which – to say the least – as a whole you cannot endorse. It is dangerous and unprofitable to read them to the people. It places the minister in a false, if not a ludicrous position, to call that the Apocrypha at the reading desk, which the Homilies oblige him to call the Scripture of the Holy Ghost in the pulpit. If Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation,” it is not wise to tamper in the Church of God with Books which may not be “applied to establish any doctrine,” and which in any part of them are directly contrary to the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament. No truth can contradict another truth,” saith Hooker, whose “judiciousness” yet fails him, but perhaps only in his strong advocacy of the Apocrypha, and especially as read in his time. How strong is prejudice – how feeble is the strength of man.

Here as elsewhere we would write not from the stand point of party, but of truth. And we think we can see something of the leaven of our argument at work in the Church of England. At all events, our present Lectionary contains considerably fewer lessons from the Apocrypha than the last; and has thrown out the more objectionable ones.

(b) The real use of the Apocryphal Books consists in this, that they form an important link in the history of the Jews – in all their fortunes ever

dear to Christians. They display the current of Jewish thought between the close of Old Testament prophecy and the coming of Christ. In them we have, if not the absolute decay, yet the impaired tone and loss of the robustness of the national mind, when the scribe of the letter of the law, and not the prophet of its spirit, guided Israel. And though the contact with idolatry in Babylon failed to bow down the people of God again to “stocks and stones,” and the heart of the masses of the post-exilians was so far sound, as witness the spirit of resistance which led to the Maccabean victories, and the establishment of synagogues to preserve the purity of the faith; yet, superstition – emasculated idolatry – prevailed in high places, and laxity in all but the “jots and tittles” of God’s Revelation ruled in Palestine as well as in Alexandria.

True, the Apocryphal Books contain some ennobling thoughts, and proverbial precepts for the conduct of life; but they are grains of gold, embedded in reprobate silver.

(4.) The general history of the Abuse of the Apocrypha is lengthened, but must be briefly sketched.

(a) The early Christian Church, through its ignorance and neglect of the study of Hebrew – pardonable perhaps at the outset in its long unsettled state, and in the cradle of frequent and fiery persecutions – admitted in many instances the Apocrypha as Scripture. And not only so, but in the case of the New Testament Canon, where a knowledge of Hebrew was in no way required, read not infrequently as Scripture uncanonical books – a “stubborn fact” and unanswerable argument against the value of Dr. Westcott’s “intuitive” guide.

(b) A well-defined stream of Christian evidence takes up the Canon of the Old Testament (with which we are here more immediately concerned), and carries it down to the Council of Carthage; but far from intact.

Thus Melito (second century), Origen (third century), Athanasius, Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, the Council of Laodicea, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Epiphanius, Ruffinus, and Jerome (fourth century) – all substantially report the books of the Hebrew Bible, except Esther, which is (probably) omitted by Gregory (but may be included in Ezra), placed among the Apocrypha by Athanasius, and only inserted in the catalogue of Amphilochius under the doubtful phrase “some add Esther.” While Baruch and the Letter are admitted by Cyril, the Council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, and (perhaps) Athanasius.

But this list is barely an index to the divergences. Irenaeus quotes as Scripture – Baruch, Wisdom, and the Apocryphal Additions to Daniel. Clement of Alexandria – Baruch, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and 2 Esdras. Tertullian – Baruch, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus. Methodius, the same. Chrysostom the same. And innumerable instances occur where the Fathers of the first four centuries casually, but nevertheless explicitly and really, do quote Apocryphal Books as Scripture, however safe we may be in saying in opposition to their more deliberate judgment, as indicated by the fact that when pressed, or discussion arose, appeal was made to our Canon.

But here, notably, Augustine wavered: at one time admitting into his Canon Apocryphal Books; and at another, disparaging even some of the Books thus admitted. And if with this renowned Father of the Church we enter the boasted Councils of Carthage, 397 and 419, we find Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, 2 Esdras, and 1 and 2 Maccabees, ratified as “Canonical Scriptures” – in exact keeping, as may be shown, with Augustine’s own general Canon. So much, alas! for the plenary authority of the Church, at the close of the fourth century, as advocated by Rome. So much for the theory of development and “intuition”. The very Council which, as the result of Dr. Westcott’s “intuitive act of the Christian Body without reasoning,” pronounced for the unadulterated Canon of the New Testament, thus pronounced for a grossly adulterated Canon of the Old.

But it is pleasing on this the eve of Christendom’s long night of unfaithfulness to the Word of God, which culminated in the Council of Trent – the darkest hour of her judicial blindness before the dawn of the blessed Reformation – to find one man asking for the Old Paths, and standing for the Law and the Testimony of Jehovah. Jerome devoted himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures and their original languages, and laid on the altar of God and of Europe the noble fruits of his labours in the Vulgate – his New Translation of the Old Testament, prefaced and fenced by its “Helmed Prologue”: “following, by no means, the custom of this time, but the authority of ancient writers,” in telling off, distinctly, the Apocrypha from the Pure Word of God.

Would to God he had gone one step further, and instead of conniving at the Church in her reading of Apocryphal Books for the so-phrased “edification of the people, though not for the authoritative confirmation of doctrine,” he had raised his manly and scholarly voice against Apocryphal

Writings altogether, and consigned them to their own place – the library of the student.

(c) The sin of the Council of Trent is soon told. In its Fourth Session, 1546, the dominant party, without one scholar of note amongst them, carried, in blind and ignorant deference to former suspicious Papal decrees – the probably unauthentic lists of Innocent I and Gelasius, repeated by Eugenius IV – the Canon of Augustine and of the Council of Carthage, with the exception of 2 Esdras and the addition of Baruch, against the Canon of Jerome and the Hebrew Bible: thus impiously and authoritatively adding Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and 1 and 2 Maccabees to God's Word. [Dr. Westcott unaccountably omits Baruch in his list of the Tridentine Council; and Bishop Browne omits 2 Esdras in his list of Carthage.] “The most Holy Ecumenical and General Council of Trent ... following the examples of the orthodox fathers, receives and venerates, with equal pious affection and reverence, all the books of the Old and New Testament [including the above], and also the Traditions, whether pertaining to faith or morals. ... If, however, any one does not receive, as sacred and canonical, the entire Books with all their parts, as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church, and in the Old Latin Vulgate Edition, and knowingly and wittingly despises the aforesaid Traditions, let him be Anathema.”

Let not our strictures, under this Article, on Dr. Westcott's teaching, be misunderstood. That teaching, from his position, is the main supply, in its kind, of our two universities of Cambridge and Oxford; and it is adopted elsewhere in quarters where we should have least expected. Painfully, but firmly in the interests of truth, we condemn it. It is but a step removed from Neology and from Rome. It weakly and foolishly, though ingeniously, builds our most Holy Faith on the perilous sand of intuition and human authority, and not on the sure foundation of God. If the intuition of the post-Apostolic Church resulted in pronouncing *clara voce* for the New Testament at Carthage, how is it that it did not result in pronouncing in like manner for the Old? What if the still more enlightened nineteenth century Church should pronounce in its turn against the post-Apostolic Church both as regards the New Testament and the Old? And the Divines of Germany have! – mutilated not only the New Testament, but the whole Bible. Demonstrably, intuition has failed to save Christendom. And it is just this anchor, neither sure nor steadfast, of Human Wisdom, whether weak and

intuitive, or more philosophic, or arrogant and presumptuous, that is wrecking the churches of God.

Article VII.

History and Doctrine with Scriptural Proof

Of the Old Testament. – The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil Precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

De Veteri Testamento – Testamentum Vetus Novo contrarium non est, quando quidem tam in Veteri, quam in Novo, per Christum, qui unicus est Mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et Homo, aeterna vita humano generi est proposita. Quare male sentiunt, qui veteres tantum in promissiones temporarias sperasse confingunt. Quanquam Lex a Deo data per Mosen, quoad Ceremonios et Ritus, Christianos non astringat, neque civilia ejus praecepta in aliqua republica necessario recipi debeant; nihilominus tamen ab obedientia mandatorum quae Moralia vocantur, nullus quantumvis Christianis est solutus.

History.

The Article, as it now stands, is made up, with some modifications, of the Sixth and Nineteenth of the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI. We subjoin these, as they tend to illustrate the history and nature of the controversy in which our Reformers were involved.

Article VI, 1552.

The Old Testament is not to be refused. – The Old Testament is not to be put away, as though it were contrary to the New, but to be kept still; for both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

Article XIX, 1552.

All men are bound to keep the Moral Commandments of the Law. – The Law, which was given of God by Moses, although it bind not Christian men as concerning the Ceremonies and Rites of the same; neither is it required that the Civil Precepts and Orders of it should of necessity be received in any commonweal: yet no man, be he never so perfect a Christian, is exempt and loose from the obedience of those Commandments which are called Moral. Wherefore they are not to be hearkened unto, who affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of whom (they say) they have learned such things as they teach, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture.

Ever since God revealed Himself to man, Satan has countermined against God by the power of infidel reason. “Yea, hath God said?” is, in one shape or other, the virtual text with which the Destroyer has wooed and won the pride and heart of his captives. In Eden, with the Patriarch, the Jew, this Gentile Christian, these subtle words have, in life or faith, worked ruin of our race. They are Satan’s chief and greatest strength; and so, you have only to look down the stream of the Church’s history to see that wherever God more fully and graciously vouchsafes His blessing, there Satan again and more vigorously sinks and works this “countermine.” It was so in the first age of Christianity, when “oppositions of science falsely so called” corrupted the infant Church. It was so at the Reformation, when Anabaptist lawlessness and contempt of the Word Written embarrassed the all-important movement. It has been so of late years, when Rationalism and a lifeless or carnal Ritualism threaten to displace the Evangelical revival of Christendom – that fuller tide and outcome of Reformation attainments. And it is just here, as we may appeal to the inner consciousness of every intelligent believer, gathers the cloud that not infrequently chills and darkens the phases of his love and light and joy.

But we must not unduly diverge from the historic limits of our Article. Its wording, “The Old Testament is not contrary to the New,” reminds us, however, of the Gnostic terminology; and we may not be altogether wrong in concluding that the compilers thus, in the first instance, had reference to Gnostic speculations – Satan’s formula in the early Christian age. In any case, a brief review of these heresies will enable us better to understand that against which the Article certainly does protest.

Gnosticism (γνῶσις, science, or the so-called true knowledge of God) soon came to disturb and to mar the Revelation of Jesus Christ. Whether we hold with Tiltmann that Gnosticism as such had no existence in the first century; or with Lewald, that notwithstanding many points of resemblance can be traced, it is essentially different from any system of either Grecian or Oriental philosophy: still, we think it apparent that the seeds of a false philosophy in direct opposition to the Gospel were sown in the days of the Apostles; and that that philosophy, whether formally coincident with previous or existent systems, contained and was contaminated with the virus of heathen theosophy, as well as the virtual germs of the future and historic Gnosis.

We must go back for a moment to Plato and to the Orientals. The former held not only the unity of God, but that He is careful of the government of the world, and administers it as an independent, powerful, and intelligent Being. He also believed in a future state, and in the immortality of the soul. But with these sound and invaluable doctrines he mixed up many fanciful and erroneous opinions; such as that matter was coeternal with God; and that to its native intractability or malignity was owing the origin of evil. The Oriental Philosophy, on the other hand, held the eternal existence of two opposite Principles, the Supreme God, the author of good; and the Demiurge, or Creator of the world, the author of evil. And thus the origin of evil was the stumbling stone at once of Platonism and Orientalism. Evil is the contrary of good, and therefore if contrary to and independent of the Supreme Good, must in one way or other be eternal.

It is easy to see how Judaism first, and Judaic and Gentile Christianity afterwards, won by Satan and the pride of the human heart to loose reasoning on the plain letters of Genesis – now swayed at Alexandria by the Platonic theory, and anon in Asia by the Oriental theory – begat and fostered vain and hybrid speculations, neither true Platonic nor Oriental, but a mixture at once of Platonism, Orientalism, and Revelation; embellished with extraneous notions from the heathen, or the fancies of individual founders. And accordingly we find at Alexandria the doctrine of “emanations,” or Eons – orders of intermediate agents, proceeding from or developed by the Deity, and varying in number according to the fancy of the several sects. While in Asia, we have the dualism of God and Matter – two hostile and eternal Principles or Personalities. But in each quarter, as

might be expected, a jumble not infrequently of both systems; and invariably, in all subdivisions, a medley of crude philosophy, grossest or anile fiction, and obscured Revelation. And this we take it is the veritable Gnosticism unquestionably alluded to and reprobated in the New Testament – as yet we grant in embryo, but which soon, and in many forms, was so detrimental to the early Church.

It is needless to follow in detail the development of Gnosticism. Let it suffice to note a representative of Alexandria and Asia, respectively, with a glance at the Manichean heresy, the new forum in which Gnosticism seems to have perpetuated itself.

Simon Magus was a Samaritan by birth, but studied philosophy at Alexandria, where he became imbued with the eclectic Gnostic notions. Returning to his native country, a fit place for the exercise of his powers, the Samaritans believing in uncreated angelic emanations from God, and Dositheus his master having preceded him as a teacher of Gnosticism there, he “bewitched the people of Samaria with sorceries,” and was recognized as an incarnation of “the power of God which is called (καλουμένη – improperly omitted in the Received Version) great” (Acts 8:9–11). Matter, with his class, was considered eternally animated, and to have produced, by its inherent energies, an evil Deity who presided over it, surrounded by numerous attendants. Hence we may naturally infer that he held the consequent doctrines of the impurity of matter, the indifference of human actions, and the non-resurrection of the body. He also rejected the Law of Moses, and declared himself the Christ who had come to abolish it. But his crowning wickedness was the mode of his embodiment of the dualistic element of two original principles; the pretense that the greatest and most powerful of the Eons – the δυνάμεις, or untreated emanations – resided in himself, while a corresponding Eon of the female sex resided in his mistress Helena – a former prostitute of Tyre. Thus in his hands the Magian theurgy passed into the most blasphemous egotism: “giving out that himself was” the Word of God, the Perfection, the Paraclete, the Omnipotent, the All of Deity.

Marcion, son of the Bishop of Sinope, in Pontus, came to settle at Rome in the reign of Antoninus Pius, in the second century, there to propagate his opinions in a larger and more important field – Rome being the capital of the world, and as Facitus says, “everything that was bad upon earth finding its way to Rome.” Various and conflicting accounts are given

of his opinions. But we may conclude that, like the Orientals, he held the eternal existence of two first causes – the Supreme Good and the Demiurge; that the latter was the God and Lawgiver of the Jews, therefore the Old Testament and all parts of the New founded upon it, were to be rejected, as incapable of bestowing sanctification; that Christ was the manifestation of the Supreme God, and sent by him to destroy the work of the Demiurge, yet that he had the appearance (δόκησις) only of a body, and consequently the Jews were unable to hurt him; that matter being intrinsically evil, we are to mortify our bodies by fasting, abstinence from marriage, and deny ourselves the use of wine, flesh, and whatever is grateful and pleasing to the body; and that whoever will thus abstract the mind from all sensible objects, and obey these principles, renouncing the Old Testament Scriptures, shall after death ascend to the celestial mansions. To these general principles he added many peculiarities, as the administration of the cup with water only; baptism in the name of the Son, excluding the Father and the Holy Ghost, and the living to be baptized for friends who had died unbaptized.

Towards the close of the third century, when Gnosticism proper was on the wane, thanks to the labours of Tertullian, the investigations and lucid confutations of the Jewish notions by Dionysius of Alexandria and Dorotheus of Antioch, and even perhaps the allegorical and tropological mode of expounding Scripture by Origen, a new and still more dangerous heresy appeared, which, despite persecutions, imperial edicts, and exterminating laws, spread over Europe, Asia, and most parts of the world. Manes, or Manichaeus, one of the Persian Magi, was born about the year 240, in the reign of Probus. Of much ingenuity, considerable talent, and versed in all the learning of his country, he combined the Magian philosophy with Christianity and some of the more popular tenets of Gnosticism, so as to present a system sufficiently luring not only to absorb the still remaining Gnostics, but also to secure at one time even the mind of Augustine. He threw aside the doctrine of emanations, and inculcated the simple belief that God was the cause of good, and Matter the cause of evil. There are two first principles of all things, a subtle and very pure substance or Light, and a gross and corrupt substance or Darkness; and over each of these a Lord has reigned from all eternity – two opposing Spirits, with numerous progenies, out of whose contexts arose the mundane confusion of good and evil. To relieve souls the creation of God imprisoned in bodies of vicious matter, God sent forth two majestic beings, Christ (the Mithras of

the Persians) and the Holy Ghost. Christ explained to men their true origin, the cause of their captivity, and the means of their recovery, viz., ceasing to worship the God of the Jews, obeying Christ's laws as expounded by Manes, and resisting lust. His body necessarily was in appearance only; but his mystical crucifixion taught mankind how to mortify the flesh; and his mystical resurrection and ascension, that death destroys not man but only his prison, and restores to purified souls the liberty of returning to heaven. The Holy Ghost, diffused throughout the atmosphere, enlightens and assists the souls of men, pouring over them his salutary influences. Manes, in fulfillment of the promise made by Jesus Christ, that the Paraclete should communicate to the world a fuller and clearer revelation, now explained by command of God the whole doctrine of salvation perfectly, without any concealment or ambiguity. As human souls cannot acquire complete purity in this life, there is, after death, for all those who have obeyed Christ, a purgatory of a twofold nature – first by sacred water, then by sacred fire; and for others, a transmigration of souls, to work out their salvation in new bodies – those who ultimately and utterly fail being handed over to the powers of darkness. The Old Testament was the work of the Prince of darkness, whom the Jews worshipped in place of the true God. The four Gospels were either not genuine, or interpolated, and stuffed with Jewish fables. The Acts of the Apostles was to be wholly rejected. The Epistles of St. Paul were genuine, but not authentic. A book, called Erteng, or Arzeng, i.e., the Gospel composed by Manes in a cave, where he spent a whole year, was dictated by God Himself. The body being the work of the evil spirit, is to be subjected to the most rigid mortification; all the propensities and instincts of our nature are to be subdued; marriage is to be rejected; and there is no resurrection. While hearers or imperfect Christians might possess property, and have sparing indulgences, the elect or perfect Christians were to adhere most rigorously to all the severe rules of the system – to drag out an inactive life of celibacy on bread and water, and to be devoid both of hatred and love. Though without temple or altar, the ecclesiastical polity of the Manichees was framed on the lines of Christ and His Disciples – a president, representing the Saviour; twelve rulers the twelve Apostles; and seventy-two bishops the seventy-two Disciples. Such was the system which replaced Gnosticism, caricatured the Gospel, and lived and lingered on to disturb the Church of God, till at last it gave birth

to some of the more obnoxious tenets of Popery, and to the Anabaptism of the sixteenth century.

Here then we find in Gnosticism and Manicheism, as we shall find in Anabaptism, and as we may also find in the Rationalism and Ritualism of our own day, a frivolous overlaying and superseding, or impious despising and questioning of God's Word Written: in each a phase of Satan's counterwork against God; and each precisely and cunningly adapted to the era of its development. And it is well for the student to see this. Hitherto the histories of heresies have been too much rendered as separate individualities, and not, as they are veritable pieces, each shaped and fashioned to its purpose and age, of the great though complicated machinery of Satan in opposition to God and His Christ. God in History brings us more lovingly, and in more filial trust, to our Heavenly Father. Satan in History, if rightly written and wisely read, would put us more keenly on our guard. A pen fully and judiciously to portray both would be of infinite service to the Church and the world.

Now to these and cognate heresies, some partly developed, and others only budding in the Apostles' time, we should expect to find, and we do find, considerable allusions in the New Testament. Take the following examples: –

St. Paul anticipates the rise of heresies at Ephesus. "For I know this, that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:29–30). And in his Epistles subsequently addressed to Timothy at Ephesus, the Apostle prophesies, through the present agency and power of the Spirit (το πνευμα λέγει), the future success of Gnostic and allied heresies in after times (εν υστέροις καιροίς), and points to their incipient budding. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in after times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils. Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron. Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer. If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things [suggesting the coming Apostasy and the means of avoiding it], thou shalt be a good

minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained. But refuse profane and anile fables (μύθους pointing, with the “endless genealogies” of chapter 1, most probably to the transitional state of heretical speculation between Judaism and Gnosticism proper), and exercise thyself rather unto godliness. For bodily exercise (σωματικη λυμνασία – understood by Ambrose, Calvin, Grotius, and others, of corporal austerities for religion’s sake; by Chrysostom, Bengel, etc., of mere gymnastic training) profiteth little: but godliness is profitable unto all things [bodily and spiritual, temporal and eternal], having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come” (1 Tim. 4:1–8). “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called (ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως – a counterfeit of the true Christian γνῶσις, and already at work), which some professing have erred concerning the faith” (1 Tim. 6:20). “And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already [consisting in a moral change – a denial of the resurrection was one of the errors of Gnostics subsequently]; and overthrow the faith of some” (2 Tim. 2:17–18).

And this false philosophy abounded also at Colossae. “Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit [the vain and deceitful mixture of Judaic and Oriental philosophy which was so soon to ripen into the developed Gnosis], after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ [the only true gauge and measure of all philosophy]. For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily (παν το πλήρωμα της θεότητος σωματιλως), all the Pleroma – the essential and personal Being of God in the incarnate and glorified Christ. He is therefore not an Eon). And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power [united to Christ, you want no supplement of vain philosophy; and your Pleroma is not to be confounded with Emanation figments, for He Himself is the Head of all created existences]. ... Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink [condemn you from his standpoint of selfish asceticism], or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ. Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels [a superstition afterwards variously embodied in Gnosticism], intruding into those things

which he hath not seen [how graphically descriptive of the whole future dreamland of Eons], vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God [a Divine anatomy of the Body of Christ, the Church, and the individual soul, tracing all Life to God, the only First Cause. And a prophetic rebuke of Papal Mariolatry]. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of time world [the weak and beggarly elements of a sensuous Jewish and Gentile cultus], why, as though living in the world, do ye suffer yourselves to be dogmatized (Touch not, taste not, handle not [as the ascetics dogmatize]; which all are to perish with the using [all meats are given us by the Creator for our consumption]), after time commandments and systems (διδασκαλίας) of men? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom (σοφίας – the higher and only true γνῶσις) in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh [what an inspired word painting of and warning against Asceticism and Superstition – two of the main features of the coming Gnosticism] (Col. 2:8–10, 16–23).

In Crete too Titus was cautioned. “Not giving heed to Jewish fables [probably the germinating seeds of the Gnostic Mythology of Eons, in its abuse of Judaism], and commandments of men [as to meats and other ascetic injunctions], that turn from the truth. [For] Unto the pure all things are pure” (Titus 1:14–15). “But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law [in idle fables about supernatural generations as grafted on the Law of Moses – most probably the mediate, if not the proximate cause of Gnostic doubt about its Divine authority]; for they are unprofitable and vain” (Titus 3:9).

Let us now turn to the heresies against which our Article is definitely set. The Anabaptism of the sixteenth century (including under this general designation, for the sake of convenience, the various lawless and fanatical sects of the Reformation period) was in the main neither more nor less than the natural outcome of the heresies we have sketched – adapted to the age. Thus a leading tenet of most Gnostic sects of Manicheism was that Christ had an unreal body – docetic, ethereal, or emanative. And many of the Anabaptists of Munster, as well as the Mennonites, denied that Christ received from the Virgin Mary that human body which He assumed, and held that it was a divine and celestial body produced out of nothing in the

Virgin's womb by the Holy Ghost. Again, Gnosticism and Manicheism rejected the Old Testament Scriptures as the work of the Demiurge. And this heresy, stripped of some of its fantastic fiction, repeated itself among the Anabaptist sects. "Here I note only one thing, which is [the] temerity, ignorance, and blasphemy of certain fantastic heads, which hold that the prophets do write only to the people of the old Testament, and that their doctrine did pertain only to their time; and would seclude all the fathers that lived under the law from the hope of eternal salvation. And here is also a note to be gathered against them which utterly reject the old Testament, as a book nothing necessary to the Christians which live under the Gospel. But as I have said before, there is no difference between the Old Testament and the New, but only in circumstance and nothing in substance. And therefore the One is as well to be allowed and received as the other" (Bishop Alley, "Poore Man's Librerie," ii. 97). Thus the ten commandments were easily antiquated, and adultery was no sin. Even the dualistic quasi-Manichean distinction between the flesh and the spirit was introduced by one of the schools, who held that in the very act of the grossest bodily sin, the soul was free and uncontaminated before God. And if the Anabaptists could not like Manes literally forge upon the world a Gospel of their own, yet they followed closely in his lines, and declared that the Sacred Volume had become so corrupted in its transmission that it was unworthy of credence, so that their preachers were at liberty to treat it, which in fact they often did, as "mere dead letter".

Hooper writing to Bullinger, 1549, gives the following awful picture of Anabaptism in England. "The Anabaptists flock to the place [of my lecture], and give me much trouble with their opinions respecting the Incarnation of our Lord; for they deny altogether that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh. They contend that a man who is reconciled to God is without sin, and free from all stain of concupiscence, and that nothing of the old Adam remains in his nature; and a man, they say, who is thus regenerate, cannot sin. They add that all hope of pardon is taken away from those who, after having received the Holy Ghost, fall into sin. They maintain a fatal necessity, and that beyond and besides that will of His, which He has revealed to us in the Scriptures, God hath another will by which He altogether acts under some kind of necessity. How dangerously our England is affected by heresies of this kind, God only knows: I am unable indeed, from sorrow of heart, to express to your piety. There are

some who deny that man is endued with a soul different from that of a beast, and subject to decay. Alas! not only are these heresies reviving among us which were formerly dead and buried, but new ones are springing up every day. There are such libertines and wretches who are daring enough in their conventicles, not only to deny that Christ is the Messiah and Saviour of the world, but also to call that blessed Seed a mischievous fellow, and deceiver of the world. On the other hand, a great portion of the kingdom so adheres to the popish faction as altogether to set at naught God and the lawful authority of the magistrates; so that I am greatly afraid of a rebellion and civil discord” (Original Letters, ed. P.S. pp. 65, 66).

Hardwick thus accounts for the (immediate) rise of the Anabaptists, and briefly delineates some of their deadly errors. “The ramifications of these varied misbelievers may be traced, in many cases, to the scene of the original collisions between the ‘old’ and ‘new learning’. One of their distinctive errors, though not *the* grand characteristic of their system, was the absolute rejection of infant baptism; and from this peculiarity came the title ‘Anabaptists’. Mistaking or perverting what was urged by Luther, as to the necessity of active, conscious faith in all partakers of the sacraments, they soon proceeded to postpone the ministration of the initiatory rite until the subjects of it had complied with all the requisite preconditions.

“But the points at which they had departed from the ground of the Reformers were not limited to infant Baptism. They proceeded to assail the Lutheran formula in which salvation was attributed to ‘faith only,’ and in agitating this, they fell into a further question respecting the two natures of our blessed Lord and His essential Divinity. John Denk, and others, now affirmed that man may earn salvation by his own virtuous actions, and regarded the Founder of Christianity chiefly in His character of Teacher and Exemplar. In Him, as one of the most spotless of our race, the Father was peculiarly manifested to the world, but to assert that Christ is the Redeemer, in the ordinary meaning of the term, was to convert him into an idol. He was held to be a Saviour of His people, *because* He was the leader and forerunner of all who would be saved.

“While notions of this kind were spreading rapidly on every side, a second school of Anabaptists were devising a very different creed. The tone of thought prevailing in the former school was strongly rationalistic: in the latter it was more entirely mystical. They introduced a dualistic (quasi-Manichean) distinction between the ‘flesh’ and ‘spirit’; and instead of

holding, like the former sect, that man, though fallen, may be rescued by his natural powers, they alleged that the ‘flesh’ alone participated in the fall, and further that when the material element in him was most of all obnoxious to the indignation of God, the spirit still continued free and uncontaminated by the vilest of the outward actions. They attributed the restoration of harmony between these elements of our nature to the intervention of the Logos, but maintained that His humanity was peculiar, not consisting of flesh and blood which He derived from the substance of the Virgin. Not a few of these same Anabaptists afterwards abandoned every semblance of belief in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and so passed over to the Arian and Socinian schools, then rising up in Switzerland, in Italy, and in Poland” (History of the Articles, pp. 85–87).

If to all this we add the flesh or peculiar errors incorporated by the Anabaptists from the times, or which still lingered in the Church and were elaborated by them – such as the theory of universalism, or terminability of future punishment, the mystical and morbid interpretation of Scripture, the sleep of the soul between death and judgment, the community of goods, the unlawfulness of military service and judicial oaths – we shall see the nature of the opposition which the Reformers had to encounter, and better understand many references in the Articles.

One other most important circumstance must not be omitted in connection with this sketch, which may be of use in putting the student on his guard, and that is the seemingly antagonistic yet complementary relation, as might be expected from their broad common heathen origin, which existed between Anabaptism and Romanism. The monstrous evils of the former caused a decided reaction in favour of the latter while, at the same time, incredible as it may seem, and infamous as it was on the part of Holy Mother Church, the Anabaptist errors would appear to have been promoted by Popish agents! Thus a letter dated Delft, May 12, 1549, was addressed to Gardiner, advising him that the best means of preventing the organization of the Reformers would be the preaching up of the Anabaptist doctrines – an advice which there is some considerable evidence to show was actually taken, just as a like policy was adopted by the Jesuits and Dominicans in the reign of Elizabeth under the garb of Puritanism, and is probably reenacted in our own day by the partisans of Rome under the cloak of ritual zeal and primitive Christianity.

“History,” at least in heresy, priestcraft, and sin, “repeats itself.”

Division.

Two Subjects – 1. One Condition of Salvation under the Old Testament and the New. 2. How far the Mosaic Law is Binding.

1. *One Condition of Salvation under the Old Testament and the New.*

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New]

The Revelation of God is an organic whole of which the several and varied parts are reciprocally means and ends, and so intimately and closely united that if you take away one part you stultify and destroy another. And this is true even if we dissect the Bible into its multiplied sections; but still more strikingly true of its great and leading divisions.

Thus to take the Old Testament and its three familiar Jewish classes of writings, the *Law* would be a wearisome detail of sacrificial prescriptions, unmeaning ordinances, and dead genealogies, altogether unworthy of a Divine and intelligent Being, were it not for the *Prophets* that point us to the Lamb of God, bearing our griefs, carrying our sorrows, wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities, and voluntarily pouring out His soul an offering for sin, to make intercession for the transgressors; and were it not for the *Psalms* that tell us, “I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices or thy burnt offerings to have been continually before me. Offer unto God thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the Most High: and call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me.” Again, the *Prophets* and the *Psalms* would be utterly unintelligible without the Pentateuch for our guide. Line after line and page after page of the former recall and are set upon the latter. Not only as a Divine revelation are they mutually inwrought, but the prophet and the hymnist of the Lord appeal to the spiritual faculty of man, and weave into the else colour-blind rites and ceremonies of the Law the eye and organ of faith. To suppose, if we could, the existence of the Law without the *Prophets*, is to cut out the woof of a web, and of the *Prophets* without the Law is to strike out its warp. Or if we take the four elements into which moderns have resolved the Old Testament, we shall find the same interdependence – the historic, prophetic, poetic, and legal, all wondrously and harmoniously interchanging, and beautifully interlaced. Moses, David, Hezekiah, and Ezra symbolizing and representing the national life and

sacred literature of the Jews, unifying and completing this first cycle of God's Revelation.

Then again if we take the New Testament, in the *Gospels* we find the announcement of a new kingdom, in the *Acts* its foundation stone laid and superstructure vigorously begun, and in the *Epistles* a detail of the doctrinal and practical law – the working life of the kingdom. Cut off the Epistles from the Historical Books of the New Testament, and you have a building without cement, left for anyone to “daub with untempered mortar”. Cut off the History from the Epistles, and you have all the “joints and bands” of a body, but without a definite organism, and therefore ready to be “knit together,” at the will and “sleight of men,” under any “Head”.

But all these relations also exist between the Old Testament and the New, only if possible still more closely and virtually drawn. The types, prophecies, and sweet songs of the one find, as an historic fact, their ideal in the other; and this ideal would be an abrupt, and unnatural, unaccountable creation without them. True the rites and ceremonies of the Old Testament have ceased to be sacraments, but they have nevertheless become symbols of deepest spiritual meaning and everlasting importance. Thus “if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh” no longer, by it we are taught, “How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” If after every commandment according to the Law had been rehearsed by Moses, “he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, and the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry” – if thus “without shedding of blood there is no remission,” we are taught the deep and solemn truth, that “therefore it was necessary that the heavenly things themselves should be purified with better sacrifices than these”: that the untreated and eternal, heavenly tabernacle of God needed, because of man's sin, a καθαρίζεσθαι by the all-prevailing sacrifice and blood of Christ! If the High Priest has passed away, his consecration with a plentiful effusion of the holy oil typified under the Old Testament Economy, but now symbolizes what the theology of our day would seem to forget, the ever-continued communication of the Spirit “without measure” by the Father unto the Mediatorial Person of Christ. If a perpetual function of the Chief Priest was to bear the names of the children of Israel “upon his two

shoulders, and in the breastplate of judgment upon his heart, when he went into the holy place, for a memorial before the Lord continually,” it symbolizes the ascended Saviour passed into the heavens, upon the palms of whose hands the names of His people are graven, and sealed upon His heart for evermore. And even the very fact of the “many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death,” brings out to the mind of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews the glorious triumphant truth that “this Man, because he continueth for everlasting (εις τον αιωνα), hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.” Then again, all the leading doctrines concerning the nature and being of God – His unity, existence in more Persons than one, His spotless Holiness, His infinite Love, His Mightiness to Save, all lie in embryo and germ in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, but find their full and wondrous development in the Gospel. And lastly, the Prophecies of the Old Testament are the standing miracles of the New Dispensation: only to be read, and ever increasing in value, in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

And even as a negative argument, if the Old Testament is the work of the true God, there is no evading of the proposition that it is “not contrary to the New,” unless indeed we return to the blasphemy of a Demiurge, and so debase all philosophy, natural and Divine, by the absurdity of two First Causes.

To quote Scriptural proof under this head would be to transcribe the Bible. But one or two suggestive passages may be selected. In passing, however, we would impress upon the student that the most profitable way of reading God’s Holy Word is prayerfully and carefully to compare Scripture with Scripture – not only, after the sense of Chrysostom, explaining and proving difficult spiritual truths of the New Testament by testimonies of the Old, but systematically comparing Bible History with Bible evolution of Doctrine: above all, taking Christ as the central figure, to Whom and from Whom all converges and flows. “Bene orasse est bene studuisse” (Luther). “Pectus est quod facit theologum” (Neander). Πνευματικοις πνευματκα συγκρίνοντες (St. Paul).

“Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be

fulfilled” (Matt. 5:17–18). We cannot refrain from quoting at length the valuable comment of Alford on this passage. “It is important to observe in *these days* how the Lord here *includes the Old Testament and all its unfolding of the Divine purposes regarding Himself, in his teaching* of the citizens of the kingdom of heaven. I say this, because it is always in *contempt and setting aside of the Old Testament* that rationalism has begun. First, its *historical truth* – then its *theocratic dispensation*, and the *types and prophecies* connected with it, are swept away; so that Christ came to fulfill nothing, and becomes only a teacher or a martyr: and thus the way is paved for a similar rejection of the New Testament, – beginning with the narratives of the birth and infancy, as theocratic myths – advancing to the denial of His miracles – then attacking the truthfulness of His own sayings which are grounded on the Old Testament as a revelation from God – and so finally leaving us nothing in the Scriptures but, as a German writer of this school has expressed it, ‘a mythology not so attractive as that of Greece.’ That this is the course which unbelief *has run* in Germany, should be a pregnant warning to the decriers of the Old Testament among ourselves. It should be a maxim for every expositor and every student, that Scripture is a *whole*, and stands or falls together. That this is now beginning to be deeply felt in Germany, we have cheering testimonies in the later editions of their best Commentators, and in the valuable work of Stier on the discourses of our Lord. [Since, however, these words were first written, we have had lamentable proof in England, that their warnings were not unneeded. The course of unbelief which induced the publication of the volume entitled ‘Essays and Reviews,’ was, in character and progress, exactly that above described: and owing to the injudicious treatment which multiplied tenfold the circulation of that otherwise contemptible work, its fallacies are now in the hands and mouths of thousands, who, from the low standard of intelligent Scriptural knowledge among us, will never have the means of answering them]” (Greek Testament in loco, 6th Ed.).

“The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand forever” (Is. 40:8). “The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: but the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you” (1 Peter 1:24–25). Here the Apostle seizes upon the imagery of the Prophet, and interweaves the Old Testament with the New into an imperishable coronal.

“Search the (Old Testament) Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify (from first to last) of me” (John 5:39). A command certainly addressed at the outset to the Jews, but applying with even stronger force to Christians, who, having both Testaments, a double testimony to the office and work of Christ, may yet be in danger of the condemnation of the following verse, ‘And ye will not come to me (in personal knowledge and identity), that ye might have life.’”

“For if ye believed Moses, ye would believe me: for he wrote of me” (John 5:46). The Pentateuch was written by Moses: and the Pentateuch leads to Christ.

“From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures (of the Old Testament), which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. [Here again we have the Divine unity of the Law and the Gospel expressly stated.] All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Tim. 3:15–17). “Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture (Isa. 53:7–8), and preached unto him Jesus” (Acts 8:35). “He (St. Paul) mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the (Old Testament) Scriptures that Jesus was Christ” (Acts 18:28).

Both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man]

Upon the head and front of the Law is written the Need of Intercession, as well as of Redemption. No other feeling could have bowed the Jew into its observance. And that conviction was and is universal in our race. We know not how, given a sinful world unable to recover itself, you are to bring it back to God, without fear and trembling, until you convince it of a Mediator, and thus teach it the doctrine of Propitiation and Substitution. Now herein lies the whole function of the Mosaic Institute. “Wherefore the law was our Schoolmaster (παιδαγωγος ἡμῶν – our pedagogue or tutor, true frequently a superior slave, and therefore inferior in rank, but with the recognized duty of enforcing discipline) to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith” (Gal. 3:24). It gathered up probably the known rituals of families and peoples – undoubtedly that of Egypt; purified them of their abominations – for instance the element of human sacrifice;

appointed a reformed Code, stringent or if you will severe, but requisite; and on that inscribed Holiness to the Lord. It marked off and finally separated an already chosen race; placed it in the center of the nations; and by the ceremonial cleansing of the blood of bulls and goats, taught it the lustration of the soul by the Blood of Christ.

If it is objected, and it has been more or less, that this is wisdom after the event – that the Christian account is sickly prophecy after the history, we reply, in the first place, Given the conditions, and let infidelity find a better solution. Take, at the present day, any tribe of heathens, with the avowed object of turning them from idols – and the children of Israel were gross idolaters to begin with – to serve the living God, and you will utterly fail until you bring them step by step to see the love, and the power, and the verity of the Atonement.

But in time second place, we distinctly maintain that the Law did verily point to the Sacrifice of Christ, or in the broader statement of our Article, that the Mediator of the Old Testament and of the New is one and the same Saviour. Not only are the rites of the Law types and figures of “good things to come,” and its sacrifices a purposed foreshadowing of “Christ our Passover” and “set forth (προέθετο – historically manifested) Propitiation through Faith in His Blood,” as once and again asserted and implied throughout the New Testament, and amply demonstrated in time Epistle to the Hebrews – an indigenous argument of a Jew to Jews in favour of Christianity; but, we are to remember that alongside the Law, and contemporary with it, were the Prophets, time Evangelists of the Law. Even before the Law, and for the first representative family of the Israelites, as well as for Gentiles within his circle, Abraham was a prophet, and an Intercessor before Jehovah. And though shortsighted commentators would so restrict as almost to nullify the prophetic gift of Abraham, interpreting it simply in the sense of a friend of God, or confining it to time vision and dream at Mamre, yet our Lord Himself expressly declares that “Abraham rejoiced to see my Day (την ημέραν την ἐμὴν – my appearance in the Flesh): and he saw it, and was glad” (John 8:56). “Which the Patriarch could only do, in the full blessing of full prophetic power, by a prophetic realizing faith in the Atonement. But there were also prophets under the Law, from Moses, Aaron, and Samuel downward – thousands of prophets probably before, and hundreds contemporary with each of the sixteen prophets, the essence of whose teaching is recorded in the Canon. No

sooner indeed was the priesthood defined by Moses, than a prophetic ministry was appointed in the Seventy Elders, “upon whom when the Spirit rested, they prophesied, and did not cease” (Num. 11). In the time of the Judges too, prophecy exercised a most powerful, though fitful influence. But at its close, Samuel gathered up the scattered embers of this fire of the Lord, and organized Schools of the Prophets, so that a due supply of these inspired men was never wanting till the close of the Old Testament Canon. Now whatever else may have been the employment or attainments of the Prophets of the Lord, their great and chief function was to be in advance of the Law, and lead it on to the Gospel – Evangelical Teachers of, and Evangelical Intercessors for the Old Testament Church. Reformers they were in the true sense of the word; but destroyers of the Law they were not. Impressed with its Divine sanction, and saturated as it were with the sacredness of its every detail, by their communion with God they were enabled to read deep within into its inner meaning, and thus bring it home, in all its spirit, vital in every part, to the hearts of the people. So that when Christianity came, its Founder could historically appeal to the all things, written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me” (Luke 24:44). And Moses, Elias, and Christ could talk on the Holy Mount of the “decease which He should accomplish (πληροῦν – fulfill in accordance with Divine appointment and prophecy) at Jerusalem” (Luke 9:30–31): most cogent proof that “Moses *with* Elias,” the Law with the Prophets, ever pointed to a Coming Redeemer – the only Mediator between God and Man, now about to suffer – the Transfigured Christ.

But another line of proof is equally striking. Thus if we examine some of the more fundamental truths of the Covenant of Redemption, we shall find the Old Testament equally explicit and assuring with the New. Take the following: –

The Reality of Christ's Priesthood, and of the Atonement.

Old Testament.

“The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. ... The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek” (Psa. 110:1, 4). Jesus Christ a King and a Priest upon His Father's Throne. And as such seen, our Lord Himself assures us in the Gospel (‘David said by the Holy Ghost’) by the Royal Psalmist – over a thousand years before the

Incarnation. “It was a prophecy of Christ, and in Him it was fulfilled. The idea went forth necessarily from the spirit of the Old Dispensation, and from the organic connection of events in the Old Theocracy; it was the blossom of a history and a religion that were in their very essence prophetic” (Neander).

“Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong: because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors: and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors” (Isa. 53:12). “The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: but because the Lord loved you” (Deut. 7:7–8).

“Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit [consequently?] there is no guile” [the inner cleansing of the heart, as the fruit and evidence of the remission of sin] (Psa. 32:1–2). If St. Paul’s interpretation of this passage, as applied (Rom. 4) to “Abraham the father of us all” is correct, then the non-imputing of sin, and the imputation of righteousness by faith, are convertible terms. But as we know of no righteousness that saves but the righteousness of Christ, we must conclude, notwithstanding all that Dean Alford and others have written to the contrary, that the saving Person and Work of the Coming Saviour was apprehended by Abraham, as well as by David, the writer of the Psalm. To speak of the implicit trust of Abraham, or the patriarchs, in God’s word, without the realization of the ο Ἐρχόμενος, as the ground of their justification or righteousness, is clearly to invent a righteousness outside the Covenant of Redemption.

“Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you. ... And ye shall be my people, and I will be your God” (Ezek. 36:25–28). “In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness” (Zech. 13:1).

New Testament.

“Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people” (Heb. 2:17). “But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come ... by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us” (Heb. 9:11–12). “Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28). “I am the Good Shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. ... And I lay down my life for the sheep” (John 10:11, 15).

Christ endured the Curse of the Law, as a Substitute for His People.

Old Testament.

“He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all” [Heb. hath made the iniquity of us all to meet on him] (Isa. 53:5–6). “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself” (Dan. 9:24–26).

New Testament.

“For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the (Old Testament) Scriptures” (1 Cor. 15:3). “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us” (Gal. 3:13). “Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us” (1 Cor. 5:7).

Christ’s Righteousness is the Plea of his People.

Old Testament.

“The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honourable” (Isa. 42:21). “Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength” (Isa. 45:24). “I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with jewels” (Isa. 61:10). “In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness” (Jer. 23:6).

New Testament.

“As by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. ... That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 5:19, 21). “But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that, according as it is written (Jer. 9:23–24), He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord” (1 Cor. 1:30–31). “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him “ (2 Cor. 5:21).

Faith is the Instrument by which we lay hold of the Salvation purchased by Christ.

Old Testament.

“And he (Abraham) believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness” (Gen. 15:6). “For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me” (Job 19:25–27). “Let him take hold of my strength, that he may make peace with me and he shall make peace with me” (Isa. 27:5). “Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious cornerstone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste” (Isa. 28:16).

New Testament.

“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life” (John 3:36). “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God” (Eph. 2:8). “Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith” (Heb. 12:2). “Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation” (1 Peter 1:5).

Good works therefore are excluded as the Ground of the Sinner’s Justification.

Old Testament.

“I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins” (Isa. 43:25). “I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins: return unto me; for I have redeemed thee” (Isa. 44:22). “In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory” (Isa. 45:25). “He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for, he shall bear their iniquities” (Isa. 53:11). “And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me” (Jer. 33:8). “For I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more” (Jer. 31:34).

New Testament.

“Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses” (Acts 13:38–39). “Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law” (Rom. 3:24–30). “But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith” (Hab. 2:4). Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law

given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. ... Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith” (Gal. 3:11, 21, 24).

“For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them (Jer. 31, 33 – He further says, verse 34), And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now, where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin” (Heb. 10:14–18).

Many other quotations might be adduced in proof of the spiritual identity of the two Dispensations, and other arguments advanced; but enough perhaps has been said to show the Oneness of the Mediatorship of each.

We would only add two statements. First, not only was the Prophetic Function the corrector of abuses, and the avenger of the Law, but it actually grew out of it, “a different thing from it, yet not foreign to it – diverse, not contrary” (Tertullian) – the natural and necessary link between Judaism and Christianity.

Second. Some theologians are accustomed to speak of the Patriarchal economy in its comparative liberty, and the Mosaic economy in its commandment, as designed by God to prove man’s inability to save himself. We would have higher views of God than to endorse such teaching. We dare not say that our loving Father thus *experimented* with generation after generation of his children. We believe the true state of the case to be that each economy was the best fitted for its age – that the freedom of the one, and the tutelage of the other, were graciously adopted for purposes of good to each people, as well as wisely adapted to the circumstances and exigencies of each period. And only thus, by taking this higher ground, may we attempt to “vindicate the ways of God to man.”

Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises]

(1.) Bishop Warburton, in his *Divine Legation of Moses*, commits himself to the strange hypothesis, that the Divine authority of the Pentateuch rests, for one of its main arguments, upon the groundless if not irreverent assumption that the Hebrew Lawgiver studiously concealed the knowledge of a future state from the Israelites.

But, first, it is not the province of national legislation to propose future rewards and punishments.

Second. The whole essence of the Jewish theocracy connected the present with the future in God. It was a politico-religious institution, with the Divine King for its center and head, drawing man into close communion with God here, and therefore infallibly impressing upon the devout Israelite the sense and the bliss of eternal happiness with God hereafter. And this indisputable tendency and aim of the Theocracy will be abundantly manifest if we reflect upon the intimate relationship subsisting between the Divine Being and His people therein. Jehovah was not only their Creator, and therefore the director of their conscience; their God, and they His peculiar people; but He was also their Royal Sovereign, and Fountain of their civil life. The Palace of the Eternal One, the Tabernacle His Presence, the Shekinah; and the Oracle, His audible living Voice, enacting and promulgating all their laws, ordering and guiding all the conditions of their being. It was impossible to be a Jew under the Theocracy, and not live in the atmosphere of a world to come.

Third. The doctrine of a future state was one of the prominent features of the theology of Egypt, and therefore it is absurd – a plain historical blunder to speak of Moses *concealing* from the Israelites a doctrine with which they must have been so recently and familiarly acquainted.

(2.) We are thus in some measure prepared for the broader question, whether the doctrine of a future state is revealed in the Old Testament. Did the old Fathers look only for transitory Promises?

(a) Innumerable pages have been written by all classes of theologians to show that the faith of a future life had but a dim and fitful, if any, existence till the New Testament times. It is even contended that the inferential argument used by our Saviour against the Sadducees was not only “the most cogent text in the Law” (*sic* – why this playing into the hands of adversaries, by minimizing the defenses?) He could produce; but that “it must be deemed probable that the Sadducees, as they did not acknowledge the divine authority of Christ, denied even the logical validity of the inference, and argued that the expression that Jehovah was the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, did not necessarily mean more than that Jehovah had been the God of those patriarchs while they lived on earth, without conveying a suggestion, one way or another, as to whether they were or were not still living elsewhere” (Hon. Edward T. B.

Twisleton, Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, Article *Sadducees*). But in all such arguments there is, if we mistake not, a narrowness of view and survey which cramps the truth. In the one we have quoted, there is in addition a total misapprehension of the facts of the case. Good pleading certainly it might have been for the Sadducees, had they been able to appreciate it, or on any historic basis to advance it. Pitiably pleading, we must say, for Christ and His Bible.

Granted, but only for argument's sake, that the text quoted by our Saviour is the most cogent in the Law, it is not the most cogent in the Old Testament Scriptures; and there is no proof, even as acknowledged by the writer, and notwithstanding the opinion of Bishop Wordsworth, following Jerome, to the contrary, that the Sadducees rejected any portion of the Old Testament however highly with other Jews they may have naturally or justly esteemed the Pentateuch. And if we carefully read St. Luke with the other synoptic Gospels, the argument of our Saviour is an open challenge to other Scripture, though based on the Books of Moses, which His opponents had quoted – an *argumentum ad ignorantiam*, as well as an *argumentum ad hominem*. “Ye do err, not knowing the whole Scripture (τας γραφας – Matthew and Mark), and even Moses (και Μωυσης – Luke) confutes you.” While, again, to write, “it must be deemed probable that the Sadducees denied even the logical validity of the inference,” is most clearly and unquestionably *against the evidence*; for we read that “the Sadducees were put to silence!” And not only this, but so completely did our Lord's answer to the Sadducees, and then immediately to the Pharisees, confound and overcome both, that, as we are told, after that there was an end to “questioning” the Saviour.

But the fact is that all these loose arguments and conclusions, with reference to the doctrine of a future life as contained in the Old Testament, would seem to be based in great measure on a weak rendering or misapprehension of certain passages in the New Testament, and especially of words of St. Paul. Thus in 2 Tim. 1:10, we have an oft-quoted passage, as it runs in the Authorized Version, “Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel”; and which is accordingly made to convey the sense that Christ first revealed the Resurrection. But the “life” here referred to is clearly the new life which the saints ever possessed in God; “the immortality,” its incorruptibility (α_θαψία); and the “brought to light,” certainly not the discovery of these glorious truths, but the additional

and reassuring light thrown upon them by the historic manifestation of Christ, and the Economy of His Spirit.

(b) Our contention then is, startling as it may appear to theologians who have of late been led away, however unconsciously, by Neologic schools, that the doctrine of a future life was axiomatic with the old Fathers, just as the existence or being of God was “axiomatic”; and therefore the Holy Spirit, in the Old Testament, essays no elaborate proof of the one more than the other. What is brought out on either side is incidental. Furthermore, since these two truths – the existence of God and a future life – had a prominent and fixed place in almost all the theologies of the world it would have stultified the very nature of a communication from God to *prove* them. The Bible we must remember is a *Revelation and a Witness* – two distinct features, which we are liable to confound; and which our so-called systems of theology do less or more confound. The Bible may witness to, but does not in any way assume to reveal, what is already known. It reveals the Origin of Evil (transgression in man, pride in Satan), Christ, and a Triune God. It witnesses to the Being of God, and a Life to Come. Its Divine Author, if we may put the phrase without profanity, never troubles Himself unnecessarily.

If in the New Testament, the Witness of a Resurrection is liable to be mistaken for a Revelation, and has been very widely mistaken, it is only because the Witness becomes so strong. And there was need for this. Heresy had sprung up and denied it. And indeed the very same may be affirmed of the other doctrine of general, if not universal, knowledge – the existence of a God. The truth is, the enemy, under guise of philosophy and boast of wisdom, had begun to “come in like a flood,” and “the Spirit of the Lord lifted up a standard” of pronounced and guiding testimony “against him”.

(c) What then is the Evidence of the Old Testament to a Future State? The question is one for a volume; but we must examine a few of the more salient passages. As a preliminary observation, however, and important confirmation of our argument that the whole evidence is incidental, we may remark that in the account of the creation of man there is no explicit statement, nor even any implied assertion whatever of his immortality – just the place where most of all, if the demonstration had not been wholly superfluous, we should have expected to find it. The account runs: “And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness. ... And the

Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living animal” (Gen. 1:26, 2:7). Here we have the Organic Life נפשחיה – the “living creature,” as Gen. 1:24, etc., – and not as our Authorized Version, living soul”); “in the image and likeness of God” – righteousness and holiness, with knowledge, wisdom, and power. But that is all. The existence of an immaterial and immortal spirit, however presupposed, forms no part of the Revelation. “And Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him” (Gen. 5:24). The very brevity of the account shows that it was fully understood at the time – and understood too, all along, for there is no subsequent attempt to expand or elucidate it, as the “Jewish” author of the Epistle to the Hebrews understood it, of translation to heaven. In other words, the old Fathers must have lived in the full familiar conviction of a life hereafter; and further, so far from looking only for transitory promises, must have felt that eternal life with God gloriously compensated for Enoch’s comparatively short life on earth. Here then, in the first age of mankind, we have an historic witness not only to the possibility of a resurrection of the body, but also to the certainty of a true human existence in heaven.

“Then Abraham died and was gathered to his people” (Gen. 25:8). Abraham was buried in the cave of Machpelah (verse 9); but his fathers in Chaldea and Mesopotamia. The expression therefore can only mean that his soul passed into the invisible world to join the congenial society of the blessed. See parallels in Job 27:19 – “The rich man shall lie down, but he shall not be gathered”; Psa. 26:9 – “Gather not my soul with sinners”; and Isa. 49:5 – “Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength.”

“For I will go down unto Sheol unto my son mourning” (Gen. 37:35). It could not be Joseph’s grave that Jacob meant, for he believed that “an evil beast had devoured him” (verse 33). Then in Num. 16:30, we read that Korah, Dathan, and Abiram “went down alive unto Sheol.” And thus in like manner, Sheol or Hades, in its two “compartments,” is witnessed to in the language of Inspiration down through the Old Testament; and endorsed by the New. Proof in itself sufficient that the doctrine of a life beyond the grave was a doctrine of the witness of God from the outset in the Jewish Church. See also under Article III.

“I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord” (Gen. 49:18). Jacob could not have meant the coming of the Shiloh, for that glad event he declares

was to transpire “in the last days”. The expression therefore could have no other meaning but the obvious one – the salvation of his soul.

“I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Exod. 3:6). Our Saviour’s comment on this passage brings out in a few words its meaning: “God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him.” “No one is dead, to Him, or in His sight” (Wordsworth). “Meyer, in reply to Strauss and Hase, finely says, ‘Our Lord here testifies of the conscious intent of God in speaking the words. God uttered them, He tells us, to Moses, in the consciousness of the still enduring existence of his peculiar relation to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.’ The groundwork of His argument seems to me to be this: – the words ‘I am thy God’ imply a *covenant*; there is *another side* to them: ‘Thou art Mine’ follows upon ‘I am Thine.’ When God therefore declares that He *is the God* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, He declares their continuance, as the other parties in this covenant. It is an assertion which *could not be made of an annihilated being of the past*. And notice also (with Bengel), that Abraham’s (etc.) *body*, having had upon it *the seal of the covenant*, is included in this. Stier (after Lavater) remarks that this is a weighty testimony against the so-called ‘sleep of the soul,’ in the intermediate state. ... Thus the burden of the Law, ‘I AM THE LORD THY GOD,’ contains in it the seed of immortality and the hope of the resurrection” (Alford, Greek Testament *in loco*). We would only add, that the pregnant reasoning here of our Saviour, “For *all* live to Him,” contains an irrefragable argument against the lately revived theory of the Annihilation of the wicked. The gloss, all the Patriarchs live to Him, is as weak as to interpret the words of the Apostle, “For in him we live and move and have our being,” of believers only.

“Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his” (Numb. 23:10). This testimony in the mouth of Balaam, the prophet-king from Mesopotamia, is of great value, for it is a Scriptural proof that the belief in a blessed immortality awaiting the just, was held (also) by the heathen.

“And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven” (2 Kings 2:11). This *public* event, and we may so call it, inasmuch as it was witnessed by the sons of the prophets who “stood in sight” (2 Kings 2:7 – Heb.), and Elisha, and seems to have been well known at the time by the idolaters at Bethel (2 Kings 2:23), transfused itself into the whole national mind down even to the Galilean peasant for centuries.”

“Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever! For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in say flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me” (Job 19:23–27). Notwithstanding all the criticism that has been brought to bear on the translation of this passage, we may safely say that the Authorized Version here is correct. Nothing but personal identity in his flesh on the part of Job, and a personal manifestation on the part of his Redeeming God, at the latter day upon the earth, and after that worms shall have destroyed the present body of the outward man, can fully or fairly satisfy this declaration of Job’s conviction. And to add to the value of the testimony is the antiquity of the book. For whether Moses was the author or not, there is little reason to doubt, from its language, its grand yet bold abrupt archaic and lapidary style, and from the simplicity of its subject, the external evidences of God’s providence, that it is one of the oldest, if not indeed *the* oldest Book of the Canon.

“I have set the Lord always before me: because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One [better thy Beloved – “The word קֹדֶשׁ never means ‘holy,’” *Perowne*] to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life; fullness of joy in thy presence, pleasures at thy right hand for evermore” (Psa. 16:8–11). We have St. Peter’s testimony that this was a conscious prediction on the part of David of a resurrection – the Resurrection of Christ (Acts 2:30–31 – προφήτης – εἰδώς – προΐδών). But the patriarch’s foresight of the Messiah was just that which gave gladness to his heart, rapture to his soul, yea and hope also to his flesh, for in the Life and Resurrection alone of his Son and Lord could he see his own blessed immortality.

“Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead” (Isa. 26:19). Strong resurrection imagery; which must have been familiar to and well understood by those among whom the prophet exercised his ministry.

“... Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord” (Ezek. 37:1–14). The Resurrection of Dry Bones, so vividly and minutely traced in the fourteen verses of this solemn grand glorious prediction, could only have cheered a people well versed in the faith of the resurrection.

“And at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever” (Dan. 12:1–3). Clear and distinct, though brief, is this final Old Testament trumpet sound of the general Resurrection and last Judgment, as any in the New Testament itself.

Now if to all this abundant testimony we may add that of the inspired author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we may safely conclude of the saints of the Old Testament: “These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek after a home ... a better home, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.” The Old Fathers looked beyond “transitory promises,” and God for that eye of faith hath given them the permanent and eternal “city which hath the foundations (τους θεμελίους), whose Architect and Master builder is God.”

(d) Finally, we are not here concerned with what has been too frequently pointed at as the doubts and fears *par signe on mépris* of the “Old Fathers”. The same doubts and fears – we appeal to the consciences of our readers – exist, in our own more desponding moments, under the Gospel. Faith, our hearts know full well, hath its phases. Now we feel with

the Psalmist that “When we awake we shall be satisfied with thy likeness”; and anon we ask, Who shall praise thee in the grave? Or with holy Job “we know that our Redeemer liveth”; and yet withal at evening time we often trill the plaintive dirge, “So man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep.” To preach immortality is one thing: to live immortals is another. Dogma and Faith, whether under the Old Dispensation or the New, are not parallels.

2. How far the Mosaic Law is Binding.

Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind, etc. (to the end of the Article)]

We need only have recourse to a few very simple and obvious first principles of theology and of reason to see the truth of this proposition.

Holiness, and the will of God, are synonymous terms. What therefore God wills under any dispensation, must be conducive to holiness, however economical and temporary may be the means. Thus even in the Christian dispensation, we have “outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace” – the one economical and temporary, the other conducive to “the will of God, even our sanctification.”

A ceremony therefore in the very nature of it is for a time and transitional. That time may be a day, or an age; but it passes sooner or later away. Baptism is once. The Sacrament of the Supper may be once, or often repeated; but neither our modal administration nor participation of it can possibly and fully obtain even in the next and millennial development of the Father’s kingdom.” While the husk therefore of the Law given of God by Moses was doomed necessarily to perish, the kernel as necessarily endureth forever. The holiness of God impressed on the Law was a part or reflex of Himself, and consequently unchangeable; but its economical surroundings, like Baptism and the Supper, had only an economical value. They were not part of God’s essential nature.

Again we are to remember that the holiness of the Law, founded in the holiness of God, existed, relatively to man, antecedently to any Divine precept, being originally inscribed on the heart of man; and therefore, as the law of nature, is of immutable obligation.

Thus then we have only to distinguish between what is positive and what is natural in God’s revealed laws to see what is alterable and changeable by God, and what of necessity abideth forever. To take for

example the fourth commandment, its naturally moral element, founded in the nature of God, originally written on the heart of our first parents, and still in some measure engraved on the minds of men, even where no written law exists, is that it appoints God to be worshipped; but its positively moral element, founded only in the will of God, and not universally engrained in man's nature, is that it enjoins that worship on a particular day – the seventh, or Sabbath day.

And the same remarks apply to the Judicial Law, in its distinctive Jewish character. Its Sabbatical Year; its Jubilee and great liberation of service and of lands; its Cities of Refuge; and its tri-yearly Male Feasts at Jerusalem, have all passed away and are abrogated: but the Law of God and of nature which underlay the whole – love to and unity with Man as flowing from love to and unity with God – is of perpetual force. “Ye shall not therefore oppress one another; but thou shalt fear thy God: for I am the Lord your God” (Lev. 25:17).

Besides, the whole Civil Polity of the Jews, whether in its embodiments of the patriarchal law, or in its new and circumstantial growths, was founded on a theocratic basis, and adapted to the past condition of an isolated people. And although we are free to hold that much of it adumbrated the Laws of Persons of Things in the coming Kingdom of Christ, yet we are to remember that our Lord's express declaration for the present is, “My kingdom is not of this world”; and that St. Paul, in conformity with that declaration, teaches us in the meantime: “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no [established] power but of God: the powers that be are ordained (or ordered with reference to a definite end – τεταγμένοι) of God” (Rom. 13:1).

Scriptural Proof.

(1.) Of the Abrogation of the Ceremonial Law.

“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt” (Jer. 31:31–32).

“And the people of the Prince that shall come (or, Messiah's future people) shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. ... And he shall confirm the (or, a) covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he

shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate (or, and upon the battlements shall be the idols of the desolator), even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate (or, upon the desolator)” (Dan. 9:26–27). We have included the marginal readings, well worthy of consideration, of this marvelous passage, written some five centuries and a half before Christ. But however translated, it clearly foretells the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, the cessation of the sacrifice and oblation, which could alone be lawfully offered there and, consequently, the abolition of the whole Ceremonial Law.

It is hardly necessary to adduce passages from the New Testament, inasmuch as all the typical Ceremonies of the Law had their full accomplishment in the death and satisfaction of the Great Antitype; and no less than three of the most closely reasoned Epistles – Galatians, Romans, and Hebrews – have, for their leading subject, *Justification by Faith, without the Law*. But a few of the more pointed texts are subjoined. It is most important however to observe that at the First Christian Council, held at Jerusalem probably A.D. 50, it was decided by the Apostles and Elders and Brethren, guided by and acting under the immediate and express influence of God (“it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us”), that the Gentile converts should be wholly unburdened by the Rites and Ceremonies of the Mosaic Law. (Acts 15.)

“Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to everyone that believeth. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above) or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead). [In other words, Let not the man who sighs for deliverance from his own sinfulness suppose that the accomplishment of some impossible task is required of him in order to enjoy the blessings of the Gospel. Let him not think that the personal presence of the Messiah is necessary to ensure his salvation. Christ needs not to be brought down from heaven, or up from the abyss, to impart to him forgiveness and holiness. Our Christian message contains no impossibilities. “We tell the sinner that Christ’s word is near to him: so near, that he may speak of it with his mouth and meditate on it with his heart. ... Is there anything above human power in such a confession and

in such a belief? Surely not. It is graciously adapted to the necessity of the very weakest and most sinful of God's creatures." – Ewbank, Comm. Ep. Rom.] But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. ... For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Rom. 10).

"There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Seythian ('barbaris barbariores'), bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. 3:11). "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but Faith which worketh by Love" (Gal. 5:1–6). "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. ... Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days ('i.e., yearly, monthly, or weekly celebrations,' *Alford*), which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ" (Col. 2:14, 16–17). "For he is our peace, who hath made both (Jew and Gentile) one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us (the whole legal system and condemnatory law of the Mosaic economy); having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in (His) one (mystical) body (the Church) by the cross, having slain the enmity (between God and man, with its resultant of separation between Jew and Gentile) thereby" (Eph. 2:14–16). "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. ... Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of

reformation” (Heb. 7:12, 9:10). “Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added (to the promise, propaedeutically) because of transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made. ... Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by Faith” (Gal. 3:19, 24). “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by Faith without the deeds of the Law” (Rom. 3:28).

(2.) Of the Perpetual Obligation of the Moral Law.

(a) Being a copy of the will of the all-perfect and righteous God, and adapted to and based on the nature of man, it is unchangeable.

“The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord (another name for Law) is clean, enduring forever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether” (Psa. 19:7–9).

(b) Fulfilled by Christ, both in spirit and letter, in the room and stead of His people.

“The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness’ sake: he will magnify the law, and make it (or, him) honourable” (Isa. 42:21). “And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him” (Matt. 3:15). “Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill” (Matt. 5:17). “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. ... That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith” (Gal. 5:13–14). “Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest. Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness remain in the fruitful field. And the work of righteousness shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever” (Isa. 32:15–17). See also Isa. 44:3, Jer. 31:33, etc. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the

flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit” (Rom. 8:1–5).

(c) Summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments, which are again reduced by our Lord to Love to God and Love to Man.

“Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets” (Matt. 22:37–40).

(d) Yet consists moreover in a corresponding quality of Divine teaching imprinted less or more distinctly on the heart of mankind.

“For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are *the law* (God’s law) unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another” (Rom. 2:14–15).

(e) A rule of duty and obedience to believers, but not a covenant of works.

“His delight is in the law of the Lord: and in his law doth he meditate day and night” (Psa. 1:2). “I delight in the law of God after the inward man” (Rom. 7:22). “Ye are not under the law, but under grace” (Rom. 6:14). “Being not without law to God, but under law to Christ” (1 Cor. 9:21).

Article VIII.

History.

Of the Three Creeds. – The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius’s Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

De Tribus Symbolis. – Symbola tria, Nicaenum, Athanasii, et quod vulgo Apostolorum appellatur, omnino recipienda sunt, et credenda, nam firmissimis Scripturarum testimoniis probari possunt.

(1.) The sixth Article being the enunciation of the Rule of Faith, we may take the seventh as a corollary – that the two parts of that Rule are not contrary the one to the other, with a necessary note touching the Ceremonial and the Moral Law; while our present Article must be viewed as a

supplement, to the effect that the Creeds are to be received, not merely because they are the voice of the Church, but inasmuch as they derive their authority from the Bible.

The Holy Scriptures therefore are the gauge of faith, independent of the authority of the Church; by which the Church is to measure all doctrine: and so in the exercise of a free and impartial judgment, accept or reject the decisions of all Councils.

The truly Protestant character moreover of this eighth Article will be further apparent, if we remember that the Ten Articles of Henry VIII – the result of a compromise between the Romish and the Reforming party – included the Creeds *with* Scripture as the Rule of Faith.

(2.) The word Creed (*Credo*, I believe) or Belief, means simply a definite summary of the more important parts of our religion, as deduced from the Bible.

In the early Church the Creed was described by a variety of names.

Among the Greeks –

η πίστις, ο κανων της αληθείας, ο πιστεως αρχαίας κανων, το κήρυγμα το αποστολικον, η ευαγγελικη και αποστολικη παράδοσις, το μάθημα, η γραφή, το σύμβολον.

Among the Latins –

Fides, regula fidei, fides apostolica, fidei clavis, tessera fidei unanimes, signaculum cordis, sacramentum fidei, symbolum.

But the name which, first mentioned by Cyprian, became commonest, was *Symbol* (σύμβολον, Symbolum). A designation which has given rise to various conjectures, and been explained in one or other of the following senses: –

1. A Collation, because each of the Apostles contributed one Article to the Creed. “Conferendo in unum quod sentiebat unusquisque” (Ruffinus). But the tradition only dates from the 4th century.

2. Like the Tessera Militaris of the Roman soldiers – the square tablet on which the watchword was written – a sign or watchword by which Christians were distinguished. “A symbol is, as much as to say, a sign, mark, privy token, or watchword, whereby the soldiers of the same camp are known from their enemies” (Catechism of Edward VI). The most probable origin of the appellation.

3. The Sacramentum, or military oath of allegiance by which the Roman troops were bound to their general. “Symbolum eordis signaculum,

et nostrae militae sacramentum” (Ambrose). A deeply significant and spiritual explanation, but not ranking perhaps in historic value with the foregoing.

4. The Password of the initiated into the ancient heathen mysteries. A far-fetched and seemingly unnatural suggestion.

5. An Epitome of Christian doctrine. Which rather describes the Symbol, than interprets the word.

(3.) Creeds are necessary as a bond of union and as a safeguard against error. It would seem a self-evident proposition that the continuity and wellbeing of any, and especially an antagonistic, society must depend in great measure upon a common and tangible basis of opinion. And it is at the same time a matter of historic evidence that creeds originated in the antagonism of Christianity, and were expanded *pari passu* with the development of heresy. And yet notwithstanding there exists at the present day a widespread prejudice against the principle of dogma – a rebound from the safe and time honoured lines of the definite, to the lawless and dangerous region of the indefinite. Is not the key, that Faith is less on the earth? (Luke 18:8.)

(4.) Dogma, unhappily, thanks to the Church of Rome, has acquired in our language a somewhat repulsive sense; but perhaps if we could strip it of the idea of undue assumption, and associate it simply with that of definite belief, the word might still pass not unprofitable muster.

If we follow the exact idea of the Greek primitive (*δοκειν* = *videri*), dogma would express the subjective estimate which we form of things without any approach to the alien notion of overbearing or self-assertion. Nor indeed can the word well exceed in the Christian Church the meaning we usually attach to “decree” or “judgment”. Hence our Authorized Version reads, Acts 15:28, “It seemed good (*έδοξε*) to the Holy Ghost, and to us”; and at ch. 16:4, well translates the derivative word for those decisions arrived at in the First Christian Council, as “decrees” (*δόγματα*).

(5.) To the New Testament and Baptism we must look for the Origin of Creeds.

(a) “Go ye therefore, and teach (*μαθητεύσατε* – make Disciples or Christians of) all nations, baptizing them for (*εις*) the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matt. 28:19–20). With all due deference to Dean Alford, and Bishop Wordsworth who substantially agrees

with him, we would just reverse his comment on this passage, that “the μαθητεύειν consists of two parts – the initiatory, admissory *rite*, and the *subsequent teaching*.” This mode of interpretation may be convenient to cover the present practice of the Church; but infant baptism does not require such straining of words and history. There is no evidence whatever in the New Testament – except by inference, the value or strength of which we would not in any way dispute – but that they were adults who were baptized. And there is no evidence in all history, that instruction, as preparatory to a Creed, has not preceded baptism. And indeed it is upon this very principle that the Church ever demands, in the case of infants, sponsorial vows and confessions. And therefore the plain argument we build upon this text is, that our Lord’s language in the institution of baptism implies a baptismal profession – the first origin of and only legitimate authority for Creeds; and had respect unto discipleship, as the rule, not, as Alford alleges, “from baptism to instruction,” but *from instruction to baptism*. “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,” may be extended, and rightly does extend, to the continued catechetical office of the Church among the baptized; but extension supposes previous existence, and has a retrospective, as well as a prospective side. Granted, as we willingly do, that infants were baptized in the Apostolic Church, our clear contention is, that they were not baptized until their parents or representatives had believed, or accepted Christianity – in other words, had professed a Creed; and thus brought their households and children into a federal covenant with the Lord. The Church of Rome may and does busy herself to snatch the children of “heretics “ and heathens to baptism, but the practice has no warrant or precedent in Scripture or in the records of the Churches of Christ. And these views we shall find fully borne out as we proceed.

(b) Baptism and the Creed in the Acts. Christian Baptism begins properly in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, after the Ascension of our Lord; and here we are, therefore, to look for the first historic traces of a Creed. Previous to the formal institution of baptism by Christ, it is true we find His disciples baptizing; but what formula was used by them, or what expression of faith they required on the part of the baptized, we are not informed, but may safely conclude that converts were baptized into the Name and Faith of Jesus as the Messiah.

Now the first baptism recorded in the Acts was that on the day of Pentecost, by St. Peter; and we have a clear enough account of the manner of its administration from the Apostle's exhortation: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you *in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts 2:38–39). Here the rendering should unquestionably be "On the Name of Jesus Christ" (ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι); the preposition ἐπι, elsewhere ἐν, specifying the ground on which baptism rests – the Confession of His Name; just as the preposition εἰς (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν) specifies the purpose for which baptism was administered – a participation in the blessings which that name implies – "the remission of sins". In other words, the first Christian Baptism was administered after a Creedal Confession (by "every one" of the "three thousand" probably *en masse*) of Christ as the Messiah and Saviour. Instruction, Confession, Baptism. And this is the character of all the other baptisms recorded in the Book, so far as any detail is given.

(c) The Creed in the Epistles – in the probable order of their publication.

The Epistle to the Romans, A.D. 57 or 58.

τύπον διδαχῆς – "that form of doctrine which was delivered you (Rom. 6:17).

κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως – "according to the proportion of faith" (lit. the analogy of the faith) (Rom. 12:6).

τὴν διδαχὴν – "the doctrine which ye have learned" (Rom. 16:17).

Without entering into the various glosses with which certain schools have read these allusions, we think we may safely say that their fair and unbiassed interpretation points to some definite formulary of belief already well known in the Christian Church, even at Rome, and within 27 years from the foundation of that Church. And that this was a Baptismal Symbol would appear evident from the careful wording of the Apostle, "the doctrine which ye learned" (εμάθετε, Aorist, *one act*); and from the fact that the first quotation is found in close connection with a solemn passage upon baptism "for Jesus Christ and His death."

The Epistle to the Philippians, A.D. 62 or 63.

τω αυτω κανόνι – “let us walk by the same rule” (Phil. 3:16). κανόνι is omitted by some MSS.; but if we follow the analogy of Gal. 6:16, “as many as walk according to this rule” (τω κανόνι τούτω), it is evidently the proper word to supply. And this keyword of both passages can only be taken from a *baptismal rule* or Canon of Faith, history knowing of no other.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, A.D. 63 or 64.

τα στοιχεια της αρχης των λογίων του θεου – “the first principles of the oracles of God” (Heb. 5:12). And what some of these were, we are told in the beginning of the next chapter:—

τον της αρχης του Χριστου λόγον – “the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ” (lit. the Word of the Beginning [of the Doctrine] of Christ). Or, θεμέλιον – “the Foundation” of Christianity. “Wherefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment” (Heb. 6:1–2).

την ομολογίαν της ελπίδος – “the profession of our faith” (Heb. 10:23). That the Creedal Confession of Baptism is here meant, is indubitable from the context: “Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water (λελουμένοι το σωμα ύδατι καθαρω – veritable Christian baptism, and so not to be spiritualized away, with Calvin, Owen, and others). Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering.”

The Two Epistles to Timothy, A.D. 64 or 65, and 65 or 66, Respectively.

την παραθήκην – “the deposit”. “O Timothy, keep in safety (φύλαζον – guard) that which is committed to thy trust [the deposit], avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith” (1 Tim. 5:20–21). Here Timothy is solemnly reminded of the Creed as that which would most effectually guard him against the errors of false teachers.

υποτύπωσιν υγιαίνοντων λόγων – την καλην παραθήκην – “the form of sound words” – “that good deposit”. “Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard (ήκουσας, heardest, Aorist) of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good deposit guard, by the Holy Ghost which

dwelleth in us” (2 Tim. 1:13–14). Here the “good, deposit” is in direct parallelism with “the form of sound words” – the Baptismal Creedal Confession.

Result.

From all this we gather: –

1. That the Formula of Baptism ran: “I baptize thee for the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”
2. That Instruction preceded Baptism.
3. That fully within 35 years after the Ascension, there existed some such well-known Symbol, as the following –

Apostolic Creed.

I renounce my own righteousness, and submit to the righteousness of God, in faith on the Lord Jesus Christ. [“Repentance from dead works, and faith toward God.”]

I accordingly renounce the doctrine of Jewish washings, and imposition of hands as practiced under the Law. [“The doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands.”]

I believe in the Resurrection of the Dead, and in Eternal Judgment.

(d) We have omitted, as will be noticed, from the above inquiry, two passages which are frequently set down as traces of a Creed: –

1 Cor. 15:3–8: “For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures: and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures: and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the Apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.”

1 Tim. 3:16: “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.”

In the first of these passages we can see little more than a detail of the heads of St. Paul’s preaching at Corinth, as it centered in the Resurrection of Christ – far too lengthened and minute to form a portion of any Creed in

the Apostolic Church. In the second, we have it is true a remarkable parallelism and concinnity (the latter very beautiful in the Greek, all the verbs ending in -θη, etc.); but the sentences, we think, are too rhetorical, and perhaps too majestic for a Confession; and their apparent abruptness and insulation from the context, urged by some commentators, would seem to be in reality only an example among others of impassioned sequence and expansion of thought on the part of the Apostle. Thus we have a similar instance in Rom. 8:38–39: “For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

(6.) The Creed in the Post-Apostolic Church.

It is essential here to remark that no one certain form of a Creed would seem to have been prescribed by Christ and His Apostles for adoption by the Church at large. Hence we find the early churches in different parts of the world framing their own creeds as well as their own liturgies; which they would evidently be at liberty to do, so long as they kept to the analogy of the faith. It is interesting therefore to exhibit those early creeds, so far as they are traceable; and necessary also in order intelligibly to understand the basis and cast of the creeds of our Article. But as the earliest of these ancient creeds only dates from the end of the second century, there is thus left a break in the History of the Creed, which we cannot sufficiently explain. That a Creed existed in the Apostolic Church before the historical books of the New Testament were written, is clear from the quotations already given; and we have been able to approximate to something of its form. Nor is it to be supposed that the Church would remain till the days of Irenaeus without some definite elaborations of that Creed. Still the fact remains, as is widely attested by the Fathers, down to the fifth century, that the Creed was, as a rule, jealously guarded as a secret. “The Sacrament of Faith (*sacramentum fidei*) is not to be profaned” (Cyprian, † 238). “Whatever you hear in the Creed may not be written” (Augustine, † 430). “Let the mind hold and the memory guard this pledge of hope, this decree of salvation, this symbol of life, this safeguard of faith, lest vile paper depreciate the precious gift of the Divinity, lest black ink obscure the mystery of light, lest an unworthy and profane hearer hold the secret of God” (Peter Chrysologus, † 456). The origin of this secrecy has been attributed by some to the language of St. Paul, “Keep in safety that

which is committed to thy trust,” etc. But we are inclined to think that such words rather indicate a secret guardianship already in existence than created it. And if so, the question is only rendered more intricate and obscure. Again it has been alleged that the period between the close of the New Testament history and the appearance of the first dated Creed was the age of Apologies, and that the battle of the Creeds had afterwards to be fought. There is much truth in this. But it does not help us to account for the “deposit” and secret guardianship of the Pauline Epistles – the age, as must be allowed, peculiarly and especially of *doctrine*.

GAUL (AND ASIA MINOR).

The Creed of St. Irenaeus, A.D. 180.

Bishop of Lyons.

I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, who made heaven and earth, the seas, and all that is in them.

And in one Christ Jesus our Lord, the Son of God, who was born of a Virgin for our salvation: suffered under Pontius Pilate: rose from the dead: ascended into heaven: and who will come again the glory of His Father to raise the dead, and for the consummation of all things.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, who preached through the prophets.

In setting forth the above as the (probable) Creed of Irenaeus, culled from his work against *Heresies*, we are sorry to differ from Dr. Lumby, who quotes this Father’s *exposition* of the Creed for the Creed itself. Actual early Creeds must ever have been short; nor can we suppose that Irenaeus would so soon forget, or ignore, the secret guardianship of the Creed, as to give its formal and precise *ipsissima verba*. Even two centuries later, St. Augustine writes of his own treatise of the Creed: “The Dissertation is of such a form, that the combination of words which is given to catechumens to commit to memory does not occur.”

NORTHERN AFRICA.

Creed of Tertullian, Before A.D. 200.

Presbyter of Carthage.

We believe in one God the Creator of the world, who made all things out of nothing.

And in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was born of the Virgin Mary: crucified under Pontius Pilate: rose again the third day from the dead: taken into heaven: now sits at the right hand of the Father: and will come with glory to judge the quick and the dead.

And in the Holy Ghost.

Add –

Creed of St. Cyprian, † 258.

Bishop of Carthage.

I believe in God the Father.

In Christ the Son.

And in the Holy Ghost.

I believe in the remission of sins and eternal life through the Holy Church.

ROME.

Creed of Novatian, A.D. 250.

Presbyter.

I believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things.

And in Christ Jesus, our Lord God, the Son of God.

And in the Holy Ghost.

NORTHERN EGYPT.

Creed of Origen, † 254.

Master of the Catechetical School at Alexandria.

We believe in one God, the Creator of all things: the God of the Old and New Testament.

And in Jesus Christ, born of the Father before every creature: who though God became Incarnate of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost: He truly suffered and died: truly rose from the dead: and was taken up.

And in the Holy Ghost, of honour and dignity with the Father and the Son.

PONTUS.

Creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus, † 270.

Bishop of Neocaesarea.

I believe in one God the Father.

And in one Lord, the only begotten Son of the Father, One of One, God of God.

And in one Holy Ghost, perfect of perfect, Life of all living.

Perfect Trinity undivided and untreated, ever the same in glory, eternity, and power, unvarying and unchangeable.

ANTIOCH.

Creed of Lucian, the Martyr, † 311.

Presbyter.

We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of all things.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ His only begotten Son, begotten of the Father before all ages, God of God, One of One: by whom all things were made: who was born of a Virgin according to the Scriptures, and became man: who suffered for us, and rose again the third day: and ascended into heaven: and sitteth on the right hand of the Father: and is coming again with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead.

And in the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete and Sanctifier of them that believe.

Three persons, but agreeing in One.

We have thus endeavoured to trace the Creeds of the leading ante-Nicene Churches, so far as we are able to glean them from the expositions and writings of men on the spot. Of course they are only to be taken as approximate Symbols. But we are not aware of overlooking any point of importance; and we have carefully avoided adding anything.

It may be objected that we have studied brevity too much. But brevity here is, we feel assured, just one of the best guides to historic truth.

On reviewing these Creeds, we have the following main features. The true Western type is the briefest – little more than the words used by our Lord at the Institution of Baptism; while the Eastern type shows traces of conflict with philosophic subtleties. They all recognize the great central doctrine of the Trinity in Unity – more sharply defined at Alexandria, Neocaesarea, and Antioch. Each article is couched in the exact words of Scripture, or what is readily deducible therefrom. And their similarity, amounting almost to sameness (except the self-evident expansions against Docetic and other like errors), and this without any Synodical authority whatever, argues a common Apostolic basis – the Rule of Faith “come

down from the commencement of the Gospel.” As Irenaeus says: “For the Church though scattered throughout the whole world even to the ends of the earth, yet having received from the Apostles and their disciples that faith which is in One God the Father Almighty, who made heaven and earth and the seas and all that is in them; and in one Christ Jesus the Son of God, who was made flesh for our salvation; and in the Holy Ghost who preached through the prophets the Economies and the Advents, and the birth [of Christ] of a Virgin, and his suffering, and His rising from the dead, and the ascension into heaven, in the flesh of our beloved Christ Jesus, our Lord, and His coming again from heaven in the glory of the Father, for the consummation of all things, and to raise all flesh of the whole human race from the dead; that according to the good pleasure of the Father invisible, every knee of things in heaven and on earth and under the earth may bow to Christ Jesus our Lord and God and Saviour and King, and every tongue may confess to Him, and He may execute just judgment on all; that He may send into eternal fire the spiritual powers of wickedness, and the angels who have transgressed and become apostate, and the impious and unjust and lawless and blasphemous among men: but, graciously bestowing life on the just and holy who have both kept His commandments and continued in His love, some from the beginning and some from the time of their repentance, He may confer on them incorruption, and make them partakers of eternal glory. Having received this doctrine and this faith, as we said before, the Church, though scattered through all the world, carefully keeps it as though dwelling in one house; and believers in like manner as though she had but one heart and one soul; and in accord therewith she preaches and teaches and delivers as though she had but one mouth. For the languages of the world are dissimilar, but the power of the doctrine is one and the same. And in no otherwise have either the Churches established in Germany believed and delivered, nor those in Spain, nor among the Celts, nor in the East, nor in Egypt, nor in Libya, nor those established in the middle of the world. But as the sun, God’s creature, is one and the same in all the world, so too the preaching of the truth shines everywhere, and enlightens all men who wish to come to the full knowledge of the truth. And neither will he who is very powerful in language among those who preside over the Churches say other than this (for the disciple is not above his Master), nor will he who is weak in speech impair the doctrine. For as the faith is one and the same, neither he who is very able to speak of it adds thereto, nor

does he who is less powerful diminish therefrom” (Contr. Haer. i. 10). [The above polemic exposition is that which Mr. Lumby rather loosely calls the Creed of St. Irenaeus. See above.]

(7.) The Three Creeds of our Article.

THE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED, A.D. 381,
commonly called
The Nicene Creed (A.D. 325),
as it stands in our Service Books.

I believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds: God of God: Light of Light: very God of very God: begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father. By whom all things were made. Who for us men, and for our salvation came down from heaven: and was Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary: and was made Man: and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried: and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures: and ascended into heaven: and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick mid the dead. Whose kingdom shall have no end.

And I believe in the holy Ghost, the Lord, and Giver of life: who proceedeth from the Father and the Son: who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified: who spake by the prophets. And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the Resurrection of the dead: and the life of the world to come. Amen.

THE ORIGINAL NICENE CREED
as it stands

in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

Πιστεύομεν εις ένα θεον Πατέρα, παντοκράτορα πάντων ορατων τε και αορατων ποιητήν. Και εις ένα Κύριον Ίησουν Χριστον, τον υιον του θεου, γεννηθέντα εκ του πατρος, μονογενη, τουτέστιν εκ της ουσίας του πατρος, θεον εκ θεου, φως εκ φωτος, θεον αληθινον εκ θεου αληθινου, γεννηθέντα ου ποιηθέντα, ομοούσιου τω πατρί. Λι ου τα πάντα εγένετο, τάτε εν τω ουρανω και τα εν τη γη· τονδι' ημας τους ανθρωπους, και δια

την ημετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα, και σαρκωθέντα, και ενανθρωπήσαντα· παθόντα, και αναστάντα τη τριτη ημέρα ανελθόντα εις τους ουράνους· και πάλιν ερχόμενον κριναι ζωντας και νεκρούς. Τους δε λέγοντας· ήν ποτε ότε ουκ ήν, και πριν γεννηθηναι ουκ ήν, και ότε εξ ουκ όντων εγένετο, η εξ ετερας υποστάσεως η ουσίας φάσκοντας ειναι, η τρεπτον η αλλοιωτον τον υιον του θεου, τούτους αναθεμάτιζει η καθολικη και αποστολικη εκκλησία.

We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is of the substance of the Father: God of God: Light of Light: very God of very God: begotten, not made: consubstantial with the Father. By whom all things were made both in heaven and earth. Who for us men and for our salvation came down, and was Incarnate, and was made Man. He suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended into heaven: and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead.

And in the Holy Ghost.

And for them that say [concerning the Son of God], There was a time when He was not; and, He was not before He was begotten; and, He was made of things that are not; and, He is of another substance or essence, or that the Son of God is subject to conversion or mutation: these men the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes.

The Constantinopolitan Creed as it Stands in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon.

Πιστεύομεν εις ένα θεον Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητην ουρανου και γης, ορατων τε πάντων και αοράτων. Και εις ένα Κύριον Ίησουν Χρίστον, τον Υιον του θεου τον μονογενη, τον εκ του Πατρος γεννηθέντα προ πάντων των αιώνων· φως εκ φωτος, θεον αληθινον εκ θεου αληθινου· γεννηθέντα, ου ποιηθέντα, ομοούσιον τω Πατρι· δι' ου τα πάντα εγένετο, τον δι' ημας τους ανθρώπους, και δια την ημέτεραν σωτηρίαν, κατελθόντα εκ των ουρανων, και σαρκωθέντα εκ Πνεύματος αγίου, και Μαρίας της παρθένου, και ενανθρωπήσαντα· σταυρωθέντα τε υπέρ ημων επι Ποντίου Πιλάτου, και παθόντα, και ταφεντα, και αναστάντα τη τρίτη ημέρα κατα τας γραφάς· και ανελθόντα εις τους ουρανους, και καθεζόμενον εκ δεξιων του Πατρός· και πάλιν ερχόμενον μετα δόξης κριναι ζωντας και νεκρούς·

ου της βασιλείας ουκ ἔσται τέλος. Και εις το ἅγιον, το Κύριον, και το ζωοποιον, το εκ του Πατρος εκπορευομενον, το συν Πατρι και Υιω συμπροσκυνούμενον, και συν δοξοζόμενον, το λαλησαν δια των προφητων. Εις μίαν αγίαν καθολικην και αποστολικην εκκλησίαν· ομολογουμεν ἓν βαπτίσμα εις ἄφεσιν αμαρτιων, προσδοκωμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρων, και ζωνη του μελλοντος αιωνος. Ἄμίν.

We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds: Light of Light: very God of very God: begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father. By whom all things were made. Who for us men, and for our salvation came down from heaven: and was Incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary: and was made Man: and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried: and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures: and ascended into heaven: and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. And he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead. Whose kingdom shall have no end.

And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord; and the Giver of life: who proceedeth from the Father: who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified: who spake by the prophets. In one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. We look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

The Constantinopolitan Creed

As It Was Said in the Medieval English Church.

Credo in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, factorem coeli et terrae, visibilium omnium et invisibilium. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum Filium Dei unigenitum, et ex Patre natum ante omnia saecula. Deum de Deo, Lumen de Lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero. Genitum non factum, consubstantialem Patri: per quem omnia facta sunt. Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de coelis. Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine. Et homo factus est. Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato: passus et sepultus est. Et resurrexit tertia die secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit in coelum: sedet ad dexteram Patris. Et

iterum venturus est cum gloria judicare vivos et mortuos. Cujus regni non erit finis. Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et vivificantem. Qui ex Patre Filioque procedit. Qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur: Qui locutus est per prophetas. Et unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam. Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum. Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum. Et vitam venturi saeculi. Amen.

I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all worlds: God of God: Light of Light: very God of very God: begotten not made: of one substance with the Father: by whom all things were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven: and was incarnate from the Holy Ghost out of the Virgin Mary: and was made Man. Was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate: He suffered and was buried: and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures: and ascended into heaven: sits at the right hand of the Father: and will come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead. Whose kingdom shall have no end.

And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and Life-giver: who proceedeth from the Father and the Son: who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified: who spake by the prophets. And one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the Resurrection of the dead: and the life of the world to come. Amen.

It will thus be observed that our English text follows the Medieval Use; that we recite after the Western form, "I believe," instead of the Eastern, "We believe"; that the clause, θεον εκ θεου, Deum de Deo, "God of God," was omitted in the Constantinopolitan Creed; that the original Nicene Creed ended with "And in the Holy Ghost;" that the additions (excepting of course the Filioque) are first found in the Constantinopolitan Creed; that the Holy Ghost is described as το Κύριον, και το ζωοποιον, Dominum et vivificantem =The Lord, and the Life-Giver, and should be pointed and read "The Lord; and Giver of Life"; that the Greek only has "in" (εις) before "one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church"; that the English only omits "Holy"; and follows the Latin, incarnatus est de Spiritu

Sancto ex Maria Virgine, rather than the Greek, σαρκωθέντα εκ Πνεύματος Αγίου, και Μαρίας της παρθένου.

The Athanasian Creed.

Fides Sancti Athanasii.

Σύμβολον της πίστεως του αγίου Ἀθανασίου.

1. Whosoever will be saved [is desirous of being saved], before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith.

Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat catholicam fidem.

Ὅστις βούλεται σωθῆναι προ πάντων χρη αυτω την Καθολικην κρατησαι Πίστην.

2. Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in aeternum peribit.

ην ει μη τις σώαν και άμωμον τηρήσειν, άνευ δισταγμου εις τον αιωνα απολειται.

3. And the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.

Fides autem Catholica haec est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate, et Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur.

Πίστι δε Καθολικη αύτη εστιν ίνα ένα Θεον εν Τριάδι και Τριάδι εν Μονάδι σεβόμεθα.

4. Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance.

Neque confundentes Personas, neque Substantiam separantes.

μήτε συγχέοντες τας υποστάσεις μήτε την ουσίαν μερίζοντες.

5. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.

Alia est enim Persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti.

άλλη γάρ εστιν η του Πατρος υπόστασις, άλλη του Υίου, και άλλη του Ἀγίου Πνεύματος.

6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one, the Glory equal, the Majesty coeternal.

Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, una est Divinitas, aequalis Gloria, coeterna Majestas.

αλλα Πατρος και Υιου και Αγίου Πνεύματος μία εστι θεότης, ίση δόξα, συναιδιος η μεγαλειότης.

7. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost.

Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus.

οιος ο Πατηρ, τοιουτος και ο Υιος, τοιου το και το Πνευμα το Άγιον.

8. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghost uncreate.

Increatus Pater, increatus Filius, increatus et Spiritus Sanctus.

άκτιστος ο Πατηρ, άκτιστος ο Υιος, άκτιστον και το Άγιον Πνευμα.

9. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible.

Immensus Pater, immensus Filius, immensus et Spiritus Sanctus.

ακατάληπτος ο Πατηρ ακατάληπτος ο Υιος, ακατάληπτον και το Πνευμα το Άγιον.

10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal.

Aeternus Pater, aeternus Filius, aeternus, et Spiritus Sanctus.

αιώνιος ο Πατηρ, αιώνιος ο Υιος, αιώνιον και το Άγιον Πνευμα.

11. And yet they are not three eternal, but one eternal.

Et tamen non tres aeterni, sed unus aeternus.

πλην ου τρεις αιώνιοι, αλλ' εις αιώνιος.

12. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, not three uncreated, but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible.

Sicut non tres increati, nee tres immensi, sed unus increatus, et unus immensus.

ώσπερ ουδε τρεις άκτιστοι ουδε τρεις ακατάληπτοι αλλ' εις άκτιστος και εις ακατάληπτος.

13. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty.

Similiter, Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens et Spiritus Sanctus.

ομοίως παντοκράτωρ ο Πατηρ, παντοκράτωρ ο Υιος, παντοκράτωρ το Πνευμα το Άγιον.

14. And yet they are not three Almighty, but one Almighty.

Et tamen non tres Omnipotentes, sed unus Omnipotens.

πλην οι τρεις παντοκράτορες αλλ' εις παντοκράτωρ.

15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.

Ita Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus.

Ούτω θεος ο Πατηρ, θεος ο Υιος, θεος και το Πνευμα το Άγιον.

16. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.

Et tamen non tres Dii, sed unus est Deus.

πλην ου τρεις Θεοι, αλλ' εις Θεός.

17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord.

Ita Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus et Spiritus Sanctus.

ωσαύτως Κύριος ο Πατηρ, Κύριος ο Υιος, Κύριον και το Πνευματο το Άγιον.

18. And yet not three Lords, but one Lord.

Et tamen non tres Domini, sed unus est Dominus.

πλην ου τρεις Κύριοι, αλλ' εις έστι Κύριος.

19. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord, so are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords.

Quia sicut singillatim unamquamque Personam, Deum et Dominum confiteri Christiana veritate compellimur; ita tres Deos aut Dominos dicere Catholica religione prohibemur.

ότι ώσπερ μοναδικως εκάστην υπόστασιν Θεον και Κύριον ομολογειν Χριστιανικη αληθεια αναγκαζόμεθα ούτω τρεις Θεους η τρεις Κυρίους λέγειν Καθολικη ευσεβεία κωλύόμεθα.

20. The Father is made of none, neither created, nor begotten.

Pater a nullo est factus, nec creatus, nec genitus.

ο Πατηρ απ' ουδενός ερτι πεποιημένος, ούτε δεδημιουργημένος, ούτε γεγεννημένος.

21. The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten.

Filius a Patre solo est, non factus, nec creatus, sed genitus.

ο Υιος απο μόνον του Πατρός εστιν ου πεποιημένος ουδε δεδημιουργημένος, αλλα γεγεννημένος.

22. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus est, sed procedens.

το Πνευμα το Άγιον απο του Πατρός και του Υίου ου πεποιημένον ούτε δεδημιουργημένον ούτε γεγεννημένον, αλλ' εκπορευτόν.

23. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.

Unus ergo Pater, non tres Patres; unus Filius, non tres Filii; unus Spiritus Sanctus, non tres Spiritus Sancti.

εις ουν εστι Πατηρ οι τρεις Πατέρες, εις Υιος ου τρεις Υιοί, εν Πνευμα Άγιον ου τρία Πνεύματα Άγια.

24. And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other, none is greater, or less than another; but the whole three Persons are coeternal together, and coequal.

Et in hac Trinitate nihil Arius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus, sed totae tres Personae co-aeternae sibi sunt, et co-aequales.

και εν ταύτη τη Τριάδι ουδεν πρωτον η ύστερον, ουδεν μειζον η έλαττον, αλλ' όλαι αι τρεις υποστάσεις συνδιαιώνίζουσαι εαυταις ειδι και ίσαι.

25. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshipped.

Ita ut per omnia, sicut jam supra dictum est, et Unitas in Trinitate, et Trinitas in Unitate veneranda sit.

ωστε κατα πάντα, ως είρηται, και Τριας εν Μονάδι και Μονας εν Τριάδι λατρεύεται.

26. He therefore that will be saved [is desirous of being saved], must thus think of the Trinity.

Qui vult ergo salvus esse, ita de Trinitate sentiat.

ο θέλων ουν σωθηναι ούτω περι της αγίας Τριάδος φρονείτω.

27. Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Sed necessarium est ad aeternam Salutem, ut Incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat.

πλην αναγκαιον έτι εστι προς αιωνίαν σωτηρίαν όπως και την ενανθρώπησιν του Κυρίον ημων 'Ιησου Χριστου ορθως πιστεύη.

28. For the right Faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man.

Est ergo Fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur, quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus periter et Homo est.

έστιν ουν Πίστις ορθη ίνα πιστεύωμεν και ομολογωμεν ότι ο Κύριος ημων 'Ιησους Χριστος ο του Θεου Υιος Θεος και 'Ανθρωπός εστι.

29. God, of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and Man, of the Substance of His mother, born in the world.

Deus est ex substantia Patris ante saecula genitus: Homo, ex substantia matris in saeculo natus.

Θεός εστιν εκ της ουσίας του Πατρος προ αιώνων γεννηθείς, και Άνθρωπος εστιν εκ της ουσίας της μητρος εν χρόνω γεννηθείς.

30. Perfect God, and perfect Man of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.

Perfectus Deus, perfectus Homo ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.

τέλειος Θεος και τέλειος Άνθρωπος εκ ψυχης λογικης και ανθρωπίνης σαρκος υποστάς.

31. Equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead; and inferior to the Father, as touching His Manhood.

AEqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem, minor Patri secundum Humanitatem.

ισος τω Πατρι κατα την Θεότητα, ελάττωντου Πατρος κατα την ανθρωπότητα.

32. Who although He be God and Man, yet He is not two, but one Christ.

Qui licet Deus sit et Hero, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus.

ος ει και Θεος υπάρχει και Άνθρωπος όμως ου δύο αλλ' εις εστι Χριστός.

33. One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God.

Unus autem, non conversione Divinitatis in carnem, sed assumptione Humanitatis in Deum.

εις δε ου τροπη Θεότητος εις σάρκα αλλα προσλήψει ανθρωπότητος εις Θεότητα.

34. One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by Unity of Person.

Unus omnino, non confusione Substantiae, sed unitate Personae.

εις πάντως ου συγχύσει φύσεως αλλ' ενώσει ύποστάσεως.

35. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ.

Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita Deus et Homo unus est Christus.

ὡσπερ γὰρ ψυχή λογική και σὰρξ εἰς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, οὕτω Θεὸς και Ἀνθρώπος εἰς ἐστὶ Χριστός.

36. Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead.

Qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferos, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.

ὁ παθὼν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, και κατελθὼν εἰς τὸν Αἴδην, και τὴ πρώτη ἡμέρα ἀναστὰς ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν.

37. He ascended into heaven, He sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty; from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

Ascendit ad coelos, sedet ad dexteram Patris; inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. [4 MSS.: Dexteram Dei P. Omnipotentis.]

και ἀνελθὼν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, και καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ και Πατρὸς τοῦ παντοκράτορος, ὅθεν ἐλεύσεται κρῖναι ζῶντας και νεκρούς.

38. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works.

Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis, et reddaturi sunt de factis propriis rationem.

οὐ τὴ παρουσία πάντες ἄνθρωποι ἀναστήσονται σὺν τοῖς ἐαυτῶν σώμασιν ἀποδῶσοντες περὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἔργων λόγον.

39. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

Et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam aeternam; qui vero mala, in ignem aeternum.

και οἱ μὲν τὰ ἀγαθὰ πράξαντες πορεύσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, οἱ δὲ τὰ φαυλὰ εἰς τὸ πῦρ τοῦ αἰώνιον.

40. This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.

Haec est Fides Catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.

αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ Καθολικὴ Πίστις, ἣν εἰ μὴ τις πιστῶς τε και βεβαίως πιστεύσῃ, σωθῆναι οὐ δυνήσεται.

The Apostles' Creed.

Symbolum Apostolorum.

Σύμβολον τῶν Ἀποστόλων.

1. I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.
Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Creatorem coeli et terrae.
Πιστεύω εις τον Θεον Πατέρα παντοκράτορα ποιητην ουρανου και
γης.
2. And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord.
Et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum.
και Ἰησουν Χριστον Υιον αυτου τον μονογενη τον Κύριον ημων.
3. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.
Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancti, natus ex Maria Virgine.
τον συλληφθέντα εκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, γεννηθέντα εκ Μαρίας της
παρθένου.
4. Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.
Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus.
παθόντα επι Ποντίου Πιλάτου, σταυρωθέντα, θανόντα, και ταφέντα.
5. He descended into Hell, the third day He rose again from the dead.
Descendit ad inferos, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.
κατελθόντα εις άδου, τη τρίτη ημέρα ανασάντα απο των νεκρων.
6. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, the
Father Almighty.
Ascendit ad coelos, redet ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis.
ανελθόντα εις τους ουρανούς, καθεζόμενον εν δεξια Θεου Πατρος
παντοδυνάμου.
7. From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.
εκειθεν ερχόμενον κριναι ζωντας και νεκρούς.
8. I believe in the Holy Ghost.
Credo in Spiritum Sanctum.
πιστεύω εις το Πνευμα το Ἁγιον.
9. The Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints.
Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, Sanctorum communionem.
αγίαν καθολικην εκκλησίαν, αγίων κοινωνίαν.
10. The Forgiveness of Sins.
Remissionem peccatorum.
άφεσιν αμαρτιων.
11. The Resurrection of the Body.
Carnis resurrectionem.
σαρκος ανάστασιν.

12. And the Life everlasting. Amen.

Vitam aeternam. Amen.

ζωην αιώνιον. Ἀμήν.

In order not unduly to swell the text of this Article, and for the sake of fuller discussion, we refer the reader to the Appendix for the historic details of the Three Creeds; and for their analysis also, as this will more clearly come out in connection with their history. – We would strongly advise the student who is preparing for theological examinations to make himself master of the Greek especially of the Creeds, as set forth above. This, with due attention to the notes and details of the Appendix, may prove of very material advantage.

As the Scriptural Proof of the main clauses of the Creeds is fully drawn out under other Articles, it is unnecessary to adduce it here.

Article IX.

Doctrine and History.

Of Original, or Birth Sin. – Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit, and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek φρόνημα σαρκος, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And, although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

De Peccato Originali. – Peccatum Originis non est (ut fabulantur Pelagiani) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium, et depravatio naturae, cujuslibet hominis ex Adamo naturaliter propagati: qua fit, ut ab originali justitia quam longissime distet, ad malum ma natura propendeat, et caro semper adversus Spiritum concupiscat, unde in unoquoque nascentium, iram Dei atque damnationem meretur. Manet etiam in renatis haec naturae depravatio. Qua fit, ut affectus carnis, Graece φρόνημα σαρκος (quod alii sapientiam, alii sensum, alii affectum, alii studiam carnis interpretantur), legi Dei non

subjiatur. Et quanquam renatis et credentibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio, peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam, fatetur Apostolus.

We here pass from the Rule of Faith to what that Rule teaches us concerning Sin and the Saviour, Arts. 9–18. It is well thus to notice, as we proceed, the structural composition of the Articles. It shows us not only the systematic lines upon which they are based, but the clear grasp of Scriptural truth which our Reformers possessed.

Leaving the profitless and vain speculations of heathen philosophy as to the origin of evil, and without also entering on the argument in proof of this innate corruption deducible from the death and sufferings of infants, we propose – 1. To examine the Development of the Doctrine of Original Sin in the Old and in the New Testament; 2. To trace the Progress of heresy in the Christian Church; and 3. Briefly to analyze the Theses and Wording of the Article. This is a departure from our usual arrangement; but we think the gain upon the whole will be apparent. We shall thus have a more connected view of the subject in its twofold bearings – the mind of the Spirit as revealed to the Churches, and the spread of error; and so be enabled more fully to appreciate the doctrinal positions assumed by the Reformers, and the better understand their somewhat scholastic phraseology.

1. The Scriptural Development of the Doctrine of Original Sin.

In the Old Testament.

“So God created man in his own image. ... And the Lord God said unto Adam, Because thou hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for unto dust shalt thou return. ... And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat [as before] in his own [sinful] likeness, after his [changed] image” (Gen. 1:27, 3:17, 19; 5:3).

“And God saw [before the Flood] that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually” (Gen. 6:5.). Or rather, according to the Hebrew, The whole imagination – the purposes and desires, every day.

“And the Lord said in his heart [after the Flood], I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake; for (or, *though*) the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth” (Gen. 8:21).

“Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one” (Job 14:4). “What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?” (Job 15:14.)

“Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me” (Psa. 51:5). “Sin is now regarded in its source. From my very earliest being, from the hour when I was conceived, sin has been with me. Sinfulness consists not merely in so many several sinful acts, but in a sinful and corrupt nature.” – *Perowne*. “He lays on himself the blame of a tainted nature, instead of that of a single fault: not a murder only, but of a murderous nature.” “Conceived in sin.’ From first moments up till then, he saw sin – sin – sin: nothing but sin.” – *Robertson*. “If a man will speak and teach aright of sin, he must consider it in its depth, and show from what *root* it and all that is godless springs, and not apply the term merely to sins that have been committed. ... According to this Psalm then, we must say that all is sin which is born of father and mother, and from so evil a root nothing good can grow before God.” – *Luther*. “Here at length he confesses himself guilty, not of one sin only or of many, but he rises to the fountainhead, (acknowledging) that from his mother’s womb he has brought nothing with him but sin, and that by nature he is altogether corrupt and as it were smeared over with vices. ... And of a truth we do not thoroughly acknowledge our sins unless we condemn our whole nature as corrupt.” – *Calvin*. “Men may say what they will, the doctrine of original sin is contained in this passage.” – *Stier*. (See *Perowne*, under Psa. 51:5.)

“The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies” (Psa. 58:3). Their whole life and habit of sin dates from their native depravity.

“Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions” (Eccles. 7:29). “The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores” (Isa. 1:5–6). “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked (עָרָב – morally corrupted and depraved): who can know it?” (Jer. 17:9).

In these Old Testament Scriptures, therefore, whether couched in the direct words of Jehovah Himself, or spoken under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, or uttered as the heartfelt experience of the authors, we are clearly taught that man is born in a state of alienation from God; that this birth sin is propagated by natural generation in consequence of the Fall; and

that it runs throughout the whole being – body and soul, the members of the one, and the faculties of the others.

“And this infection of nature doth remain,” moreover, “yea, in them that are regenerated”: –

“Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from sin?” (Prov. 20:9). “But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away” (Isa. 66:6). “If thy people sin against thee – for there is no man that sinneth not” (1 Kings 8:46). “For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not” (Eccles. 7:20).

Finally, “concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin”: –

“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour’s” (Exod. 20:17). “Woe to them that devise iniquity, and work evil upon their beds” (Micah 2:1). “Woe to him that coveteth an evil covetousness to his house” (Hab. 2:9).

In the New Testament.

Here, and especially in the Epistles, as might be expected, we have the teaching set out more fully and systematically; and it may be fitly arranged under the various and consecutive heads of the Article.

(a) Original Sin infects all men, naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam, that is to say, Christ alone excepted.

“There is none good but One, that is God” (Matt. 19:17). “Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man” (John 2:24–25).

“Jesus answered (Nicodemus), Verily, verily, I say unto thee [a form of words not only signifying the firm certainty of what is about to be said, but used by our Lord, as Stier remarks, in his coequality with the Father], Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That (το, neuter) which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye (υμας) must be born again (or, from *above* – ἀνωθεν)” (John 3:5–7). This most solemn passage stamps the stain and guilt of Original Sin upon all flesh. As Alford writes: “6.] The neuter denotes not only the universal

application of this truth, but (see Luke 1:35) the very first beginnings of life in the embryo, before sex can be predicated. So Bengel: ‘notal ipsa prima stamina vitae.’ The Lord here answers Nicodemus’s hypothetical question of verse 4, by telling him that *even could it be so*, it would not accomplish the birth of which he speaks. In this σαρξ (‘flesh’) is included *every part* of that which is born after the ordinary method of generation: even the spirit of man, which, receptive as it is of the Spirit of God, is yet in the natural birth *dead*, sunk in trespasses and sins, and in a state of wrath. Such ‘flesh and blood’ cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, 1 Cor. 15:50. But when the man is born again of the Spirit (the water does not appear any more, being merely the outward form of reception the less included in the greater), then just as flesh generates flesh, so spirit generates spirit, after its own image, see 2 Cor. 3:18 fin.; and since the Kingdom of God is a spiritual kingdom, such only who are so born can enter into it. 7.] The weightiest word here is υμας (‘ye’). The Lord did not, could not, say this of *Himself*. Why? – Because in the full sense in which the flesh is incapacitated from entering the kingdom of God, He was *not born of the flesh*. He inherited the weakness of the flesh, but His spirit was not, like that of sinful man, alien from holiness and God; and therefore on Him no second birth passed; when the Holy Spirit descended on Him at His baptism, the words spoken by the Father were indicative of *past approval*, not of *renewal*. His obedience was accepted as perfect, and the good pleasure of the Father rested on him. Therefore he includes not Himself in this necessity for the new birth” (Greek Testament, *in loco*).

Gentiles and Jews included: –

The Gentiles rejected the objective knowledge of God in creation, and so lost its internal or subjective teaching: –

“Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them [the testimony of nature conveyed to man’s heart by the senses]; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his Eternal Power and Divinity (θειότης – not θεότης, or “Godhead,” as A.V.; but His high and moral attributes, as displayed in Creation and Providence – the universal Fatherhood of God); so that they are without excuse. Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imagination, and their foolish heart was darkened. ... And even as they did not like to retain God in

their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind (αδόκιμον νουν – not devoid of ‘knowledge’ or discernment, but judicially abandoned to its own natural and fostered depravity), to do those things which are not convenient” (Rom. 1:19, etc.)

On the other hand, the Jews had the superadded knowledge of Revelation in the Law of Moses – the real reflection, so far as it went – the μόρφωσις of the holiness and character of God; and yet, by their breaking of the law not only was God dishonoured, but the name of God was blasphemed among the Gentiles through them (Rom. 2.)

Hence the inevitable conclusion is that the inherent sinfulness of man is universal; and appertains to the whole human race individually. “Jews and Gentiles are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one” (Rom. 3). Well may Luther in commenting on the 14th Psalm (again appearing in the Elohist 53d), from which this quotation is taken, say: “See how many words he uses that he may comprehend all, excluding none. First he says *all*, then *together*, and then *no, not one*.” And St. Paul, in his free quotation, would make the language if possible even still more emphatic – repeating *none, no, not one*.

(2) This universal depravity is not derived from imitation – “standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk)”; but is inherited by birth.

Following up the argument of the Apostle as above in the Epistle to the Romans, we find that, having introduced reconciliation by Christ, or justification by faith, as the only ground of peace with God, he proceeds to explain the original source and spring of sin and condemnation by one of the strangest and strongest kaleidoscopic reiterations in any language: “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin – through the offence of one many be dead – the judgment was by one to condemnation – by one man’s offence death reigned by one – by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation – by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners” (Rom. 5). And as if to meet the Pelagian objection, he inserts in the very middle of this statement the words: “Nevertheless [notwithstanding what I have said about sin not being fully reckoned where there is no Written Law] death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over

them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (5:14). That is, the sin and condemnation must be universal, and inherited by birth, inasmuch as, in the interval between Adam and Moses, they died who had not broken any positive Revealed Law. And this force of the reasoning remains, whether we thus interpret the words, or with Beza and others refer them to *infants and idiots*, or even (if not indeed more strongly) with Grotius, to those *who lived pious lives*. Then further on, the Apostle still yet advances another and final step, and traces home – clearly and explicitly brings out the *individuality*, consequent on the generic oneness, of the seat and fountain of corruption. "For they that are after the flesh, do mind the things of the flesh. ... For to be carnally minded is death. ... BECAUSE THE CARNAL MIND IS ENMITY AGAINST GOD. For it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. 8:5–8). The mind of the flesh (το φρόνημα της σαρκος) – the mind in a state of nature – the whole unconverted man – having its element in that which is opposed to the Spirit of Life, is, and cannot but be morally and spiritually *Dead*, and so alienated from God. "Hic locus maxime refutat Pelagianos et omnes qui imaginantur homines sine Spiritu Sancto legi obedire" (Melancthon).

And precisely similar is the teaching of the New Testament elsewhere: –

"That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" (John 3:6–7). "In Adam all die" (1 Cor. 15:22). "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14).

"From within, out of the heart (καρδία – the seat, center, and laboratory of the whole moral life) of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness, all these evil things come from within, and defile the man" (Mark 7:21–23). All evil in its fountainhead and development of actual transgression proceeds from the innate corruption of the human heart; in other words, from Original Sin.

"And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh

in the children of disobedience. Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of our flesh and of our thoughts (διανοιων, plural); and were by nature (φύσει – *being*, not accessory influence of another, not acquired, but inherent state and inclination) the children of wrath, even as others” (Eph. 2:1–3).

(3) Original Sin in itself is deserving of the wrath of God.

“In Adam all die” (1 Cor. 15:22). “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, because (εφ’ω – or, *in whom* [Adam]) all sinned” (ἡμαρτον – Aorist) (Rom. 5:12). “The wages of sin is death” (Rom. 6:23). “We were by nature the children of wrath” (Eph. 2:3).

(4) This infection of original sin, or fleshly nature, remains even in the regenerate.

“In many things we offend all” (James 3:2). “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us” (1 John 1:8). “I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but to perform that which is good, is not. For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. ... I find then this law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the Law of God after the inward man: but I see another law (ἕτερον νόμον – a different law) in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. ... So then with my mind I myself serve the Law of God; but with my flesh [subjectively, though not energetically] the law of sin” (Rom. 7).

(5) Nevertheless, there is no condemnation for the true believer.

This is expressly stated in so many words by the Apostle at the opening of the following chapter: “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of Life hath made me free (ηλευθέρωσεν – Aorist, one past act – *freed me*, at my conversion), in Christ Jesus, from the law of sin and death” (Rom. 8:1–2).

And elsewhere: “O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God [for deliverance] through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 7:24–25). “The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, who *giveth* us the victory (διδόντι – *present*, and therefore forever certain) through our Lord Jesus

Christ” (1 Cor. 15:56–57). “Being justified by Faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. 5:1).

And especially also by Christ: “He that believeth on the Son is not condemned (ου κρίνεται – *enters not into the judgment of God*)” (John 3:18). “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation (εις κρίσιν ουκ έρχεται – *comes not into the final judgment*, as to the condemnatory part of it; but is passed (μεταβεβηκεν – *Perfect, has already passed over*) from death unto life” (John 5:24).

(6) “Concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.”

“Evil concupiscence and covetousness, which is idolatry” (Col. 3:5). “Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy” (James 4:5). “The flesh lusteth against the spirit” (Gal. 5:17). “I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet” (Rom. 7:7). “When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death” (James 1:15). “All that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever” (1 John 2:16–17).

2. *The Rise and Progress of Heresy.*

To the Gnostics in general, and especially the two great families of Marcionites and Manichees, in their attempts to reconcile Philosophy so-called and Revelation, we owe, as our readers will remember, erroneous views on the origin of evil; which alike with their other heresies tended materially to disturb and harass the Church.

Florinus and Blastus, about the end of the second century, presbyters of Rome, seem to have been the first Christians of note or official standing who publicly identified themselves with the heterodox teaching. At all events, both were excommunicated by Bishop Eleutherius; and it is certain that Florinus, though he had enjoyed the friendship of Irenaeus, and been a disciple of Polycarp’s, taught that God was the author of evil, as a letter remonstrating with him, from the pen of Irenaeus, is preserved by Eusebius.

But error is hydra-headed; and the fragrance of heresy was soon evaded by baseless dreams of the imagination, modified figments of Gnosticism; and the subtleties of Creatianism and Traducianism – that

souls are created by God on their union with the body, or that souls are produced through generation by parents to their children. Thus, notably, in the first half of the third century, the over-acute mind of Origen sought to conciliate an eternal philosophy, without if possible disturbing the unity of the faith; and taught the preexistence of human souls, and their present imprisonment in bodies more or less gross according to the offences committed in a former state: and so in reality removing, or attempting to remove, the question of the propagation of evil out of the category of practical and important Christian doctrine into that of comparatively unimportant speculation.

Thus, and in like human elements, divorcing the mind of the Church from Christ and the simplicity of the Gospel, were laid the foundations of Pelagianism – a heresy that probably never will be wholly meted out.

Pelagius (Brito) – a name Latinized from Morgan = Marigena, *seaborn*, in reference to the British Isles – was in all probability of Welsh extraction. Trained and educated in a monastery (most likely the celebrated monastery of Bangor), it has been freely and perhaps truly alleged that he became indignant at the hypocrisy of the monks and their moral indolence, and so by his own earnest strivings after excellence, and his progress in supposed spiritual self-improvement, was led unduly to esteem the energy of the human will, and pride himself upon a sort of quantitative religion. A recoil from the deadness of monkish profession and the slothfulness of Christian life – from the *opus operatum* of the Sacraments, landing him eventually in a like recoil not only from the prevalent repose upon the *opus operatum* of faith, but from justification by faith altogether. At all events, he began his heretical career, by disputing, more covertly than in public, against the grace of God. “We need no inward grace, for we have no inborn sin,” was the motto by which he sought, for himself and then for his friends and the world, to bridge over the gulf between Christianity and Paganism. Coming to Rome about the year 400, by his earnestness and perhaps insinuating manners – *coluber Britannus* is an uncharitable epithet of Prosper’s – he gained the confidence of Coelestius, said to have been a co-islander, a man much younger than himself, of good parts and noble birth, with considerable dialectic abilities, a rising advocate, bold and outspoken. This was just the spokesman which the timid precursor of modern Rationalism wanted – “Coelestius apertior, Pelagius occultior ... certi ille liberior, hic astutior” (Augustine). When the Goths were laying waste Italy,

the two friends retired to Sicily, and afterwards to Carthage. Here first in 412, Pelagius having quietly departed, Coelestius was summoned before a Council on the two following charges of false doctrine. That the sin of Adam had injured only himself; and that infants come into the world in the same sinless state as Adam was before the Fall. The scapegoat was condemned, and banished from the fellowship of the African Church. “Auditum, convictum, confessum, detestatumque ab Ecclesia, ex Africa profugisse” (Orosius). We need not follow his fortunes, nor those of the heresiarch. Suffice it to say, that after various successes and disasters, owing in some measure to personal influences, but chiefly to the ignorance or knowledge of the subjects in dispute on the part of their judges, they were both finally condemned at the Third General Council of Ephesus in 431; and so personally disappear from history.

But it is of more importance to have a clear and correct view of the Pelagian system. And it may fairly be reduced to one leading and original element – the Denial of the Need of Supernatural Grace. In this the whole really centered; and from this blasphemous formula everything naturally followed. It cut out the Mystery of Godliness and the New Creation; and fostered the pride of the human heart not only in Heathendom but in Christendom. God had created man and left him to the development of his natural powers. By these he is able, if he will, to merit eternal life. The Fall is only hurtful from the possibility of imitating Adam’s sin: which explains all the passages in the New Testament bearing on the connection between the first transgression and the sins of our race. Sin, being a thing not of nature but of the will, cannot be transmitted. Moreover, the propagation of guilt conflicts with the justice of God. All which is plain proof that there can be no such thing as derived and innate corruption. As the word *Grace* could not be extirpated from the Bible, nor from the vocabulary of Christians, the term only meant the gifts bestowed on mankind and their preservation, or the revelation of our duty, or the forgiveness of actual transgression – anything in short but the internal, evangelical renewal by the Holy Ghost. Christ too was a constant factor of Revelation, yet not a Redeemer from the captivity of sin and the curse of the law, but a higher Exemplar than any who had gone before – a sort of excelsior stimulus to the human will. Baptism is commanded – a signatory pass into the kingdom: but there its efficacy begins and ends.

Augustine was the chief and most successful opponent of Pelagianism. Taking his stand upon the express declarations of Scripture, and the general belief of the Christian Church from the beginning, he vigorously and exhaustively vindicated the truth. And though we may easily detect some shortcomings, owing to the age, his bent of mind and imperfections of Greek education, yet upon the whole his twelve books against the Pelagians, are a noble contribution to theological learning – a lasting monument of his systematic thought, patience, and industry. His thesis is to the effect that the sinful condition of Adam, his death in body and soul, incurred by the Fall, is transmitted, through natural generation, to all his posterity; that we need the grace of God, not only to do, but to will, that which is good; and that this divine, regenerating life is freely communicated by God, through Christ, and shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost – an internal and constraining, creative energy of likeness and love.

The following details, carefully gleaned and lucidly arranged by Professor Robertson, will well repay the diligent perusal of the student: –

“The fundamental question between Pelagius and his opponents related to the idea of Free Will. By this term, Pelagius understood an unbiassed power of choosing between good and evil; and such a faculty he maintained man has, since the power of choice is essential to responsibility, and there can be no sin or guilt unless where there is voluntary evil. Augustine, on the other hand, taught that freedom must be distinguished from the power of choice. God, he said, is free, although his nature excludes the possibility of his choosing or doing anything that is evil; hence a natural and necessary limitation to good is higher than a state of balance between good and evil; and such a balance cannot be, since the possibility of inclining to evil is a defect. Man is not free to choose between good and evil, but is governed either by grace or by sin. Our freewill, without grace, can do only evil; the direction of the will to good must be God’s gracious gift. Grace does not take away freedom, but works with the will, whose true freedom is the love of that which is good.

“Since Scripture undeniably refers all good to Grace, Pelagius acknowledged this in words; but he understood the term *grace* in senses of his own, as meaning merely external gifts and benefits – the being and constitution of man; freewill itself; the call to everlasting happiness; the forgiveness of [actual ?] sins in [adult ?] baptism, apart from any influence

on the after spiritual course; the knowledge of God's will, the Law and the Gospel, the example of the Saviour's life; or, if he sometimes used the word to signify the influence of the Holy Spirit on the soul, he did not represent this influence as necessary to the work of salvation, but only as rendering it easier. Pelagius laboured to exclude from the notion of grace anything that might be inconsistent with freewill; Augustine, everything that might savour of merit on the part of man. Distinguishing three stages in good, – the capacity, the will, and the performance, – Pelagius referred the first to God's gift, but regarded the others as within the power of human nature. Augustine, on the contrary, refused to admit the idea of a grace bestowed according to the previous receptivity of the soul; because this, as he thought, placed the determination in human merit. Grace must, by its very name, be gratuitous; the will to do good must be God's gift, as well as the capacity.

“While Augustine held that the Fall had injured man both spiritually and physically; that by communion with God Adam was enabled to live a higher life; that he might have avoided sin, and, if he had not sinned, would have been raised to perfection without tasting of death, even as the angels, after having borne their probation in a lower degree of grace, were endowed with that higher measure of it which lifts above the possibility of falling, and confers immortality: – Pelagius maintained that man's original constitution was mortal; that Adam was originally placed as we are, and that we are not inferior to him. The passages in which St. Paul speaks of death as the punishment of sin, he interpreted as meaning spiritual death only. Augustine taught that in Adam all men sinned; that, in punishment of the first sin, sin is transmitted by generation to all mankind; that although under the guidance of grace directing his freewill, man might live without sin, this sinless life has never been actually realized. Pelagius, on the contrary, supposed that Adam's sin did not affect his posterity otherwise than as an example; that there is, indeed, a deterioration of the race through custom of sinning, even as an individual man becomes worse through indulgence in sinful habits; that this comes to affect us like a nature, and has required occasional interpositions of the Divine mercy by revelations and otherwise; but that man had all along been able to live without sin; that some men had in fact so lived; and that, if this had been possible under the earlier dispensations – nay, even in heathenism – much more must it be possible for us under the Gospel, which gives additional motives, higher

rules of righteousness, and the light of a brighter Example. According to Pelagius, the saints of the Old Testament were justified by the Law; but Augustine held that in spirit they belonged to the New Testament; that they were justified through faith in Christ, and through his grace which was bestowed on them by anticipation. Pelagius saw mainly in Christ nothing more than a teacher and a pattern. His death, although it was allowed to be efficacious for sinners, could not (it was supposed) confer any benefit on those who had no sin; the living union of the faithful with Him was an idea as foreign to the system of this teacher as the union of the natural man with Adam in death. Pelagius, however, did not deviate from the doctrine of the Church with respect to the Saviour's Godhead.

“The practice of infant baptism, which was by this time universally regarded as apostolical, was urged against Pelagius. his opponents argued from the baptismal rites – the exorcisms, the renunciation of the devil, the profession of belief in the remission of sins. Why, they asked, should infants be baptized with such ceremonies for the washing away of sin, if they do not bring sin into the world with them? The Pelagians answered that infants dying in their natural state would attain eternal life, which they supposed to be open to all, whether baptized or not; but that baptism was necessary for the higher blessedness of entrance into ‘the kingdom of heaven,’ which is the especial privilege of the Gospel; that, as baptism was for all the means of admission to the fullness of the Christian blessings, the baptismal remission of sins must, in the case of infants, have a view to their future life on earth. ... With respect to baptism, Augustine held that it conveys forgiveness of all past sins whatever, whether original or actual: that by it we receive regeneration, adoption, and redemption; but that there yet remains in us a weakness against which the regenerate must struggle here through God's help, and which will not be done away with until that further ‘regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory.’ The doctrine of this remaining infirmity was represented by the Pelagians as disparaging the efficacy of the baptismal sacrament.

“Pelagius supposed that God had furnished man naturally with all that is needed for living without sin and keeping the commandments, and that the use of these gifts depends on our own will; Augustine, that at every point man needs fresh supplies of Divine and supernatural aid. Pelagius understood justification to be merely the outward act of forgiveness; whereas Augustine saw in it also an inward purification through the power

of grace. Grace, he held, does not constrain the will, but delivers it from bondage, and makes it truly free; he distinguished it into – (1) the *preventing* grace, which gives the first motions towards goodness; (2) the *operating*, which produces the free will to good; (3) the *cooperating* which supports the will in its struggles, and enables it to carry its desires into act; and lastly (4) the *gift of perseverance*.” – (History of the Christian Church, i. 438, etc.)

Out of this conflict arose Semi-Pelagianism, at the head of which stood John Cassian, of Scythian extract, born at Athens 351, ordained presbyter at Rome, and finally settling at Marseilles in France – an illiterate and superstitious, but active and pious monk. He adopted for the most part Augustine’s positions as to original corruption, etc. without his systematic development of doctrine, but eliminated the element of the constraining power of grace; or rather, in his inability to decide whether freewill depends on grace, or grace on freewill, seems to strike the balance in favour of the latter.

“Until Pelagius, whose opinions he strongly reprobated, Cassian acknowledged that all men sinned in Adam; that all have both hereditary and actual sin; that we are naturally inclined to evil; and that for every good thing – the beginning, the continuance, and the ending – we need the aid of supernatural grace. But, although he maintained that grace is gratuitous – although he admitted that, in the infinite varieties of God’s dealings with men, the first call to salvation sometimes proceeds from preventing grace, and takes effect even on the unwilling – he supposed that ordinarily the working of grace depends on the determination of man’s own will; that God is the receiver of the willing, as well as the Saviour of the unwilling. As examples of those who are called without their own will, he referred to St. Matthew and St. Paul; for proof that in some cases the will precedes the call, he alleged Zacchaeus and the penitent thief, – as to whom he made the obvious mistake of regarding the visible part of their story as if it were the whole. He held that God furnishes man’s nature with the seeds of virtue, although grace be needful to develop them; that Christ died for all men, and that grace is offered to all. Faith and good works (it was said), although they do not deserve grace, are motives to the bestowal of it. Grace must work with our own will and endeavour; it may be lost, and is to be retained by man’s free will – not by a gift of perseverance. God’s purpose and calling, according to Cassian, bring men by baptism to salvation; yet the

benefits of the Saviour's death extend to persons who in this life were never made members of Him – their readiness to believe being discerned by God, and reckoned to their credit. In like manner children who die in infancy are dealt with according to God's foreknowledge of what they would have become if they had been allowed to live longer: those who would have used grace rightly are brought by baptism to salvation; the others die unbaptized." – (Robertson, i. 445, etc.)

Passing to the Scholastic doctrine of original sin, as expounded by Bellarmine, it may be sufficient to quote the following: – "The state of man after the fall of Adam differs from the state of Adam in what was purely natural to him (*in puris naturalibus*), no more than a man who is stripped differs from a naked man. Nor is human nature worse, if you take away original sin, nor does it labour more with ignorance and infirmity, than it would be and would labour in what is purely natural as it was created." In other words, and as the Schoolmen abundantly and explicitly teach, Adam was created mortal, and spiritually naked. He was then clothed with immortality and a superadded original righteousness – ornaments bestowed upon him, but not as parts of himself. These he lost in the Fall, and was so reduced back to his primitive state and condition; but with this material add formidable difference: he was now, having trifled with and lost the precious gift of immortality and righteousness, an object of Divine displeasure; and so transmitted to his seed the poison or infection of his body *fomes peccati*, a fuel that might be kindled into sin, and the guilt by imputation of his soul. Thus then original sin consists not in a positive quality of evil, but in an absence of original righteousness; in a defect of the soul, liable to pollution through the body, rather than in an inherent evil disposition, or direct power and dominion of sin. Concupiscence, or man's tendency to sin, has in it no necessary guilt, for man in this respect is precisely in the same predicament since the Fall as he was before, and consequently in a state of innocence. Baptism therefore cannot, and does not, touch either concupiscence or mortality – these being two of the characteristics of the creature man; but it takes away original sin, inasmuch as it restores the spiritual adornment which was lost by the Fall – original righteousness.

The Anabaptists follow in the order of time; and are referred to in the corresponding Article of Edward, 1552: "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians doe vainly talk, which also the Anabaptists do nowadays renew." The reader will find, under Article 7, the

Pelagian errors which were “renewed” or expanded by the Anabaptists. They may be briefly recounted here: It is possible for man to earn salvation by his own virtuous actions. The Flesh alone participated in the Fall. Or, even granting that man is fallen, he may be rescued, by his natural powers. Christ was one of the most spotless of our race; a Teacher and Exemplar; a Saviour in the sense of our leader and forerunner; but to call Him the Redeemer, in the ordinary sense of that term, is to convert Him into an idol. And as to concupiscence, a man who is reconciled to God, is without all stain thereof, nothing of the old Adam remaining in his nature.

Finally, we come to the Council of Trent. On the subject before us we find, as usual, truth mixed up with deadly error. Our business however is with the points directly or inferentially opposed by our Article. Thus we find it decreed in the Fifth Session: –

“If any one denies that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in Baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted; or moreover asserts that the whole is not taken away of that which has the true and proper nature (*ratio*) of sin; but says that it is only cut down or not imputed. Let him be Anathema.

Nevertheless, this Holy Council doth confess and is of opinion that Concupiscence, or the fuel of sin, remaineth in the baptized; which being left for the purpose of trial, cannot hurt those who do not consent to it, but manfully through the grace of Christ resist it.

“The Holy Council declares that the Catholic Church hath never understood that this concupiscence, which the Apostles sometimes call sin, is called sin because sin is truly and properly in the regenerate, but because it is of sin, and inclines to sin. If anyone hold a contrary opinion, let him be Anathema.”

It was also expounded and determined: That the perfection of Adam consisted in an infused quality, which adorned the soul, made it acceptable to God, and exempted the body from mortality. That Original Sin consists in the deprivation of this Original Righteousness. That in Baptism the soul is restored to purity, and the state of primeval innocence, though the punishments incurred by sin are not removed. That the regenerating grace of baptism is accompanied by justifying grace, which worketh in some greater effects than original righteousness, though not on the body, to the removal of natural defects and mortality. And that the decree concerning the

transmission of sin by generation, from Adam to his posterity, “did not mean to comprehend the Blessed Virgin.”

3. *Analysis and Working of the Article.*

The construction is elaborate, careful, and for all necessary purposes, exhaustive. The Article might easily be recast so as to compress its substance, but it would be difficult to reduce its wording into a smaller compass, and bring out at the same time all its valuable points.

(1.) Original Sin is defined (a) negatively – “standeth not in the following of Adam, *in imitatione Adami* (in the imitation of Adam), as the Pelagians do vainly talk”; (b) positively as to its nature and extent – “it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, *vitium et depravatio naturae cujuslibet hominis* (the fault and depravity of every member of the human family), that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam.”

(2.) The measure or degree of this fault and corruption of nature – “whereby man is very far gone, *quam longissime distet* (most far gone) from original righteousness, and is of his own nature, *sua natura* (radically and inborn), inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit.”

(3.) In deserving in itself of the wrath of God – “and therefore in every person born into this world, *in unoquoque nascentium* (at birth, not *natorum*, or *after* birth), it deserveth God’s wrath and damnation.”

(4.) Remains in the regenerate – “and this infection of nature, *haec naturae depravatio* (this depravity of nature), doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated, *renatis*; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek φρόνημα σαρκος [St. Paul’s expression, Rom. 8:7, for the enmity of the natural man against God, the unrestrained outcome of which he describes in Gal. 5:19–22], which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God.”

(5.) Nevertheless there is no condemnation for the true believer – “there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, *renatis et credentibus*.” Here we have *renatis* again, before translated *regenerated*, now *baptized*, but qualified by the word *believe* – a plain proof that the Reformers did not look upon adult baptism at least, *per se*, as equivalent to full spiritual birth.

(6.) Concupiscence has the nature of sin – “concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature, *rationem* (the fixed relation and reckoning), of sin.”

The reader who has followed us in this Article will therefore, we think, clearly see not only the Scriptural positions assumed by our Reformers, but also the calm yet firm and uncompromising stand made by these noble men against error – whether Pelagian, Scholastic, Anabaptist, or Romish. And it is just this twofold element – Scriptural truth and faithful protest against error, which chiefly and so highly enhances the value of the Thirty-nine Articles. Quaint occasionally they may be in style, and not unfrequently and almost necessarily tinged with scholastic phraseology, yet nevertheless they are one of the very profoundest contributions to sound theology ever given, in a doctrinal formulary, to the world.

Only a very few additional words are required in conclusion. Our Article is a positive protest against the Pelagian doctrine of imitation. It is a negative protest against Rome's scholastic figment as to that in which original righteousness consisted. It is a positive protest against the scholastic *privatio*, or mere lack of superadded righteousness, also endorsed by the Council of Trent. It is a positive protest against Rome's dogma of sinless concupiscence. It is a constructive protest against Rome's *ex opere operato* efficacy of Baptism, as well as against her feeble (Tridentine) dogma of an immaculate Virgin. And lastly it is a negative protest against the very debatable doctrine of the imputation of Adam's guilt, herein agreeing with the great Germanic Confession, as well as with the Helvetic, Saxon, and Belgic Confessions – a doctrine, however, plainly asserted by the Westminster Assembly of Divines.

Article X.

History and Doctrine, With Scriptural Proof.

Of Free Will. – The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

De Libero Arbitrio. – Ea est hominis post lapsum Adae conditio, ut sese naturalibus suis viribus, et bonis operibus, ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac praeparare non possit. Quare absque gratia Dei (quae per Christum est), nos praeveniente, ut velimus, et cooperante, dum volumus, ad pietatis opera facienda, quae Deo grata sunt et accepta, nihil valemus.

The title and the text of the Article introduce two Subjects: – 1. The Scientific View. 2. The Scriptural View.

1. *The Scientific View.*

(1.) Demonstrative science, metaphysical science, and religious science, if indeed we may give them the same surname, have little affinity or sisterhood. The notation of the first is human, yet absolutely fixed and certain, of constant value, and may be expressed in any medium; the notation of the second is vague and variable as language itself, and its assumed truths may well be rejected as sophisms or subtleties, if they must be confined to a given enunciation; the notation of the third is Divine, and hinges *in toto* on one grand axiom, namely, that GOD is LOVE – or, if you choose to express it in another formula, God, and not Man, is the Saviour.

The first and the second, therefore, are at antipodes; as well as the second and the third. If there is any affinity among them all, it is between the first and the third – between demonstrative, and religious, science. They have the same fixity of notation; only that the principia of the one are miraculously revealed and documentary, the principia of the other are to be discovered.

Again, the study of all physical science, or the laws of nature, is eminently if not chiefly conducive to our temporal well-being; metaphysical science, or the study of the laws of mind, is perhaps at most a profitable pastime; but the faithful study of the laws of God, “godliness, is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.”

Moreover, it has to be affirmed that religious science differs from all human science in this respect – which must ever exist as an impassable gulf between them – that the former is designedly as well as necessarily fragmentary, segments of several circles or systems, now human, now angelic, now Divine, not one of which is or indeed could be completely described to our finite minds; whereas the latter is occupied with one system only, and left naturally to the feebleness and imperfections of its own calculus.

If then the mental phenomena, and even those with which we are more immediately conversant, remain in and of themselves a mystery, in their very nature unfathomable, unstable, illusory, far above the mere world of external nature, and must needs so remain, the difficulty of the problem

is only infinitely increased when, on the Bible platform, the human mind is brought into contact with other worlds of spirits, holy and unholy, Divine and Satanic.

(2.) It is difficult, and so difficult that for all practical purposes it may be assumed to be impossible, for man to think in any other groove than that to which he has been accustomed. True, some men of patient and exalted genius are at home in humble phrase and illustration, as well as in the higher walks of abstract reasoning; but the duplex attainment is rare, rarer than we may at first imagine, and after all just resolves itself back into custom and training. When Plato and the schools sent their students into the temple of Christianity, these naturally brought with them their philosophic modes of thought, and unhappily not a little of their philosophy also. In other words, Satan used “the wisdom of the wise” to mar and counteract much of the simplicity of the Gospel. And this blinding or emasculating process has been kept up and prevailed till almost our own day. Change the phraseology, and you have till within a very late period, the alien spirit of so-called philosophic thought and metaphysical exposition which set in against the genius of the New Way in the second century.

(3.) A brief review of men and dates may be useful landmarks for the student, here and in following Articles.

The Apostolic Fathers.

In the golden age of Christianity, if anywhere, we should expect to find the doctrines of grace taught by Christ and His Apostles, faithfully reflected. Whatever may have been the errors which were creeping into the Church, or whatever human weaknesses may have been displayed by the Apostolic Fathers, theirs *par excellence* is the age to which above all that follow we are justified in looking for the strong vitality of the life of the Christian Faith. Let us therefore hear St. Clement of Rome, the first Bishop of that See, whom St. Paul mentions as one of his “fellow labourers, whose names are in the Book of Life” (Phil. 4:3): –

“God glorified his saints of old, not for their own sake, or for their own works, or for the righteousness that they themselves wrought, but through his will. And we also being called by the same will in Jesus Christ, are not justified by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, or the works which we have done in holiness of heart; but by that faith by which God Almighty has justified all men from the beginning. To

whom be glory forever and ever. Amen. What shall we do, therefore, brethren? shall we be slothful in well-doing, and lay aside our love? May God keep us, that such things be not wrought in us! But rather let us give all diligence, that with earnestness and readiness of mind we may perfect every good work. ... How excellent, beloved, are the gifts of God. Life in immortality! glory in righteousness! truth in confidence! faith in full assurance! continence in holiness! All these are comprehensible to us. But what shall those things be which he hath prepared for them that wait for him? The Creator, the Everlasting Father, the All-Holy; he only knows their greatness and their beauty. Let us then *agonize* that we may be found among the number of those that abide in him, that we may be made partakers of the free gifts he hath promised. But how shall this be, beloved? If, having our minds confirmed in faith towards God, we seek those things which are pleasing and acceptable unto him; fulfilling that which is agreeable to his holy will; and following the way of truth, we cast off from us all unrighteousness and iniquity. This is the way, beloved, wherein we find our salvation, even Jesus Christ, the High Priest of all our offerings, the support and help of our infirmities. By (faith in) him we gaze upon his pure and most exalted countenance, and behold therein, as in a glass, the heights of the heavenly felicities. By him are the eyes of our hearts opened; by him our foolish and darkened understandings rejoice to behold his marvelous light” (1 ad Cor. 32–33).

St. Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul (Acts), is frequently quoted by Clement of Alexandria and Origen, which with other evidence tends to establish the authority of his Epistle. He unhappily retains many of the blemishes of Jewish writing, but the following passage, though perhaps inferior to Clement in diction, yet is equally satisfactory: –

“Before that we believed in God, the habitation of our heart was frail and corruptible, even as a temple merely built with hands. For it was a house full of idolatry, a house of demons; inasmuch as there was done in it whatsoever was contrary unto God. By what means shall a house like this be gloriously rebuilt in the name of the Lord? I will tell you. *Having received remission, of our sins through faith in the name of the Lord, we are made anew, being created as it were from the beginning.* Then God truly dwells in our house, that is, in us. But how does he dwell in us? By the word of his faith, by the calling of his promise, by the wisdom of his righteous judgments, by the commands of his doctrine: he himself speaks

within us, he himself dwelleth in us, and openeth to us, who were in bondage of death, the gate of our temple, that is the mouth of wisdom, having given repentance unto us. By this means he hath made us an indestructible temple. He then that desireth to be saved must not look for help to man, but to him that dwelleth in his servants, and speaketh by them. This is the spiritual temple that is built unto the Lord” (Epis. 16).

St. Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, by whom probably he was appointed to the See of Antioch, thus writes: –

“Nothing shall be hidden from you if ye have perfect faith and love to Jesus Christ, which is the beginning and the end of life. For the beginning is faith, and the end is love, and these two joined together are of God; and all other things that concern a holy life are the effects of these. No man professing a true faith sinneth; neither does he who hath love hate any. The tree is made manifest by its fruit: so they who profess themselves Christians are to be judged by what they do. For Christianity is not the work of an outward profession; but the power of faith enduring unto the end” (Ad Eph. 14).

St. Polycarp, also the disciple of St. John, and by him appointed to the See of Smyrna, has the following meek and lovely passages: –

“Brethren, watch unto prayer, and strengthen yourselves therein with fasting: with supplication beseeching the all-seeing God not to lead us into temptation; for the Lord himself hath said, ‘The Spirit is willing but the Flesh is weak!’ Let us, therefore, without ceasing, hold unto him who is our hope and the pledge of our righteousness, even Jesus Christ: ‘who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree’ ‘who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth’: but suffered all for us that we might live through him. Let us, therefore, imitate his patience: and if we suffer for his name, let us glorify him; for this example he himself hath set before us, that believing in him we might follow it. Wherefore, I exhort all of you, that obeying the word of his righteousness, ye exercise yourselves unto all the patience which ye yourselves have beheld, not only in the blessed Ignatius, and Zozimus, and Rufus, but in Paul also, and the rest of the Apostles; being confident of this, that all these have not run in vain, but in faith and righteousness; and are gone to the place which was prepared for them of the Lord, with whom also they suffered. For they loved not this present world; but him who died and was raised again by God for us” (ad Philip. 8–9). And again: “Polycarp and the presbyters that are with him in the church of God,

which is at Philippi: mercy unto you, and peace from God Almighty, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, be multiplied. I rejoiced greatly with you in the Lord Jesus Christ, that the root of the faith which was preached from the beginning remains firm in you, and brings forth fruit to our Lord Jesus Christ, who suffered himself to be brought even to the death for our sins. Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death.’ ‘Whom having not seen ye love, in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory,’ into which ye earnestly desire to enter; knowing that by grace ye are saved; not by works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ” (Supra, 1).

Here then is the unsophisticated Christianity of the New Testament as taught by the companions of the inspired Apostles – no metaphysics, but the whole ethics of the question of the Freedom of the Will – the whole ethics of Salvation drawn out, so to stimulate and win to the activities of Faith working by Love, as if the whole work of salvation depended upon man himself.

In the Second and Third Centuries.

The discussion upon the Freedom of the Will had now long been as hotly debated by the Platonists and Stoics outside the pale of Christianity, as it was in the Church between Calvinists and Arminians at the Synod of Dort. Whatever softening of the picture may be drawn from individual texts, such as Seneca’s, “Ille ipse omnium conditor et rector, *scripsit* quidem *fata*, sed sequitur. Semper *paret* semel *jussit*” (De Providentia, 5), or whether we contend that the Stoical Fate was a physical or a moral necessity, as it touches the Supreme Being, yet it is abundantly clear that the philosophers of the Porch held the doctrine of an irrevocable fate, an inevitable necessity or destiny invincibly controlling the volitions of the human mind. On the other hand, whether we read Plato as ascribing to God neither omnipotence, nor omnipresence, nor omniscience (Schlegel), or as acknowledging [inferentially and obscurely?] *all* the divine perfections (Maclaine), yet it is also abundantly evident that the philosophers of the Grove held the entire and perfect free agency not only of the Creator but of man. For Stoicism and Platonism, read Calvinism and Arminianism, and you have *mutatis mutandis*, and these of no appreciable moment in the argument, the battle of the 17th century fought and fiercely, in the early period before us, at the schools of Athens – only with this difference of

result, that Platonism triumphed, whereas between Calvinism and Arminianism the laurels were divided: Calvinism prevailing in Holland and other like Protestant countries, but ultimately in England, under Charles I and the Laudites, Arminianism was honoured with royal and prelatie favours.

And thus Philosophy, with its chilling influence, steps, in the second century, upon the platform of Christianity.

Justin Martyr became a convert to the Christian faith, but clung tenaciously to his philosopher's cloak. A rigid Platonist, of high repute in the schools, he brought with him the whole of his Platonism into the school of Christ; and so unhappily infected the divinity of the second century with his passion-theme – the *το αυτεξούσιον*, or absolute freedom of the will of angels and men. Here the enemy made a fatal breach in our walls, soon came in like a flood, and for seventeen long centuries, now with the Platonic element, and anon with the Stoic, has been trying to stifle the living and pure word of God, by engaging the human understanding in a sphere utterly beyond its present ken and cognizance – man's responsibility and God's sovereignty. Would to God that Christendom universally – in her halls of theology and seats of learning, as well as in her pulpits and her press – could be induced to return, with heart and soul, to the simple ethics of the Apostles and their immediate successors – “Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure!”

Here we cannot do better than quote Mr. Osburn, in his *Doctrinal Errors of the Fathers* (London, 1835) – a work that well deserves to be revised and reprinted, and which should be in the hands of every intelligent Churchman at the present day. We have examined the references in the original; duly weighed the charges, and endorse them: –

“The circumstance that of all others most powerfully contributed to the establishment of the Platonic theory regarding the Freedom of the Will, in the Christianity of the second century, was the conversion of Justin the philosopher. This event probably took place at a period, when not many of the same standing and pretensions in literature had embraced the tenets of the then despised and persecuted sect of the Christians; and it is pretty certain that Justin was the first of the rank of a philosopher who set the seal of martyrdom to the sincerity of his profession. These incidents conferred upon his writings an astonishing degree of authority and influence with his

contemporaries and successors, for which we should scarcely find anything to account, in the intrinsic merits of those of them that remain. ...

“The Freedom of the Will was a subject in which Justin’s feelings were already warmly interested, when he embraced Christianity; and upon which he was most probably fully committed in the schools. It is on this account that he never once quotes scripture authority for the doctrine, nor does he even cite that or anything else in proof of it, but he invariably assumes it as an axiom antecedent to all proof.

“Thus the example and authority of Justin, combined with other circumstances to identify this tenet of Platonism with Christianity, in the divinity of the second century.

“Irenaeus dogmatizes upon the entire freedom of the will in the same style as his predecessor: and also endeavours to establish it from Scripture. His mode of proof is sufficiently comprehensive: every hortative passage in the Sacred Volume which addresses man as a rational and accountable being, he conceives to be unanswerable demonstration of his unlimited free agency. Nor does he at all scruple to carry the doctrine out to all the consequences of which it is capable. Man is the author of his own faith; he accomplishes at the first his own election, and he achieves at the last his own salvation!

“Tertullian did not allow his own antipathy to philosophy to prevent him, either embracing the doctrine of Plato, or availing himself of the argument by which that philosopher supported it. He contends at great length for the freedom of the human will, on the ground that without it there can be no human responsibility: which is the Platonic argument.

“Clement of Alexandria enforces the freedom of the will to the full extent in which it was maintained by the Platonists, and frequently upholds his opinion by the express sanction and authority of passages from the works of Plato. ...

“What would be the fate, with these writers, of the portion of the Christian scheme which depends upon the solution of this question, and which, since the Reformation, has been comprehended under the technical expression *doctrines of Grace*, it is not very difficult to divine. The large and liberal canon of scriptural interpretation then in use, or, in a case of emergency, the timely aid of the ἀμφιβολία (equivocation, or double meaning), could scarcely fail to remove all impediments from this quarter, to a system of divinity in entire harmony with the Platonic principle. And

such is certainly the fact of the case. Upon these points, the Bible is only quoted to be disregarded, or explained away where it seems to oppose the doctrine to be proved; it is perfectly powerless against this their prepossession. If we are saved by faith alone, faith is merely that assent of the understanding, which, by the express doctrine of both the Stoics and Platonists, is in our own power. If the grace of God be needed at all, beyond the ordinary grace of baptism, it is only for those whose ambition, and whose nerve, have prompted and enabled them to climb to perilous elevations on the giddy eminences of gnosticism and martyrdom. If there be anything like depravity in human nature, it is that which it is entirely within the power of the will to rectify; nor does it, in any one of the fathers of the second century, overstep the dimensions which the academic philosophy has assigned to it – namely, that man has a pure soul dwelling in an impure body. We may, indeed, in our anxiety to apologize for the early representatives of the visible church, cite passages from the works of Justin, which apparently give some degree of countenance to these doctrines; but though I readily acknowledge that more of this phraseology will be found there than in the writings of his successors, yet I cannot help fearing that they will not admit of an orthodox interpretation, without doing considerable violence to the entire scope of the author's meaning. And I feel compelled to state, unhesitatingly, that upon this part of the great question between God and man, which constitutes religion, the fathers of the second century were the disciples, not of Christ, but of Plato: – nor are the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel to be found in their works, and for this most obvious reason, because they did not maintain them.

“We have no difficulty in accounting for this circumstance. Their mode of interpretation has already shown us that they regarded the Bible in the light of a mythology, revealing certain truths regarding the divine nature and worship, but concealing, under the semblance of moral maxims, twisted together in amphibologics, or enshrined in allegorical histories, the elemental germs of an ethical system, which it was the province of philosophy to develop. And to what philosophy could they so naturally apply for this assistance, as to that from whence the proto-martyr of this phase of Christianity had stepped into the new religion; which had already been applied as the solvent of the Mosaic dispensation by the Hellenizing Jews; and the intellectual beauties of which project the shadow of an apology for those who have denominated its founder, the divine Plato? ...

“It was inevitable to such a scheme that a large measure of value and efficiency should be ascribed to good works. We have already laid before the reader their opinions of the power and prevalence with God of fasting, and the other ceremonies of religion; and that they would assign the same value to the fulfillment of the moral law of the New Testament, is a corollary too self-evident to require that we should work it out.

“This was the doctrinal religion of the fathers of the second century. If the tradition, either of the Apostles, or the Apostolical Fathers, is to be received, it was not Christianity. If the works of Plato, and their own constant admissions are to be regarded it was Platonism” (ch. xv.).

Origen works out, as might be expected, the problem of the Freedom of the Human Will, more elaborately and systematically than his preceptor, Clement of Alexandria; discussing the doctrine of grace and freewill as a sort of binomial equation, with, perhaps, eventually a preponderance in favour of the former: –

“He builds the house, whosoever progresses, and he keeps the city, whosoever is perfect; but vain is the labour of the builder, and vain the watching of the watchman, except the Lord build, and the Lord keep. The power of the Lord which assists in the building of him that buildeth, and which helps him to build who is not able of himself to complete the building, is a good beyond our own free choice: and the same must be thought about the city that is kept. And as if I should that the good in agriculture, which causes the fruit to grow, is mixed of that freedom of choice which is in the art of the farmer, and of that which is not in his free choice but from Providence, that is to say, the temperature of the atmosphere, and the supply of sufficient rain; so the good of the reasonable creature is mixed, of his own free will, and the Divine power assisting with him that chooses the things that are most honest. Therefore, in order to be honest and good, there is not only need of our own free choice, and the Divine assistance, which as far as we are concerned is not in our own choice; but this is also necessary, that he who has become honest and good, should persevere in virtue. Since he that has been made perfect will fall again, if he is over-elated with his honesty, and claims the merit to himself, and does not pay the honour that is due to Him who has contributed much more to the acquirement and support of his virtue. ... Perhaps the holy Apostle, seeing that our free will contributed much less than the power of God to the attainment of good things, said that the end is not of him that

wills, nor of him that runs, but of God who has mercy. Not as if God had pity on those who did not will or who did not run, but as if the willing and the running were nothing in comparison of the mercy of God, and therefore that it was fitting the good should be ascribed rather to the mercy of God, than to human willing or running” (Select. in Psalm).

In the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.

It would be difficult to find in so few words a more complete summary of the prevalent teaching on the point before us than what Hilary gives us about the middle of the 4th century: –

“Human weakness is incompetent to obtain anything of itself; and this only is the duty of its nature, that it should be willing to begin to form itself into the family of God. It belongs to the mercy of God to assist those who are willing, to confirm those who begin, to receive those who come. *But the beginning is from ourselves*, that he may perfect it” (Tr. in Psa. 117. lib. xvi. 10).

In the beginning of the 5th century, as we have seen, Pelagians brought out into boldest relief the question of the Freedom of the Will, distinctly maintaining, “That man may be without sin, and keep the commandments of God, if he will”; and that, “Our victory proceeds not from the help of God, but from the freedom of the will.” The Semi-Pelagians also afterwards taught, that while the grace of God is necessary to our perseverance in good works, yet it is not necessary as a prevenient power to produce the beginnings of true repentance, every individual possessing the natural strength to turn himself unto God.

Augustine began life a Manichean; and then, when on the verge of absolute skepticism, threw himself into the arms of Neo-Platonism, ravished with its illusory charms. But its ideals ever eluded his passionate grasp; and though his intellect was dazzled, his soul was at unrest and unsatisfied. He had the shell of Christianity without the kernel. Nor was it until he had passed over to the simple gospel of God – from the ideal, to the real, Christ – from the philosophy of the world, to the philosophy of faith rooted and grounded in humility and love, that he was able to throw off the shackles which bound him, and emerging from his Platonic intellectualism, spell out the innate beauty and dignity of Christianity to his own age, and to Luther and our Reformers – *Fides Praecedat Intellectum!*

We do not endorse all that St. Augustine has written on the subject of Free Will, simply because we are not ready to endorse his contradictions. Nor could we expect such a spirit to be altogether free from the idols of its den – to show no trace whatever of the impure and traditional elements which floated around him. But while his contradictions just prove to us the main point for which we contend, namely, that the question of man's Freedom and God's Sovereignty is one altogether outside the sphere at least of our present understandings, yet it is refreshing to read the following selected from other like passages, inasmuch as it brings us back in a measure to the Divine realities of the Gospel: –

“The will is then truly free, when it serves neither vice nor sin. Such was given by God; and being lost by our own depravity, cannot be restored except by him who was able to give it. Accordingly Truth says, ‘If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed.’ But that is the same as if he said, ‘If the Son shall save you, then you shall be saved indeed’” (De Civitate Dei, I. xiv. 11).

The Middle Age.

In the ninth century, through private animosity among the monks, a violent controversy arose on the kindred subjects of grace, predestination, and free will, which divided the councils and writers of the day. Goteschalk, a monk of Orbais in France, was charged by his abbot and enemy, Rabanus Maurus, with “affirming that the predestination of God related to evil as well as to good; and that there are some in the world who cannot reclaim themselves from their errors and sins, on account of the predestination of God”; and with having “seduced many who are negligent of their salvation, and who say, What will it profit to exert myself in the service of God?” He was defended by Ratramn, monk of Corby, Remigius, Bishop of Lyons, and many others.

The second of the four articles agreed on in the Council of Chiersey, 853, which condemned him, runs thus: –

“We lost freedom of will in the first man, which we recover by Christ our Lord; and we have free will to good when prevented and aided by grace; and have free will to evil when forsaken of grace. That we have free will is because we are made free by grace and are healed of corruption by it.”

The substance of one of the canons of the Council of Valence, 855, which defended him, is as follows: –

“In regard to saving grace and ‘free will which was impaired by sin in the first man, but is recovered and made whole again by Jesus Christ in all believers in him’; this council holds with various councils and pontiffs; and rejects the trash vended by various persons.”

Whether Stoic or Platonist, Calvinist or Arminian, Goteschalk was brutally treated by his judge, the arrogant Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who ordered him to be “whipped with very severe stripes” (*durissimis verberibus*) till he should throw the statement of his doctrine made at Mentz into the flames; and committed him to prison in the monastery of Hautvilliers for life, where he lingered twenty years, firmly maintaining his opinions till the last. It may be judicious as a rule for the historian to smother his own feelings, and let the picture speak; but here we cannot well help writing on the canvas – The Baptist of the Gospel of the Papacy.

The cause of Goteschalk is espoused by the Benedictines, Augustinians, and Jansenists: the Jesuits say he was righteously condemned.

The Schoolmen of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries ranged themselves into two hostile camps on the subject of Free Will – the Dominicans, or Thomists under Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, symbolizing with St. Augustine; and the Franciscans, or Scotists under Duns Scotus, the Subtle Doctor, approximating to Semi-Pelagianism.

Now too was elaborated, in the course of discussion, the Scholastic Theology – a system of metaphysical and technical Divinity, originating with the Schoolmen of the eleventh century, and which gave us the names Predestination, Perseverance, Grace of Congruity (or *fitness*), Grace of Condignity (or *desert*), and the like; or frequently occurring under some of the following articles: and all which have done incalculable injury to the Church of God. We need not here further anticipate ourselves than to explain, that the Grace of Congruity is theologically opposed to the Grace of Condignity – the former meaning that it is fit and agreeable to the nature and goodness of God, though not obligatory on His justice, to bestow grace on the unassisted efforts of man towards holiness; the latter, that after grace is received, man arrives at a state of merit, in which he deserves and can claim at the hands of God as a right, not only further grace, but eternal

happiness, Circuitous Pelagianism – man virtually working out and ensuring his own salvation.

At the Reformation and Since.

The master spirit of the Reformation, in his variations like Augustine on Free Will, is a further proof, if further proof is necessary, that the subject in its bearings is not to be grasped by our present understandings. The more thoughtful language, however, of both Luther and Melancthon, may be seen in the 18th and 19th Articles of the Augsburg Confession, which in substance run: –

“Men have some free will to live reputably, to choose among objects which their natural reason can comprehend; but without the gracious aids of the Holy Spirit they cannot please God nor truly fear him, exercise faith, or overcome their sinful propensities. God. is not the cause and author of sin; but the perverse wills of ungodly men and devils are the sole cause of it.”

Calvin on the other hand, through his extremely logical mind, clearly overstepped the legitimate boundary of argument on this and allied subjects; often unhappily couching his positions and conclusions in needlessly harsh and coarse phraseology: –

“We hold it therefore an indubitable truth, which can be shaken by no tricks, that the mind of man is so wholly alienated from the justice of God, that it can conceive, desire, effect nothing but what is impious, perverted, foul, impure, flagitious. The heart is so completely besmeared with the venom of sin, that it can breathe forth nothing but fetid corruption” (Institut. I. ii. 19).

In the Council of Trent, we have the proverbial cunning and duplicity of Rome. She could not afford to dispense with the popular and powerful Dominicans, who were the enemies of grace *de congruo*, nor with the not less influential and courtly Franciscans, who were its friends. And therefore the Tridentine decree on Free Will, like others of the infallible council, is a sort of flexible jumble – a mass without joints or nerves, with a bend perhaps in favour of the Franciscans: –

“Whosoever shall say that the free will of man, moved and excited by God, does not at all cooperate with God when exciting and calling, that thus he may dispose and prepare himself for obtaining the grace of justification, and that he cannot dissent though he wills it, but, like something inanimate,

does nothing at all, and holds himself merely passive, let him be Anathema” (Sess. 6, Can. 4).

“Whosoever shall say that the free will of man was lost and extinguished after Adam’s sin, or that it is a thing of name merely, or a name without a thing, in short, a figment introduced into the Church by Satan, let him be Anathema” (Can. 5).

And yet those also were anathematized who said, that “a man could be justified without grace”; or that “grace is given to live well with greater facility, and to merit eternal life, as if free will could do it though with more difficulty”; or that “a man may believe, love, hope, or repent, without the prevention or assistance of the Holy Spirit.”

Turning to our own Church during the establishment of the Reformation, it is instructive to notice how she treats the question of Free Will. Thus in 1543, when the Church was retrograde, Gardiner being in the ascendant, Henry VIII set forth the *Necessary Doctrine*, which declares that “man has free will now after the fall of Adam”; defining it to be “a power of reason and will, by which good is chosen by the assistance of grace, or evil is chosen without the assistance of the same”; and concluding: “All men be also to be monished, and chiefly preachers, that in this high matter, they, looking on both sides, so attemper and moderate themselves, that neither they so preach the grace of God, that they take away thereby free will, nor, on the other side, so extol free will that injury be done to the grace of God.” And in keeping with this trembling of the balance, we have Gardiner’s own words in his *Declaration (Against George Joye)*: –

“All such texts of Scripture as seem to attribute to man power and faculty of himself to do good, how plainly soever they be, I may gather no sense or understanding of them, but such as may agree with those texts of Scripture that show how man of himself cannot do any good thing, not so much as think a good thought, but it be by the special gift and grace of God. And how plain soever some of the texts of Scripture seem, so to consider man as to resemble him to an earthpot at the pleasure of the potter, and only to do as he is ordained to do by God, yet must we forbear to make any other sense, than such as may agree with other texts of Scripture, that declare man’s free choice to receive grace when it is offered him, or to refuse it and continue in sin.”

Under Edward, in 1552, the ninth of the forty-two Articles was worded thus: –

“Of Free Will. – We have no power to do good works pleasant, and acceptable to God, without the Grace of God by Christ, preventing us that we may have a good will, and working in us, when we have that will.”

But this was followed by a supplementary Article, the tenth, which ran: –

“Of Grace. – The Grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost by him given, doth take away the stony heart, and giveth an heart of flesh. And although those that have no will to good things, he maketh them to will, and those that would evil things, he maketh them not to will the same: Yet nevertheless he enforceth not the will. And therefore no man when he sinneth can excuse himself, as not worthy to be blamed or condemned, by alleging that he sinned unwillingly, or by compulsion.”

If we now turn to our present Article, we shall then see the admirable wisdom of its compilation. Free will is neither defined nor asserted; and the supplementary tenth of 1552, about “making men will, yet nevertheless enforcing not the will,” is altogether omitted. Indeed were it not for the title, and the consequent implied limitation of its subject, we might treat it altogether as an Article on the Necessity of Grace.

Since the Reformation, we have had –

In the Protestant Church.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Calvinistic camp divided into two sections. Sublapsarians (*sub lapsum* – “after the Fall”), who besides their distinguishing opinion that the decrees of God respecting the human family were subsequent to the fall of Adam, or contemplated that apostasy as past, held that man fell of his own will, and not in consequence of the divine preordination. And Supralapsarians (*supra lapsum* – “above or before the Fall”), who maintained that God from all eternity had decreed the transgression of Adam, which was therefore an involuntary act of disobedience, and proving that man did not profess free will even in his state of innocence.

About this time also arose the Arminian schism which, based on the position of the free agency of each individual of the human race, maintained that redemption is offered indifferently to all, and that the Divine decrees were framed contingently, in accordance with the use which Adam and his posterity might make of their free will. A solecism in language, as well as in thought; for, in the quaint but well-put words of Tillotson: “It would

puzzle the greatest philosopher that ever was, to give any tolerable account, how any knowledge whatsoever can certainly and infallibly foresee an event through uncertain and contingent causes.”

The pitched battle between the followers of Arminius and those of Calvin, at the Synod of Dort, will come more properly before us under the seventeenth Article.

In the Roman Catholic Church.

Lewis Molina, a Spanish Jesuit, professor in the Portuguese university of Eborá, at the end of the sixteenth century promulgated doctrines substantially the same as those advocated by the Semi-Pelagians, and by the Remonstrants at Dort – that the Divine decrees as to the human race are founded on God’s *scientia media*, or knowledge of man’s use of his free will – the future contingencies and voluntary actions of His creatures. A contention that gave mortal offence to the Dominicans, as implicit followers of Thomas Aquinas.

A little further on, after the death of the author, was published the *Augustinus* – a work from the pen of Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres in the Netherlands, which professes to set forth and explain the opinions of St. Augustine on the state and powers of human nature before and after the Fall. And thus again were the flames of controversy kindled, the Jansenists being violently opposed by the Jesuits and Franciscans.

Finally, in more modern times, and consequently lifted out of the strict sphere of ecclesiastical and denominational strife – for the tactics of the Archenemy would seem to be no longer so much to localize the tares of a vain philosophy, as to sow them broadcast over the churches – we have had the metaphysico-Scriptural disquisition of Jonathan Edwards on *Freedom of Will* – a work which, so far as the arena of public disputation is concerned, has hitherto silenced Arminianism, and Crowned Calvinism. *But how much better is the Church of the living God?*

Of a truth, looking back along the whole line of battle from the days of Justin Martyr in the second century, who at least, with Pelagius in the fifth, provoked the strife, we cannot but sigh and deeply for the cause of Christ – of true and vital Christianity. How sadly has the divine wisdom of the Galilean peasants, and the heavenly gnosis of St. Paul – “Jesus Christ, and Him Crucified” – been obscured by the philosophy of Satan and of man!

How admirable are the closing sentences of Isaac Taylor, in his Introductory Essay on Edwards's Treatise on the Will: –

“The Arminian divine, inwardly persuaded, he knows not on what ground, that human nature contains a *something* more than the passivity of brute matter, or of animal life, has recourse to the figment of Contingent Volition; and then, to give his unintelligible notion an appearance of consistency, has been led to the enormous error of denying the Divine foreknowledge. Thus, in his zeal to defend one attribute of Deity, he has demolished another. Why will he not be content with the simple principles of human nature, as known to all men, and as recognized in the transactions of every day, and with the plain evidence of the Bible, which always takes up and supposes the existence of those principles?

“His opponent, the Calvinist, spurning the absurdities of Arminian metaphysics, believes that, when he has scattered these sophisms, he has exhausted the subject of human agency, and may triumphantly return from the vanquished field to his own theological position; nor deems it necessary once to lay aside his high lenses, or to look abroad upon human nature as it shows itself to the *naked eye* of common sense. Then he goes to his Bible, cased in metaphysical certainties, and proceeds, without scruple or compunction, to apply the crushing engine of dogmatical exposition to all passages that do not naturally fall in with the abstractions which he has framed to himself. Meanwhile, men of sense are disgusted, and skeptics glory. How shall these evils be remedied – how, unless by the prevalence of a better – a genuine system of interpretation?

“But even without this better exposition, a great and important reform would spontaneously follow from a more vivid persuasion of the *reality* of the great facts affirmed in the Scriptures. Let but the quickening affirmations of the inspired writers be allowed to take effect on the ground of the ordinary motives of human life; let it but be believed that the Son of God has come to inform men (his fellows, by an ineffable condescension) of a future danger to which all are liable; and to impart to them freely a benefit they could never have obtained by their own efforts; and then it will no more seem pertinent or necessary to adjust the terms of this message of mercy to metaphysical subtleties, than it does to do the like when a friend snatches a friend from ruin, or when a father bears his children in his arms from a scene of perils. How much mischief has arisen from the supposition

that a *mystery* belongs to the matter of salvation, which waits to be cleared up by philosophy!

“Philosophy, it is to be hoped, will at length work its way through its own difficulties. But the result to Christianity of so happy a success would simply be to set in a stronger light the enormous folly of obstructing the course of a momentous practical affair by the impertinences of learned disputation.”

2. *The Scriptural View.*

(1.) The Theology of Texts is at once delusive, and our only guide. Delusive, if isolated, or twisted to suit preconceived and denominational theory. Our only guide, if contextual, or if read in a true and obvious exegesis, and in keeping with the tenor of Holy Writ. Spurning any such wise and safe precautions – the natural dictates of common sense – the pronounced Arminian and the pronounced Calvinist, have waged, and may wage, perpetual and unprofitable warfare, to the utter and really consequent and inevitable neglect of the chief lessons of the Bible.

(2.) Take, on the one hand, the phrase Human Depravity, and on the other hand, the phrase God’s Salvation, and see how texts, types, and figures cluster around them. They are the two threads – the warp and the woof of Holy Scripture. Man the bond slave, and God-Man the Redeemer. Nor is there a Daysman of human merit or power between them. Sin and Grace are the factors of the Bible and our Being.

It was not therefore but with deep insight into the Sacred Volume, and of the mind of the Spirit, that our Reformers penned as a supplement to the ninth our present Article. In the former, we have the statement that “man is very far gone from original righteousness”; in this, we have the “longissime” drawn out to utter helplessness. Utter helplessness to do works pleasing and acceptable to God without preventing grace. Utter helplessness, even when we have a regenerated will, to do good without the cooperating grace of the Holy Ghost. Here is the voice neither of Calvin, nor of Arminians, nor of the Schoolmen – of Platonism nor Stoicism: nothing but man’s impotency, and God’s omnipotent mercy.

(3.) To quote texts is to go over much the same ground as that opened up under the ninth Article. It may, however, be useful, as tending still further to establish and illustrate the positions there maintained, briefly to notice the statements before us.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God]

(a) Because the understanding is corrupted. “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned” (1 Cor. 2:14).

(b) Because the whole mind and conscience is defiled. “The carnal mind (φρόνημα – thoughts, affections, aims) is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be” (Rom. 8:7). “Unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure: but even their mind (ο νοῦς – their rational part) and conscience is defiled” (Titus 1:15). “And therefore, uncleanness tainting their rational acts and their reflective self-recognitions, nothing can be pure to them: every occasion becomes to them an occasion of sin, every creature of God an instrument of sin; as Mack well observes, ‘the relation, in which the sinful subject stands to the objects of its possession, or of its inclination, is a sinful one’” (Alford *in loco*).

(c) Because the body is corrupted. “For when we were in the flesh, the motions (τα παθήματα – the passions) of sins did work (ενηργειτο – *middle*, energized) in our members to bring forth fruit unto death” (Rom. 7:5). “The body of the sins of the flesh” (“the domination of the flesh is a Body of Sin”) (Col. 2:11.) “Neither yield ye your members as instruments (όπλα – weapons: each individual member being a different arm of lust) of unrighteousness” (Rom. 6:13).

(d.) And this entire corruption of the whole man, and of man universally – this death in trespasses and sins, proceeds originally from the Fall. “In Adam all die” (1 Cor. 15:22).

(e.) Hence, throughout the Bible, we are explicitly taught, that man cannot turn himself, of his own strength, unto God.

“A deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?” (Isa. 44:20). “O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps” (Jer. 10:23). “The preparations (or, disposings) of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord” (Prov. 16:1). “Turn thou me, and I shall be turned; for thou art the Lord my God. Surely after that I was turned, I repented; and after that I was instructed, I smote upon

my thigh” (Jer. 31:18–19). “A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven” (John 3:27). “I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love; and I was to them as they that take off the yoke on their jaws, and I laid meat unto them” (Hosea 11:4). “No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. ... It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life” (John 6:44–45, 63).

To the plain and obvious argument of some of these and like passages, it is objected, that they refer to the external and outward means of grace, and that our Free Will is exercised and manifested in accepting or rejecting the calls and drawings of God. But it is sufficient to answer, that (1) if, as we have abundantly proved, man is the bond slave of sin, there is of necessity a bondage of the will – a helplessness of his elective component faculty to choose the good and refuse the evil; and (2) the words of our Lord are express, “Without me ye can do nothing” (John 15:5).

Wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will]

(1.) The necessity of Preventing Grace: *grace going before, anticipating, and pre-engaging us.*

This doctrine follows as a natural consequence of the position that man of himself cannot turn unto God, or rather is a fuller restatement of it. Round it cluster all such passages as speak of the *New Birth*, the *New Man*, the *New Creation*, our being God’s *Workmanship*, our being *Called* and *Turned* of God, and of the *Glorious Liberty* into which we are brought by the Son. Take the following:

“We are his workmanship (ποίημα – handiwork), created in Christ Jesus unto good works” (Eph. 2:10). “The new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Eph. 4:24). “I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name” (Isa. 65:1). “It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do (ο ενεργων το θελειν και το ενεργειν – the Energizer of the will and the work) of his good

pleasure” (Phil. 2:13). “The glorious liberty of the children of God” (Rom. 8:21). “So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy” (Rom. 9:16).

(2.) The necessity of Cooperating Grace.

(a) In the Parker English MS. of 1571, “Working *with* us,” as more closely following the Latin (co-operante), was substituted for “Working *in* us.” And we think it was well so. Great and good men have objected to the doctrine of Cooperation, but as it would seem to us, upon insufficient grounds. The true idea of Cooperation neither sullies the robe of Christ’s righteousness, nor exalts our filthy rags. But it does exalt, as well as incite men, to be “workers together with God.” And this we take it is the great aim and ennobling honour of Christianity – the true essence of the liberty of the children of God. While our conversion is of God, and all our guidance and strength of God also, yet God does not call us to slothfulness, either in the business of practical life or salvation. Saved drones, if the idea is conceivable, or the expression allowable, could only be unhappy in heaven.

(b) Among the vast number of passages which teach the necessity of continual assistant, or cooperating Grace, are the following: –

“Lord, thou wilt ordain peace for us: for thou also hast wrought all our works in us” (Isa. 26:12). “Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ” (Phil. 1:6).

“I can do all things in (εν) Christ who strengtheneth me” (Phil. 4:13). Oh, what a rapturous thought! what humble faith! what triumphant, universal power!

“By the grace of God, I am what I am: and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I but the grace of God which was with me” (1 Cor. 15:10).

“For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you” (Matt. 10:20). The preponderating grace and power of God in Christ by the Holy Ghost, and the subordinate co-agency of man.

“Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves: but our sufficiency is of God” (2 Cor. 3:5). “I am the Vine, ye are the Branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit” (John 15:5).

“For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen” (Rom. 11:36). The Origin, Subsistence and Disposal,

and Perfect End of all creation, are to be ascribed to the Three-One God.

(c) Among the multitude of passages which call upon us to press forward as rational and responsible agents, are the following: –

“Run, that ye may obtain” (1 Cor. 9:24. See the whole context, verses 24–27). “I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus” (Phil. 3:14). “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage” (Gal. 5:1). “Stir up the gift of God, which is in thee” (2 Tim. 1:6). “Quench not the Spirit” (Thess. 5:19). “Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the Leader (αρχηγον) and Perfecter (τελειωτην) of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the Throne of God” (Heb. 12:1–2). “We then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain ... but in all things approving ourselves ... by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left” (2 Cor. 6:1, 4, 7. See the entire chapter.)

And as embracing the whole subject of God’s Sovereignty and man’s Responsibility, we can only repeat: – “Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure” (Phil. 2:12–13).

“Christian! seek yet not repose,”
Hear thy guardian angel say;
Thou art in the midst of foes;
“Watch and Pray.”

Principalities and. powers,
Mustering their unseen array,
Wait for thy unguarded hours;
“Watch and Pray.”

Gird thy heavenly armour on,
Wear it ever night and day;
Ambushed lies the Evil One;
“Watch and Pray.”

Hear the victors who o'ereame:
Still they mark each warrior's way;
All with one sweet voice exclaim
 "Watch and Pray!"

Hear, above all, hear thy Lord,
Him thou lovest to obey;
Hide within thy heart His word,
 "Watch and Pray."

Watch, as if on that alone
Hung the issue of the day;
Pray, that help may be sent down;
 "Watch and Pray." Amen.

Such is something of an outline of man's reasonings and God's teachings upon this most momentous question. We feel we cannot more appropriately close our remarks, than in the following weighty and pregnant words, to hand as we write, of a dear friend, elsewhere quoted, to whom we owe the patient criticism, and indeed the existence, of these volumes – one to whom God hath bountifully vouchsafed "a right judgment in all things":

—

"No doubt the question of the Freedom of the Human Will is one capable of being very profoundly argued on metaphysical grounds, but since I looked into phrenology, now some half century ago, I have felt the utmost contempt for every other method of dealing with the science of mind. If we are to accept the descriptions of man's nature given to us in the Word of God, we are bound to believe that it is utterly corrupt, every thought and imagination of his heart being only evil continually. The natural man is enmity against God. And to this agree such terms as 'regeneration,' 'new birth,' etc., with reference to man as converted to God. A being who had any good in him would hardly need to be born again. The better qualities could be taken hold of and strengthened and the bad ones subdued, but this is not the idea which the language brings before us. It is that of something which, being inherently and irremediably wrong, has to be set aside, and a new thing produced. The natural man has a conscience, which up to a certain point enables him to distinguish between right and wrong, and from certain motives he may sometimes prefer the former to the

latter; but these motives center in self, and therefore do not deserve a place among the virtues.

“When we find such a writer as John Milton floundering when he begins to talk of ‘Fixt fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,’ we may well deem that the part of wisdom is to leave such discussions alone. The question has two sides. Holy Scripture puts them before us with equal plainness – God’s Sovereignty and Man’s Responsibility – how they are to be reconciled we are not told and must be content not to know.”

Article XI.

History and Doctrine, With Scriptural Proof.

Of the Justification of Man. – We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

De Hominis Justificatione. – Tantum propter meritum Domini ac Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera, et merita nostra, justi coram Deo reputamur. Quare sola fide nos justificari doctrina est saluberrima, ac consolationis plenissima, ut in Homilia de Justificatione Hominis fusius explicatur.

History.

How shall man be just before God? is the most momentous question of our common humanity – one which has engrossed the minds of all peoples – Patriarchs, Jews, Gentiles, Christians. And it may be well at the outset briefly to examine where each has erred.

Arriving perhaps by different lines of thought and experience, the three friends of the great tribal chief of the land of Uz could only come to the same conclusion, which may be best expressed in the words of Eliphaz the Temanite: “God shall deliver the island of the innocent: and it is delivered by the pureness of thine hands.”

Forgetting or despising the deep spiritual significance of sacrifice, the Jew, throughout his history, despite the evangelism of the prophet, and then the plain logic of St. Paul, ever and anon, up to the present hour, holds out in his hand the merit of his ceremonial obedience, as a price to satisfy God.

The refined Gentiles – heathen Greek and Roman – blackened the heavens with the smoke of their hecatombs, and reared their votive temples

of fabulous gold, to propitiate their deities. And the untutored heathen still delivers his soul by bowing down to wood and stone.

Even professing Christians of our day are “working with the strength of their arms” – mind being little of a factor – to fashion a huge idol of esthetics; or “making religion consist of little else than a self-denying course of the practice of virtue and obedience, a kind of house-of-correction work”; or gauging the mercy of our Heavenly Father by their feelings and frames.

Verily, notwithstanding all God’s appliances, “half the world is Macedon.” Man cannot and will not see the weakness and vileness of the work of his own hands.

And not a few of the members even of the once Protestant Churches of Christendom less or more deliberately ignore that *Articulus Stantis aut Cadentis Ecclesiae* – Justification is by Faith only. How sad to find Bishop Forbes of Brechin write: “Christ merited that the Sacraments should have a power of justifying, and that the good works which are necessary to the justification of adults should be sufficient for the purpose”; and in the very face of our Article, unblushingly declare, “neither is there mention of the renouncing of our own merits as the formal cause of our justification!” (Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles, vol. i. p. 176, and Epistle Dedicatory to Dr. Pusey, p. 10). What a dangerous doctrine, that Christ died not as the Holy Ghost teacheth, that we might be “justified by his Blood,” but, as Dr. Forbes teaches, that He might provide for and implant in sinners a new sentiment or element on the ground and plea of which, conjoined with grace – unholy admixture – they become just before God! In other words, that justification is internal as well as external: the latter the work of God; the former founded upon man’s inherent though inwrought righteousness – strange Romish slaughter of the Queen’s English – and which indeed, as alleged, “is the genuine theological sense of the word ‘justification’.” And so, that “it would not be safe to say that the righteousness of Christ is the formal cause of our justification!” [See pp. 174–184 of the Explanation.] Alas! why all this cautious trimming? – why (if we must use a common and incisive phrase) this super-abounding “sugar coating”? If justification, in all its former cause and reality, is not of the righteousness of Christ alone, why desecrate that righteousness by introducing and “conjoining” it at all? Pelagianism is bad, but Humanism, as it patches the spotless robe of Christ’s righteousness with our filthy rags

– and that too in a Protestant Church, and by one of its dignitaries – is worse. We may be censured for this plain speaking. It is painful to us, as it should be to the school of our author. But there are desperate diseases which demand desperate remedies. And Popery, however dexterously syllabized, in our Reformed Church, is one of them.

And this brings at once before us the two great opposing elements all along of Divine truth and human error in the History of the subject of our Article – God’s good pleasure, and man’s self-exaltation ignoring, less or more, the work of God.

St. James wrote his Epistle probably about thirty years after the laying of the foundation stone of the Christian Church; and the broad cast of his letter is against the Judaizing of Christianity – the transposal of faith from its *living* place in the Christian system, to that which *dead* ceremonial observance occupied in the Jewish.

So early in Christianity, as in creation itself, was the seed of the serpent “bruising the heel of the woman”.

Nor was the work of Satan long in bringing forth its fruit. The Apostolical Fathers, as might be expected, escaped the pollution; but the testimony of many succeeding Fathers is doubtful.

Thus, thank God, in addition to the passages of the Apostolic Fathers, quoted under the preceding Article, attributing all salvation to justification by faith, or the apprehended merits of Christ –

Clement could write: “Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and see how precious is his Blood with God; which being shed for our salvation, has obtained the grace of repentance for the whole world” (Ep. IA ad Corinth. s. 7).

And Barnabas could write: “For this cause the Lord endured to give his body unto death, that we might be sanctified by the remission of sins, that is, by the sprinkling of his blood. For it is written concerning him partly to the people of the Jews, partly to us. But thus he speaks, ‘He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: with his stripes we are healed. He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth’” (Ep. Cathol. s. 4).

And Ignatius could write: “By the fruits of which sufferings we are, even by his blessed passion; that he might set up a token for all ages, through his resurrection, unto his holy saints and faithful servants, whether

amongst the Jews, or amongst the Gentiles, in one body of his Church. For all these things he suffered for our sakes, that we might be saved” (Ad Smyrn. s. 1, 2).

But alas the testimony of too many of those who succeeded the Apostolic Fathers – the stumbling block of free will having been introduced by Justin – is discordant and self-contradictory; so much so that Romanists and Protestants may extract, and have abundantly extracted, passages from the patristic writings in favour respectively of their mutually antagonistic creeds.

Even Augustine could not determine on the words of St. Paul, “The doers of the law shall be justified” (Rom. 2:13), whether justification means *making*, or *esteeming*, just.

It is true the days here of great controversy and sharp technical debate had not yet come; and this is put forward with some plausibility to cover the want of firm footing in the patristic testimony. Still we cannot but conclude that there was a far deeper lesion of truth, when we find such a practical and ethical divine as Chrysostom write on Rom. 4:7 (“Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven”): “He seems to be bringing a testimony beside his purpose. For it does not say, Blessed are they whose faith is reckoned for righteousness. But he does so purposely, not inadvertently, to show the greater excellence. For if he be blessed that by grace received forgiveness, much more he that is made just and that manifests faith”; and again on Rom. 5:16 (“The free gift is of many offences unto justification): “It was not only, that sins were done away, but that righteousness was given. So deeply indeed had the Justinian taint infected even this truly pious and noble man, that his favourite maxim was, *If we but WILL, nothing can harm us*. “God comes not with his gifts before our will: but if we only begin, if we only will, he gives us many means of salvation” (Hom. 18 Joh.).

But yet on the other hand, whenever or wherever the virus of philosophy was inert, the testimony of the Fathers is explicit and unwavering.

Irenaeus: “For the Faith, which is towards the Most High God, justifieth man” (Adv. Haeres. iv. 5). “‘For the just shall live by faith.’ Now this doctrine ‘that the just shall live by faith,’ was foretold by the Prophets” (Adv. Haeres. iv. 34).

Clement of Alexandria: “Abraham was justified, not by works, but by faith” (Strom. i. 7).

Origen: “I can scarcely persuade myself that there can be any work that can demand a recompense from God as a debt, seeing that our power to do, or think, or speak anything, proceeds from his free gift and bounty” (Ep. ad Rom. 4:1).

Cyprian: “It is faith alone which profits us” (Test. ad Quirin. 43).

Basil: “This is the perfect and only glorying in God, when one is not lighted up with his own righteousness, but acknowledgeth that he wanteth the true righteousness, and: that it is by faith only in Christ that he can be justified” (De Hum. s. 3).

Ambrose: “A sinner is justified before God by faith only” (Ep. ad Rom.).

Chrysostom: “What did Abraham lose by not being under the law? Nothing; for faith alone was sufficient for his justification” (Ep. ad Gal. 3:6).

Jerome: “Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness; and so will faith alone suffice you also for righteousness. ... But because none is justified by the law, seeing no one keeps it, it is therefore said that believers are to be justified by faith only” (in Gal. 3).

Augustine: “When therefore the Apostle says ‘that a man is justified through faith without the works of the law,’ this is not his object, that, after the delivery and profession of faith, works of righteousness can be despised, but that each man may know that he can be justified through faith, although the works of the law have not gone before. For they follow after one who is justified, not go before one who shall be justified” (De Fide et Operibus, xiv. 21). And again: “Forasmuch as in the old Law sacrifices for sins were called ‘sins’; which He truly was made, whereof they were shadows. Hence the Apostle, after he had said, ‘We beseech you for Christ to be reconciled to God’; straightway adds and says, ‘Him who knew no sin, he made sin for us, that we may be the righteousness of God in Him.’ He says not, as in certain faulty copies is read, ‘He who knew no sin, for us wrought sin’; as if Christ Himself had sinned for us: but he says, ‘Him who had not known sin,’ that is, Christ, ‘God, to whom we are to be reconciled, made sin for us,’ that is, a Sacrifice for sins, through Which we might be able to be reconciled. He therefore sin, as we righteousness; nor that of our own, but of God; nor in us, but in Him: as He sin, not His own, but ours; which that it

had not place in Him, but in us, He showed by the likeness of the flesh of sin, in which He was crucified” (De Fide, Spe. et Caritate xli. 13).

Now all this, with innumerable other passages from the Fathers on either side – a deep substratum of Scriptural truth, marred and overlaid with man’s unsanctified reasoning – enables us to arrive, as by a process of actual demonstration, at the clear and positive conclusion, that the Romish doctrine of implanted inherent righteousness, or of *ex opere operato* Sacramental grace, as the ground of our justification, is traceable, really and substantially, to the introduction on the one hand of the Platonic philosophy with its earthly accretions into the Church, and on the other hand, to the carnal Judaic principle of the virtue in themselves of sacrificial rites and ceremonial observances. Platonism enabled Clement of Alexandria to give faith new epithets calling it εκούσιος πίστις, freewill faith, and τεχνη φυσικη, a natural art! And Judaism, as we have observed, translated faith into legal merit or barren orthodoxy. Fruitful soils for the Church of Rome, the Council of Trent, and our Tractarian Apostasy.

The Schoolmen, as indeed was only natural – the evangel of the Bible being long lost to the world – cast into their crucible of dialectic argument and subtle distinctions the old but still floating elements of philosophic Christianity; not to purge them of their dross, but to fuse and pour them out into new Aristotelian, the now more fashionable molds. It was a reunion, to some extent, of the Porch and the Grove; and a phenomenal reaction the while, of the West and its hard Latinity upon the East and Origen. Boethias, a Roman, and probably a heathen, statesman under the Gothic kings, published with other like manifold treatises his *Consolation of Philosophy*, which was translated by Alfred the Great into Anglo-Saxon (and afterwards into English by Chaucer and by Queen Elizabeth). Without violently impugning the Platonic philosophy, he, like most of the younger Platonists, also approved the precepts of Aristotle, and thus formed a sort of dualistic basis, though with a less or more decided Aristotelian strain, for the so-called scholastic theology of the Middle Ages. Hence that crop of dull and profitless, or pernicious, verbal crystallizations, which cost the Church untold wealth of time, and lost vast opportunities for good. We may be told, and we have been told, that out of the chaos came order and light. It may be so. God often turns pessimism into optimism. But we think that evil is scarcely to be desiderated by us mortals, that good may come. At all events, is the good in this instance worth the cost? Humbling ideas we certainly

have suggested by the jargon and lifeless theology of the Schools; and though a more accurate and perhaps truer nomenclature and philosophy followed, yet is salvation made easier, or more widely circulated and extended? We trow not.

Meritum de congruo and *meritum de condigno* (merit, as we have seen, respectively before and after grace is obtained); *attrition* and *contrition* (compunction for sin, also respectively before and after grace); *penance* added to attrition, and works of *satisfaction*, with ghostly *absolution*, enjoined and enacted by the *power of the keys* to still the conscience, carry the sinner mayhap to contrition, and avert the temporal punishment due to his sins; *ex opere operato* (the saving grace of the Sacraments *per se*); *fides informis* and *fides formata* (merely speculative faith, and faith which is perfected by good works as the official ground or instrument of salvation); and lastly *justification*, though defined to be the remission of sins, yet manifestly understood as the *consequent of grace infused*: are some of the products of the scholastic doctors, which bear upon the history of the subject of our Article; logical and unedifying or baneful subtleties applied to theological discussions, by which they amused or bewildered their own minds, and glamoured or disgusted the people. A mash of sterile philosophy, heathenism, and the husks of Christianity; to the destruction, we may fear, of many souls.

Now let us enter with Luther upon this scene, and we shall not be surprised, taking into account his idiosyncrasy and lion heart, at the home thrusts which he dealt at “the divinity of the kingdom of Antichrist”; nor, taking into account the impetuosity of his foes and the distractions of the deepened combat, shall we wonder if the all but singlehanded champion of the Reformation was drawn into occasional vehement, or perhaps inaccurate, utterances.

The godless and blasphemous Nomos of pre-Reformation times was enough to betray even the mildest and most cautious Evangelical into seeming Antimonial *abandon*. Just as in the present day, when men find themselves surrounded by the meshes of Ritualistic bondage, they are likely at times to fall into language which a century hence may be translated by a shallow critic into virulent or direct opposition to all ritual and ecclesiastical order. The standpoint of all true, honest criticism and history is the circumstance of the case and the time.

We might not dwell long on Luther's views of Justification, inasmuch as his well-known formula, Justification is by Faith Only, so fully expresses them. But still, as it is a duty, no less than a pleasure, to "walk about Zion, and go round about her, telling the towers thereof," we would cordially invite the reader to accompany us in the following lengthy but most valuable extracts from Luther's *Commentary on, the Epistle to the Galatians*, which show how he "set his heart to the bulwarks" of the Reformation; and by the lever of the all-important doctrine of our Article, shook the Popedom, and unslaved the world.

For the student who may desire to prove a faithful watchman on the walls of the dear old once Protestant Church of England, it seems to us to be absolutely necessary that he should carefully trace these and other lines of our great Reformers. Rugged he may occasionally find them, but nevertheless they have the clear ring of loyalty to God and his blessed Word. Rough as may be at times the casing of the weapon, it is yet a trusty blade. "If," said Luther, "I have exceeded the bounds of moderation, the monstrous turpitude of the times has transported me." Nor indeed can we otherwise well account for the feebleness of protest on the part of too many of the rising generation of ministers, than that among the textbooks of our Theological Colleges, a place is seldom if ever found for the works of these wonderful and heroic past leaders of the Faith and of Protestantism. And it is in some measure to supply that deficiency, that we are tempted to enlarge this Article somewhat beyond our usual space; sincerely hoping at the same time, that someone may be prompted to furnish a compendium of the works of the early reformers, and others who have more closely followed in their footsteps, as a convenient textbook for students in divinity.

Luther on Justification.

"Know that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ. Even we, I say, have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law. Because by the deeds of the law, no flesh shall be justified." – Gal. 2:16.

Know that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ. [We follow Middleton's excellent Translation.] – "This word [the work of the law] reacheth far, and comprehendeth much. We take the work of the law therefore generally for that which is contrary to grace. Whatsoever is not grace, is the law, whether it be judicial, ceremonial, or

the ten commandments. Wherefore, if thou couldst do the works of the law according to this commandment: ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,’ etc. (which no man yet ever did or could do), yet thou shouldst not be justified before God: for a man is not justified by the works of the law. But hereof we will speak more largely hereafter.

“The work of the law, then, according to Paul, signifieth the work of the whole law, whether it be judicial, ceremonial, or moral. Now, if the work of the moral law do not justify, much less doth circumcision justify, which is a work of the ceremonial law. Wherefore, when Paul saith (as he oftentimes doth) ‘that a man is not justified by the law, or by the works of the law’ (which are both one), he speaketh generally of the whole law, setting the righteousness of faith against the righteousness of the whole law. ‘For by the righteousness of the law,’ saith he, ‘a man is not pronounced righteous before God: but the righteousness of faith God imputeth freely through grace, for Christ’s sake.’ The law, no doubt, is holy, righteous, and good, and consequently the works of the law are holy, righteous, and good: yet notwithstanding a man is not justified thereby before God.

“Now, the works of the law may be done either before justification or after. There were many good men even amongst the Pagans, as Xenophon, Aristides, Fabius, Cicero, Pomponius, Atticus, and others, which before justification performed the deeds of the law, and did notable works. Cicero suffered death valiantly in a good and just cause. Pomponius was a constant man, and loved truth, for he never made a lie himself, nor could suffer the same in any other. Now, constancy and truth are noble virtues and excellent works of the law, and yet were they not justified thereby. After justification, Peter, Paul, and all other Christians have done and do the works of the law, yet are they not justified thereby. ‘I know not myself guilty in anything (saith Paul), and yet am I not thereby justified’ (1 Cor. 4:4). We see then that he speaketh not of any part of the law, but of the whole law, and all the works thereof.

“The Divinity of the Popish Sophisters, Commonly Called the Schoolmen.

“Wherefore, the wicked and pernicious opinion of the Papists is utterly to be condemned, which attributes the merit of grace and remission of sins to the work wrought. For they say that a good work before grace is able to obtain grace of congruence (which they call *meritum de congruo*), because it is meet that God should reward such a work. But when grace is

obtained, the work following deserveth everlasting life of due debt and worthiness, which they call *meritum de condigno*. As for example: if a man being in deadly sin, without grace, do a good work of his own good natural inclination: that is, if he say or hear a mass, or give alms and such like, this man of congruence deserveth grace. When he hath thus obtained grace, he doth now a work which of worthiness deserveth everlasting life. For the first, God is no debtor: but because he is just and good, it behooveth him to approve such a good work, though it be done in deadly sin, and to give grace for such a service. But when grace is obtained, God is become a debtor, and is constrained of right and duty to give eternal life. For now it is not only a work of free will, done according to the substance, but also done in grace, which maketh a man acceptable unto God, that is to say, in charity.

“This is the divinity of the Antichristian kingdom; which here I recite, to the end that the disputation of Paul may be the better understood (for two contrary things being set together, may be the better known): and moreover, that all men may see how far from the truth these blind guides and leaders of the blind have wandered, and how by this wicked and blasphemous doctrine they have not only darkened the gospel, but have taken it clean away, and buried Christ utterly. For if I, being in deadly sin, can do any little work which is not only acceptable in God’s sight of itself, and according to the substance, but also is able to deserve grace of congruence, and when I have received grace, I may do works according to grace, that is to say, according to charity, and get of right and duty eternal life; what need have I now of the grace of God, forgiveness of sins, of the promise, and of the death and victory of Christ? Christ is now to me unprofitable, and his benefit of none effect: for I have free will and power to do good works, whereby I deserve grace of congruence, and afterwards by the worthiness of my work, eternal life.

“Such monstrous and horrible blasphemies should have been set forth to the Turks and Jews, and not to the Church of Christ. And hereby it plainly appeareth, that the Pope, with his bishops, doctors, priests, mid all his religious rabble, had no knowledge or regard of holy matters, and that they were not careful for the health of the silly and miserable scattered flock. For if they had seen, but as it were through a cloud, what Paul calleth sin, and what he calleth grace, they would never have compelled the people to believe such abominations and execrable lies. By deadly sin they understood only the external work committed against the law, as murder,

theft, and such like. They could not see that ignorance, hatred, and contempt of God in the heart, ingratitude, murmuring against God, and resisting the will of God, are also deadly sins, and that the flesh cannot think, speak, or do anything, but that which is devilish and altogether against God. If they had seen these mischiefs fast rooted in the nature of man, they would never have devised such impudent and execrable dreams touching the desert of congruence and worthiness. ...

“Wherefore, saith Paul, we utterly deny the merit of congruence and worthiness, and affirm, that these speculations are nothing else but mere deceits of Satan, which were never done in deed, nor notified by any examples. For God never gave to any man grace and everlasting life for the merit of congruence or worthiness. These disputations therefore of the schoolmen, are nothing else but vain toys and dreams of idle brains, to no other end and purpose but to draw men from the true worship of God. And hereupon is the whole papacy grounded. For there is no religious person, but he hath this imagination: I am able by the observation of my holy order to deserve grace of congruence, and by the work, which I do after that I have received this grace, I am able to heap up such a treasure of merit, as shall not only be sufficient for me to obtain eternal life, but also to give or sell unto others. Thus have all the religious orders taught, and thus have they lived. And to defend this horrible blasphemy against Christ, the Papists do at this day attempt against us what they can. And there is not one of them all, but the more holy hypocrite and merit-monger he is, the more cruel and deadly enemy he is to the Gospel of Christ.

“The True Way to Christianity.

“Now, the true way to Christianity is this, that a man do first acknowledge himself by the law, to be a sinner, and that it is impossible for him to do any good work. For the law saith, ‘Thou art an evil tree, and therefore all that thou thinkest, speakest, or dost, is against God’ (Matt. 7:17). Thou canst not therefore deserve grace by thy works: which if thou go about to do, thou doublest thy offence: for since thou art an evil tree, thou canst not but bring forth evil fruits, that is to say, sins. ‘For whatsoever is not of faith, is sin’ (Rom. 14:23). Wherefore he that would deserve grace by works going before faith, goeth about to please God with sins, which is nothing else but to heap sin upon sin, to mock God, and to provoke his wrath. When a man is thus taught and instructed by the law,

then is he terrified and humbled, then he seeth indeed the greatness of his sin, and cannot find in himself one spark of the love of God: therefore he justifieth God in his word, and confesseth that he is guilty of death and eternal damnation. The first part then of Christianity is the preaching of repentance, and the knowledge of ourselves.

“The second part is: if thou wilt be saved, thou mayest not seek salvation by works: ‘For God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. He was crucified and died for thee, and offered up thy sins in his own body.’ Here is no congruence or work done before grace, but wrath, sin, terror and death. Wherefore the law doth nothing else but utter sin, terrify and humble, and by this means prepareth us to justification, and driveth us to Christ. For God hath revealed unto us by his word, that he will be unto us a merciful Father, and without our deserts (seeing we can deserve nothing) will freely give unto us remission of sins, righteousness, and life everlasting for Christ his Son’s sake. For God giveth his gifts freely unto all men, and that is the praise and glory of his divinity. But the justiciaries and merit-mongers will not receive grace and everlasting life of him freely, but will deserve the same by their own works. For this cause they would utterly take from him the glory of his divinity. To the end therefore that he may maintain and defend the same, he is constrained to send his law before, which, as a lightning and thundering from heaven, may bruise and break those hard rocks.

“This briefly is our doctrine as touching Christian righteousness, contrary to the abominations and blasphemies of the Papists, concerning the merit of congruence and worthiness, or works before grace and after grace. ... For Paul here plainly affirmeth that no man is justified by the works of the law either going before grace (whereof he speaketh in this place) or coming after grace. You see then that Christian righteousness is not such an essential quality engrafted in the nature of man, as the schoolmen do imagine, when they say:

“(The Divinity of the Schoolmen

“When a man doth any good work, God accepteth it, and for this good work he poureth into him charity, which they call charity infused. – This charity, say they, is a quality remaining in the heart, and this they call formal righteousness (which manner of speaking it is expedient for you to know), and they can abide nothing less than to hear that this quality,

forming and adorning the soul, as whiteness doth the wall, should not be counted righteousness. They can climb no higher than to this cogitation of man's reason, that man is righteous by his own formal righteousness, which is grace making him acceptable unto God, that is to say charity. So to this quality cleaving unto the soul, that is to wit, charity (which is a work after the law, for the law saith, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,' etc.), *they* attribute formal righteousness, that is to say, true Christian righteousness, and they say that this righteousness is worthy of everlasting life, and he that hath it is formally righteous: and moreover he is effectually or actually righteous, because he now doth good works, whereunto everlasting life is due. – This is the opinion of the Popish schoolmen, yea, even of the best of them all.

“Some others there be which are not so good, as Scotus and Occam, which said ‘that for the obtaining of the grace of God, this charity infused or given of God is not necessary: but that a man ever by his own natural strength may procure this charity above all things.’ For so reasonable Scotus: if a man may love a creature, a young man a maiden, a covetous man money, which are the less good, he may also love God, which is the greater good. If he have a love of the creature through his natural strength, much more hath he a love of the Creator. With this argument were all the sophisters convicted, and none of them all was able to refute it. Notwithstanding thus they reply:

“The scripture compelleth us to confess, say they, that God, besides that natural love and charity which is engrafted in us (wherewith alone he is not contented) requireth also charity, which he himself giveth. And hereby they accuse God as a tyrant and a cruel exactor, who is not content that we keep and fulfill his law, but above the law (which we ourselves are able to fulfill) requireth also that we should accomplish it with other circumstance and furniture, as apparel to the same. As if a mistress should not be contented that her cook had dressed her meat excellently well, but should chide her for that she did not prepare the same, being decked with precious apparel and adorned with a crown of gold. Now, what a mistress were this, who when her cook had done all that she was bound to do, and also exactly performed the same, would moreover require that she should wear such ornaments as she could not have? Even so, what a one should God be, if he should require his law to be fulfilled of us (which notwithstanding by our

own natural strength we observe and fulfill) with such furniture as we cannot have?

“But here, lest they should seem to avouch contrary things, they make a distinction, and say that the law is fulfilled two manner of ways: first, according to the substance of the deed, and secondly, according to the mind of the commander. According to the substance of the deed, say they, we may fulfill all things which the law commandeth, but not according to the mind of the commander, which is that God is not contented that thou hast done all things which are commanded in the law [although he can require no more of thee], but he further requireth that thou shouldst fulfill the law in charity: not that charity which thou hast by nature, but that which is above nature and heavenly, which he himself giveth. And what is this else but to make of God a tyrant and a tormentor, which requireth that of us which we are not able to perform? And it is in a manner as much as if they should say that the fault is not in us if we be damned, but in God, which with this circumstance requireth his law to be accomplished of us.

“These things I do the more diligently repeat, that you may see how far they have strayed from the true sense of the scripture, which have said that by our own natural strength we may love God above all things, or at least by the work wrought we may deserve grace and everlasting life. And because God is not content that we fulfill the law according to the substance of the deed, but will have us also to fulfill the same according to the mind of the commander: therefore the scripture further compelleth us to have a quality above nature poured into us from above, and that is charity, which they call formal righteousness, adorning and beautifying faith, being also the cause that faith justifieth us. So faith is the body, and the shell: charity the life, the kernel, the form and furniture. These are the monstrous dreams of the schoolmen.

“But we, in the stead of this charity, do place faith, and we say, that faith apprehendeth Jesus Christ, who is the form which adorneth and furnisheth faith, as the colour adorneth and beautifieth the wall. Christian faith, therefore, is not an idle quality or empty husk in the heart, which may be in deadly sin until charity come and quicken it: but if it be true faith, is a sure trust and confidence in the heart, and a firm consent whereby Christ is apprehended: so that Christ is the object of faith, yea rather even in faith Christ himself is present. Faith therefore is a certain obscure knowledge, or rather darkness which seeth nothing; and yet Christ, apprehended by faith,

sitteth in this darkness: like as God in Sinai and in the Temple sat in the 'midst of darkness,' etc. (Exod. 19:9, 1 Kings 8:10). Wherefore our formal righteousness is not charity furnishing and beautifying faith, but it is faith itself, which is, as it were, a certain cloud in our hearts: that is to say, a steadfast trust and affiance in the thing which we see not, which is Christ: who although he be not seen at all, yet he is present.

"Faith therefore justifieth, because it apprehendeth and possesseth this treasure, even Christ present. But this presence cannot be comprehended of us, because it is in darkness, as I have said. Wherefore, where assured trust and affiance of the heart is, there Christ is present, yea, even in the cloud of obscurity and faith. And this is the true formal righteousness, whereby a man is justified, and not by charity, as the Popish schoolmen do most wickedly affirm.

"To conclude, like as the schoolmen say that charity furnisheth and adorneth faith: so do we say that it is Christ which furnisheth and adorneth faith, or rather, that he is the very form and perfection of faith. Wherefore Christ apprehended by faith, and dwelling in the heart, is the true Christian righteousness, for the which God counteth us righteous, and giveth us eternal life. Here is no work of the law, no charity, but a far other manner of righteousness, and a certain new world beyond and above the law. For Christ or faith is not the law, nor the work of the law. But concerning this matter, which the schoolmen neither well understood nor taught, we intend to speak more largely hereafter. Now it shall be enough that we have shewed that Paul speaketh not here of the ceremonial law only, but of the whole law.

"The True Rule of Christianity.

"Contrary to these vain trifles and doting dreams (as we have also noted before) we teach faith, and give a true rule of Christianity in this sort: first, that a man must be taught by the law to know himself, that so he may learn to say with the prophet: 'All have sinned, and have need of the glory of God.' Also, 'There is not one righteous, no not one: not one that understandeth, not one that seeketh after God: all have gone astray.' Also, 'Against thee only have I sinned' (Rom. 1:23, Psa. 14:3, 53:3 51:4). Thus we, by a contrary way, do drive men from the merit of congruence and worthiness. Now, when a man is humbled by the law, and brought to the knowledge of himself, then followeth true repentance (for true repentance

beginneth at the fear and judgment of God), and he seeth himself to be so great a sinner, that he can find no means how he may be delivered from his sins by his own strength, works, or merits. Then he perceiveth well what Paul meaneth when he saith, 'that man is the servant and bond slave of sin.' Also, 'that God hath shut up all under sin' (Rom. 7:14, 11:32, 3:19), and that the whole world is guilty before God, etc.; then he seeth that all the divinity of the schoolmen, touching the merit of congruence and worthiness, is nothing else but mere foolishness, and that by this means the whole Papacy falleth.

"Here now he beginneth to sigh, and saith in this wise: Who then can give succour? For he being thus terrified with the law, utterly despaireth of his own strength: he looketh about, and sigheth for the help of a mediator and saviour. Here then cometh in good time the healthful word of the gospel, and saith, 'Son, thy sins are forgiven thee' (Matt. 9:2). Believe in Christ Jesus crucified for thy sins. If thou feel thy sins and the burden thereof, look not upon them in thyself, but remember that they are translated and laid upon Christ, whose stripes have made thee whole (Isa. 53:5).

"This is the beginning of health and salvation. By this means we are delivered from sin, justified and made inheritors of everlasting life; not for our own works and deserts, but for our faith, whereby we lay hold upon Christ. Wherefore we also do acknowledge a quality and a formal righteousness of the heart: not charity (as the sophisters do) but faith, and yet so notwithstanding, that the heart must behold and apprehend nothing but Christ the Saviour. And here it is necessary that you know the true definition of Christ. The schoolmen being utterly ignorant hereof, have made Christ a judge and a tormentor, devising this fond fancy concerning the merit of congruence and worthiness.

"But Christ, according to his true definition, is no lawgiver, but a forgiver of sins, and a saviour. This doth faith apprehend, and undoubtedly believe that he hath wrought works and merits of congruence and worthiness before and after grace abundantly. For he might have satisfied for all the sins of the world by one only drop of his blood; but now he hath shed it plentifully, and hath satisfied abundantly (Heb. 9). 'By his own blood hath he entered into the holy place once for all, and obtained eternal redemption.' Also Rom. 3 and 4. 'And we are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to

be a reconciliation unto us, through faith in his blood.’ Wherefore it is a great matter to lay hold upon Christ, by faith, bearing the sins of the world. And this faith alone is counted for righteousness.

“Here is to be noted, that these three things, faith, Christ, acceptance or imputation, must be joined together. Faith taketh hold of Christ, and hath him present, and holdeth him enclosed, as the ring doth the precious stone. And whosoever shall be found having this confidence in Christ apprehended in the heart, him will God account for righteous. This is the mean, and this is the merit whereby we attain the remission of sins and righteousness. ‘Because thou believest in me, saith the Lord, and thy faith layeth hold upon Christ, whom I have freely given unto thee, that he might be thy mediator and high priest, therefore be thou justified and righteous.’ Wherefore God doth accept or account us as righteous, only for our faith in Christ.

“And this acceptance, or imputation, is very necessary: first, because we are not yet perfectly righteous, but while we remain in this life, sin dwelleth still in our flesh’: and this remnant of sin God purgeth in us. Moreover we are sometimes left of the Holy Ghost, and fall into sins, as did Peter, David, and other holy men. Notwithstanding we have always recourse to this article: ‘That our sins are covered, and that God will not lay them to our charge’ (Ps. 32 and Rom. 4). Not that sin is not in us (as the Papists have taught, saying that we must be always working well until we feel that there is no guilt of sin remaining in us); yea, sin is indeed always in us, and the godly do feel it, but it is covered, and is not imputed unto us of God, for Christ’s sake: whom because we do apprehend by faith, all our sins are now no sins. But where Christ and faith be not, there is no remission or covering of sins, but mere imputation of sins and condemnation. Thus will God glorify his Son, and will be glorified himself in us through him.

“When we have thus taught faith in Christ, then do we teach also good works. Because thou hast laid hold upon Christ by faith, through whom thou art made righteousness, begin now to work well. Love God and thy neighbour, call upon God, give thanks unto him, praise him, confess him. These are good works indeed, which flow out of this faith, and this cheerfulness conceived in the heart, for that we have remission of sins freely by Christ.

“Now what cross or affliction soever does afterwards ensue, is easily borne, and cheerfully suffered. ...

“We therefore do make this definition of a Christian: that a Christian is not he which hath no sin, but he to whom God imputeth not his sin, through faith in Christ. This doctrine bringeth great consolation to poor afflicted consciences in serious and inward terrors. ...

“Wherefore this doctrine of the schoolmen, with their ceremonies, masses, and infinite foundation of the papistical kingdom, are most abominable blasphemies against God, sacrileges and plain denials of Christ, as Peter hath foretold in these words: ‘There shall be,’ etc. (2 Peter 2:1). As though he would say: the Lord hath redeemed and bought us with his blood, that he might justify and save us; this is the way of righteousness and salvation. But there shall come false teachers, which denying the Lord, shall blaspheme the way of truth, of righteousness, and salvation; they shall find out new ways of falsehood and destruction, and many shall follow their damnable ways. Peter, throughout this whole chapter, most lively painteth out the Papacy, which, neglecting and despising the gospel of faith in Christ, hath taught the works and traditions of men; as the merit of congruence and worthiness, the difference of days, meats, vows, invocation of saints, pilgrimages, purgatory, and such like. In these fantastical opinions the Papists are so misled, that it is impossible for them to understand one syllable of the gospel, of faith, or of Christ.

“And this the thing itself doth well declare. For they take that privilege unto themselves which belongeth unto Christ alone. He only forgiveth sins, he only giveth righteousness and everlasting life. And they most impudently and wickedly do vaunt that they are able to obtain these things by their own merits and worthiness before and after grace. This, saith Peter and the other apostles, is to bring in damnable heresies and sects of perdition. For by these means they deny Christ, tread His blood under their feet, blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and despise the grace of God. Wherefore no man can sufficiently conceive how horrible the idolatry of the Papists is. As inestimable as the gift is which is offered unto us by Christ, even so and no less abominable are these profanations of the Papists. Wherefore they ought not to be lightly esteemed or forgotten, but diligently weighed and considered. And this maketh very much also for the amplifying of the grace of God, and benefit of Christ, as by the contrary. For the more we know the profanation of the papistical mass, so much the more we abhor and detest the same, and embrace the true use of the holy communion, which the Pope hath taken away, and hath made merchandise thereof, that being bought for

money, it might profit others. For he saith that the massing priest, an apostate, denying Christ and blaspheming the Holy Ghost, standing at the altar, doth a good work, not only for himself, but also for others, both quick and dead, and for the whole Church, and that only by the work wrought, and by no other means.

“Wherefore even by this we may plainly see the inestimable patience of God, in that he hath not long ago destroyed the whole Papacy, and consumed it with fire and brimstone, as he did Sodom and Gomorrah. But now these jolly fellows go about, not only to cover, but highly to advance their impiety and filthiness. This we may in no case dissemble. We must therefore with all diligence set forth the article of Justification, that, as a most clear sin, it may bring to light the darkness of their hypocrisy, and discover their filthiness and shame. For this cause we do so often repeat, and so earnestly set forth the righteousness of faith, that the adversaries may be confounded, and this article established and confirmed in our hearts. And this is a most necessary thing; for if we once lose this sun, we fall again into our former darkness. And most horrible it is, that the Pope should ever be able to bring this to pass in the church, that Christ should be denied, trodden under foot, spit upon, blasphemed, yea, and that even by the gospel and sacraments; which he hath so darkened, and turned into such horrible abuse, that he hath made them to serve him against Christ, for the establishing and confirming of his detestable abominations. O deep darkness! O horrible wrath of God!

Even we, I say, have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified. – “This is the true mean of becoming a Christian, even to be justified by faith in Jesus Christ, and not by the works of the law. Here we must stand, not upon the wicked gloss of the schoolmen, which say, that faith then justifieth, when charity and good works are joined withal. With this pestilent gloss the sophisters have darkened and corrupted this, and other like sentences in Paul, wherein he manifestly attributeth justification to faith only in Christ. But when a man heareth that he ought to believe in Christ, and yet notwithstanding faith justifieth not except it be formed and furnished with charity, by and by he falleth from faith, and thus he thinketh: If faith without charity justifieth not, then is faith in vain and unprofitable, and charity alone justifieth; for except faith be formed with charity, it is nothing.

“And to confirm this pernicious and pestilent gloss, the adversaries do allege this place (1 Cor. 13:1): ‘Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels, I have no love, I am nothing.’ And this place is their brazen wall. But they are men without understanding, and therefore they can see or understand nothing in Paul: and by this false interpretation, they have not only perverted the words of Paul, but have also denied Christ, and buried all his benefits. Wherefore we must avoid this gloss as a most deadly and devilish poison, and conclude with Paul, ‘that we are justified, not by faith furnished with charity, but by faith only and alone.’

“We grant that we must teach also good works and charity, but it must be done in time and place, that is to say, when the question is concerning works, and toucheth not this article of justification. But here the question is, By what means we are justified, and attain eternal life? To this we answer, with Paul, ‘that by faith only in Christ we are pronounced righteous, and not by the works of the law or charity’: not because we reject good works, but for that we will not suffer ourselves to be removed from this anchor-hold of our salvation, which Satan most desireth. Wherefore, since we are now in the matter of justification, we reject and condemn all good works; for this place will admit no disputation of good works. In this matter therefore we do generally cut off all laws, and all the works of the law.

“But the law is good, just, and holy. True, it is. But when we are in the matter of justification, there is no time or place to speak of the law: but the question is, what Christ is, and what benefit He hath brought unto us? Christ is not the law; he is not my work, or the work of the law; he is not my charity, my obedience, my poverty; but he is the Lord of life and death, a mediator, a saviour, a redeemer of those that are under the law and sin. In him we are by faith, and he in us. The bridegroom must be alone with the bride in his secret chamber, all the servants and family being put apart. But afterwards, when the door is open, and he cometh forth, then let the servants and handmaidens return, to minister unto them: then let charity do her office, and let good works be done.

“We must learn therefore to discern all laws, yea, even the law of God, and all works, from the promise of the gospel, and from faith, that we may define Christ rightly. For Christ is no law, and therefore he is no exacter of the law and works, ‘but he is the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world’ (John 1:29). This doth faith alone lay hold of, and not charity, which notwithstanding, as a certain thankfulness, must follow faith.

Wherefore victory over sin and death, salvation and everlasting life, came not by the law, nor by the works of the law, nor yet by the power of freewill, but by the Lord Jesus Christ only and alone.

That we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law. – “Paul speaketh not here of the ceremonial law only, as before we have said, but of the whole law; for the ceremonial law was as well the law of God, as the moral law. As for example, circumcision, the institution of the priesthood, the service and ceremonies of the Temple, were as well commanded of God, as the ten commandments. Moreover, when Abraham was commanded to offer up his son Isaac in sacrifice, it was a law. This work of Abraham pleased God no less than other works of the ceremonial law did, and yet was he not justified by this work, but by faith; for the scripture saith: ‘Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness’ (Gen. 15:6, Rom. 4:3).

“But since the revealing of Christ, say they, the ceremonial law killed: and bringeth to death. Yea, so doth the law of the ten commandments also, without faith in Christ. Moreover, there may no law be suffered to reign in the conscience, but only the law of the spirit and life, whereby we are made free in Christ from the law of the letter and of death, from the works thereof, and from all sins: not because the law is evil, but for that it is not able to justify us: for it hath a plain contrary effect and working. It is a high and an excellent matter to be at peace with God, and therefore, in this case, we have need of a far other mediator than Moses or the law. Here we must be nothing at all, but only receive the treasure, which is Christ, and apprehend him in our hearts by faith, although we feel ourselves to be never so full of sin. These words therefore of the Apostle: ‘That we might be justified by faith, and not by the works of the law,’ are very effectual, and not in vain or unprofitable, as the schoolmen think, and therefore they pass them over so lightly.

“Hitherto ye have heard the words of Paul which he spake unto Peter; wherein he hath briefly comprised the principal article of all Christian doctrine, which maketh true Christians indeed. Now he turneth to the Galatians, to whom he writeth, and thus he concludeth: Since it is so, that we are justified by faith in Christ, then by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified.

Because by the deeds of the law, no flesh shall be justified. – “Flesh, in Paul, doth not signify (as the schoolmen dream) manifest and gross sins,

for those he useth to call by their proper names, as adultery, fornication, uncleanness, and such like: but by flesh, Paul meaneth here, as Christ doth in the third chapter of John, ‘That which is born of the flesh,’ saith he, ‘is flesh’ (John 3:6). Flesh therefore signifieth the whole nature of man, with reason and all other powers whatsoever do belong to man. This flesh, saith he, is not justified by works, no, not of the law. Flesh therefore, according to Paul, signifieth all the righteousness, wisdom, devotion, religion, understanding and will, that is possible to be in a natural man; so that if a man be never so righteous, according to reason and the law of God, yet with all this righteousness, works, merits, devotion, and religion, he is not justified.

“This the Papists do not believe, but being blind and obstinate, they defend their abominations against their own conscience, and continue still in this their blasphemy, having in their mouths these execrable words: He that doth this good work, or that, deserveth forgiveness of his sins: whosoever entereth into this or that holy order, and keepeth his rule, to him we assuredly promise everlasting life. It cannot be uttered what a horrible blasphemy it is to attribute that to the doctrine of devils, to the decrees and ordinances of men, to the wicked traditions of the Pope, to the hypocritical works and merits of monks and friars, which Paul the apostle of Christ taketh from the law of God. For if no flesh be justified by the works of the law, much less shall it be justified by the rules of Benedict, Francis, or Augustine, in which there is not one jot of true faith in Christ; but this only they teach, that whosoever keepeth these things hath life everlasting. ...

“Horrible and unspeakable is the wrath of God, in that he hath so long time punished the contempt of the gospel and Christ in the Papists, and also their ingratitude, in giving them over into a reprobate sense, insomuch that they blaspheming and denying Christ altogether as touching his office, instead of the gospel received the execrable rules, ordinances and traditions of men, which they devoutly adored and honoured, yea, and preferred the same far above the word of God, until at length they were forbidden to marry, and were bound to that incestuous single life; wherein they were outwardly polluted and defiled with all kinds of horrible wickedness, as adultery, whoredom, uncleanness, ... and such other abominations. This was the fruit of that filthy single life.

“So God punishing sin with sin, inwardly gave them over into a reprobate mind, and outwardly suffered them to fall into such horrible

abominations, and that justly, because they blasphemed the only Son of God, in whom the Father would be glorified, and whom he delivered to death, that all which believe in him, might be saved by him, and not by their own execrable rules and orders. ‘Him that honoureth me,’ saith he, ‘I will honour’ (1 Sam. 2:30). Now, God is honoured in his Son. Whoso then believeth that the Son is our mediator and saviour, he honoureth the Father, and him again doth God honour; that is to say, adorneth him with his gifts, forgiveness of sins, righteousness, the Holy Ghost, and everlasting life. Contrariwise, ‘They that despise me,’ saith he, ‘shall be despised.’

“This is then a general conclusion: ‘by the deeds of the law no flesh shall be justified.’ The law of God is greater than the whole world, for it comprehendeth all men, and the works of the law do far excel even the most glorious will-workers of all the merit-mongers; and yet Paul saith ‘that neither the law, nor the works of the law, do justify.’ Therefore we conclude with Paul – ‘That Faith Only Justifieth.’”

The foregoing will suffice as the main outline of Luther’s great argument on Justification; which the student would do well still further to pursue. Here we cannot but add that, when we take into account the age in which Luther wrote, and his early training in the nurseries of Romish error and sin, we must thankfully mark the good hand of God upon him and upon Christendom, in shedding so abundantly into his heart and mind the grace and enlightenment of the Holy Ghost. Since the days of the Apostle Paul, history records no such example of miraculous, important, and in all respects truly wonderful conversion. “Thy single words were piercing thunderbolts” – which first made righteous havoc of the see of Antichrist. And yet, such is the direful spread of nineteenth-century Popery, even within the pale of the Church of England, that we want, alas, another Luther to marshal the saints of the Most High God – “the knees which have not bowed unto Baal” – and fight over again the Battle of the Reformation.

And in exact accordance with the above opinions on justification is the Augsburg Confession, which, however, being a public and ecclesiastical standard of belief, necessarily avoids any tendency to strong language. Thus it asserts justification to be, solely, on the ground of Christ’s righteousness imputed to the believer, and not on the ground of any personal righteousness of his own, agreeably to Rom. 3:4; that the phrase, “We are justified by Faith,” is a Pauline figure, by which is meant, not that Faith of itself is the meritorious cause of salvation, but that we thus obtain remission

of sins and the imputation of righteousness by grace on account of the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; that true faith always produces good works, which every man is bound to perform, yet must not rely upon them for salvation; and that useless works, as the rosary, worshipping saints, pilgrimages, monastic vows, stated fasts, etc., are to be discouraged, as tending to obscure the doctrine of justification by faith alone. (See also above.)

And so Melancthon: “When it is said, we are justified by Faith, it is not otherwise asserted, than that we receive remission of sins and are esteemed just on account of the Son of God.” And adds, that the proposition is a correlative term for justification and acceptance, through grace, on account of the Son.

The Council of Trent on Justification.

We now come, in the exact order of discussion, to the Council of Trent, in its sixth Session. Here one of the main objects was to crush the rising Reformation by a grand attack upon Luther’s doctrine of justification. The animating principle of the Canonists being, as the historian of the Council tells us: “He who would establish the body of Catholic doctrine (such as indulgences, penance, purgatory, and the sacrifice of the mass), must overthrow the heresy of Justification by Faith alone.”

(1) *Trent’s Definition of the Term.* – “Justification is not the mere forgiveness of sins, but also Sanctification, and the renewal of the inner man, by the voluntary reception of grace and gifts; whence the man from unrighteous becomes righteous, from an enemy becomes a friend, so as to be heir according to the hope of eternal life.”

(2) *Causes and Mode.* – “The causes of Justification are these: – The Final Cause is the glory of God and of Christ, and life eternal. The Efficient Cause is the merciful God, who freely washes and sanctifies, sealing and anointing with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance. The Meritorious Cause is his well-beloved and only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who, when we were enemies, because of the great love wherewith he loved us, by his own most holy Passion on the Wood of the Cross, merited justification, and gave satisfaction to the Father for us. The Instrumental Cause is the Sacrament of Baptism, which is the sacrament of faith, without which justification is never obtained. Lastly, the sole Formal Cause is the righteousness of God, not that by which he himself

is righteous, but that by which he makes us righteous, i.e., by which he presents us with it, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only reputed, but are truly called, and are, righteous, each one of us receiving his righteousness in ourselves according to the measure which the Holy Spirit imparts to each as he pleases, and according to the proper disposition and cooperation of each. For although no man can be righteous unless the merits of Christ's Passion are communicated to him, that takes place in this Justification of the ungodly, when, by the merit of the same holy Passion, the love of God is diffused by the holy Spirit in the hearts of those who are justified, and inheres in them. Hence, in Justification itself, along with the remission of sins, man receives, through Jesus Christ in whom he is ingrafted, all these things infused at the same time, viz., Faith, Hope, and Charity. ... This faith, before the sacrament of baptism, catechumens, in accordance with the tradition of the Apostles, seek from the Church when they seek faith producing eternal life."

(3) *Justification Complete.* – "It must be believed that the justified are in no respect deficient, but that they may be considered as fully satisfying the divine law (as far as is compatible with our present condition) by their works, which are wrought in God, and as really deserving eternal life, to be bestowed in due times if they die in a state of grace."

(4) *Yet Progressive!* – "By the observance of the commands of God and the Church, faith cooperating with good works, the justified gain an increase of that righteousness which was received by the grace of Christ, and are the more justified."

(5) *And may actually be Repeated!* – "Those who by sin have fallen from the grace of justification received may be justified again when, moved by divine influence, they succeed in recovering their lost grace by the sacrament of penance, through the merits of Christ. For this method of justification is that recovery of the lapsed which the holy fathers have fitly called the second plank after shipwreck of lost grace!!"

(6) *Anathemas.* – No. 1: "That a man can be justified by his works, which are done either by the powers of human nature on the teaching of the law without divine grace through Christ." No. 2: "That Divine grace by Jesus Christ is given for this purpose only, that men may be able to live righteously and merit eternal life, as if he could do both by freewill without grace, though scarcely and with difficulty." No. 3: "That without the preventing inspiration of the Holy Spirit and his assistance, man can

believe, hope, love, or repent, so that the grace of justification behooves to be conferred upon him.” No. 4: That the freewill of man, moved and excited by God, does not at all cooperate with God when exciting and calling, that thus he may dispose and prepare himself for obtaining the grace of justification.” No. 5: “That the freewill of man was lost and extinguished after Adam’s sin.” No. 7: “That works done before justification are truly sins.” No. 9: “That the wicked is justified by faith alone, in such a sense that nothing else is required in the way of cooperation to obtain the grace of justification.” No. 10: “That men are justified without the righteousness of Christ, by which He merited for us, or that by that righteousness they are formally righteous.” No. 11: “That men are justified by the mere imputation of Christ’s righteousness, or by the mere remission of sins, exclusive of grace and charity which is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, and is inherent in them, or that the grace by which we are justified is only the favour of God.” No. 12: “That justifying faith is nothing else than trust in the Divine mercy forgiving sins by Christ.” No. 18: “That the commandments of God are impossible of observance even to a justified man.” No. 20: “That a man is justified without the condition of observing the commandments.” No. 24: “That received righteousness is not preserved and even is not increased in the view of God by good works; that works themselves are only the fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not the cause of increasing it.” No. 30: “That after the grace of justification has been received, the guilt or liability to eternal punishment is so remitted to every penitent sinner, that no liability to temporal punishment remains to be discharged either in this world or in the next in Purgatory, before he can obtain access to the kingdom of heaven.” No. 32: “That the good works of a justified man are in such a sense the gifts of God, that they are not good merits of the justified man himself, or that a justified man by good works which are done by him through the grace of God and the merits of Jesus Christ, of which he is a living member, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the actual attainment of eternal life if he die in grace, together with increase of glory.” No. 33: “That this Catholic doctrine of justification expressed by the Holy Council in this present decree, derogates in any respect from the glory of God or the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ (!) and does not rather illustrate the truth of our faith, in short, the glory of God and of Jesus Christ (!)”

We shall not waste the time of the reader in animadverting on all the contradictions and muddle of thought and language, in this fair specimen of Tridentine theology, which we certainly cannot excuse on the part of an Infallible Council, whose decrees were “given out as the responses of the Holy Ghost!” but which indeed we can only expect at the hands of men of whom the honest Calvin writes: –

(Character of the Tridentine Council:)

“Moreover, if hitherto there was any doubt how great the difference is between a Council and the tribunal of the Holy Spirit, from which there is no appeal, a striking illustration has been given us in the Council of Trent. They contend that a Council cannot err, because it represents the Church. What if the latter position be denied to be true? But in order to determine the point we must, I presume, see who the men are that compose it. Perhaps forty Bishops or so are present. I do not keep to a number, nor much care about it, as it is of little consequence. Let the advocates of Councils answer me in good faith. Were anyone to review them all in order, how many of them would he not contemn? Nay, when the venerable Fathers look in each other’s faces, it must be impossible for them not to feel ashamed; for they know themselves, and are not ignorant of the opinion which they have of each other. Hence, if you take away the name of Council, the whole Papacy will confess that all the Bishops who attended were nothing but dregs. I am willing, however, to let other nations keep their ornaments untouched. I will only ask my French countrymen what price they set on the portion which they contributed? They doubtless hold the kingdom of France to be one of the leading branches of the Church. Why, then, it sent but two bishops, one from Nantes, and another from Clermont, both equally dull and unlearned. The latter was not long ago deemed as ridiculous as a buffoon, and so libidinous that he was wont to track out dens of infamy with the scent of a pointer, till he placed himself under the discipline of a notorious Parisian, Sosia. After this he became suddenly wise, if men can so easily be made wise by a lady of the school of Francis Picart. It is clear that the master is completely devoid of brains, belongs to the class of fanatics, and is little better than a madman. The Archbishop of Aix I scarcely count a Frenchman. He of Asti, however, as is usual with curious men, was present as an idle spectator. I ask you, my countrymen, who among you can persuade himself that anything which even a countless multitude of such

men could have vented, proceeded from the Holy Spirit? The two of whom I speak never had a taste of even the first rudiments of theology. How miserable, then, will the condition of the Christian Church be, if everything which pleased them, and a few no better than they, is to be held oracular! And yet very many are so thoughtless, that when they hear of the publication of the decrees of the Holy Council, they reflect not that the authors of them are persons to whom they would not give the least credit in the paltriest question. Did this occur to them they would instantly reject with indignation and trample under foot what they now inconsiderately kiss. Why? Is there anything which their judgment approves? Not at all. But reverence for the Council blinds them. What folly, when you know the ass to tremble at his lion's skin! But here it may be objected by the opposite party, that the decision did not rest with the bishops alone. I am aware. And this I particularly wished to observe. For there are certain garrulous and audacious monks, some of whom hunt after miters, and others after cardinals' hats, while all of them sell their prattle to the Roman Pontiff. ... For nothing is determined at the Council save at the nod of the Roman Pontiff. In future, then, let them have done with their bombast, that he who rejects the decrees of the Council fights not with men, but with God – that they are nothing but instruments, while he is the President who guides their minds and tongues by his Spirit. Were it so, I hold that they themselves insult the Holy Spirit by reprimanding him through their Pope, to whose decision and censure everything is subjected. I speak of what is perfectly notorious. As soon as any decree is framed, couriers flee off to Rome, and beg pardon and peace at the feet of their idol. The holy father hands over what the couriers have brought to his private advisers for examination. They curtail, add, and change as they please. The couriers return, and a sederunt is appointed. The notary reads over what no one dares to disapprove, and the asses shake their ears in assent. Behold the oracle which imposes religious obligations on the whole world! Why do they not openly confess the thing as it is – that ten or twenty monks, whose labours they have hired, concoct the decrees – that the Pope puts his censorial pen through whatever does not please him, and approves of the rest – that nothing is left to the Council but the burden of publishing? In ancient times, after the Roman Senate had deliberated, the plebeians examined; but the Pope, by no means contented with examining, arrogates right, moreover, to correct anything that does not please him in the deliberation of the Council.

Presumptuously does he so act, if he thinks that the Holy Spirit is presiding there. We, however; I presume, may with impunity despise it, because we are aware of its being composed by such doctors, and corrected by such an Aristarchus. The proclamation of the Council is entitled to no more weight than the cry of an auctioneer” (Preface to *Antidote to the Council of Trent*: Calv. Trans. Soc.).

Now after all this, and all the absurdities, plain self-evident contradictions, and evasions of the Tridentine theology, we cannot but ask, How is it that Popery does or can infatuate any rational mind? Is it not that darkness hates the light? that ignorance to fools is bliss? In the pregnant words of the great Genevan Reformer: “The mask which the Roman Pontiff has placed on the eyes of men is one by which no seeing man can be deceived.”

It remains to note –

The Characteristics of Romish Justification.

(1) Not blindly, but for a most daring and impious purpose, Rome blends together and confounds Justification and Sanctification, which the Bible, the Economy of Redemption, and the Glory of God keep distinct.

(2) By the heterodoxy of an “infused and inherent” righteousness, with its feigned consequent meritorious value, as a cooperating factor with the grace of God in Justification, Rome strips Christ of His Crown; and divides the glory of God and of Christ between the Saviour and the sinner.

(3) By putting forth Baptism as the instrument of Justification, Rome makes Salvation dependent on a ministerial ordinance; vastly increases the enslaving power of her priests; and flatly contradicts the Holy Spirit, who declares by the mouth of St. Paul, “That a man is justified by Faith, without (χωρίς – apart from, or exclusive of) ordinances, or the deeds of the law.”

(4) In a word, Rome preaches, teaches, and practices “another Gospel, which is not another”; for there is in reality no other than that which the Apostles and Prophets of God do preach, namely – “The righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God: to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he

might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of Faith. Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by Faith without the deeds of the law.” “For in the Gospel of Christ is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, as the Prophets of old testified and wrote, The just shall live by Faith.”

And, therefore, we conclude, that if the Church is, according to the Word of God, “built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner Stone,” the apostate Confederacy of Rome has no claim whatever to be recognized even as a branch of the Church Catholic.

Calvin on Justification.

The student will now perhaps be somewhat better prepared more fully to grasp and appreciate the logical details of the second great chief of the Reformation on the subject before us. We regret, however, that the compass of this work will not permit us to enter upon these so largely as we could wish. But we shall endeavour to present such a summary as may suffice for most ordinary purposes, with the earnest hope that in this case, as well as in that of Luther, we may be successful in stimulating still more to the study of the originals. No theological library is complete without Martin Luther and John Calvin. And it would be hard for Popery to exist, in colleges or households, where the works of these two God-sent and God-honoured champions of Liberty and the Gospel were read. And especially should we like to see Calvin’s *Antidote to the Council of Trent* issued separately and widely circulated at the present day, as a Complete Protestant Manual and Antidote to Puseyism; or what might be better still, a small fund created for the cheaper issue of Vol. III. of Calvin’s Tracts, as it contains not only the “Antidote,” but other most valuable papers.

Analysis.

Connection between Justification and Sanctification. – “Christ given to us by the kindness of God is apprehended and possessed by faith, by means of which we obtain in particular a twofold benefit: first, being reconciled by the righteousness of Christ, God becomes, instead of a judge, an indulgent Father; and, secondly, being sanctified by his Spirit, we aspire to integrity, and purity of life.”

Importance of the Doctrine of Justification. – “It is the principal ground on which religion must be supported. For unless you understand first of all what your position is before God, and what the judgment which he passes upon you, you have no foundation on which your salvation can be laid, or on which piety towards God can be reared.”

Definition. – “A man will be *justified by faith* when, excluded from the righteousness of works, he by faith lays hold of the righteousness of Christ, and clothed in it appears in the sight of God not as a sinner, but as righteous. Thus we simply interpret Justification, as the acceptance with which God receives us into his favour as if we were righteous; and we say that this justification consists in the forgiveness of sins and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.”

Confirmation from Scripture. – “Thus it is said in Paul’s discourse, in the Acts, ‘Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses’ (Acts 13:38–39). You see that after the remission of sins justification is set down by way of explanation; you see plainly that it is used for acquittal; you see how it cannot be obtained by the works of the law; you see that it is entirely through the interposition of Christ; you see that it is obtained by faith; you see, in fine, that satisfaction intervenes, since it is said that we are justified from our sins by Christ.” Read also Gal. 3:8, Rom. 3:26, etc.

Equivalents. – Acceptance (Eph. 1:5–6). Imputation of righteousness – Remission of sins – Blessedness (Rom. 4:6–8). Reconciliation with God (2 Cor. 5:18–21). Righteousness by the obedience of Christ (Rom. 5:19).

Not Essential Righteousness. – As Osiander dreams, “that Christ is our righteousness, because he is the eternal God, the fountain of righteousness, the very righteousness of God” – “that we are substantially righteous in God by an infused essence as well as quality” – that “to be justified is not only to be reconciled to God by a free pardon, but also to be made just; and righteousness is not a free imputation, but the holiness and integrity which the divine essence dwelling in us inspires.” After many arguments to disprove these and other like false positions of Osiander’s, Calvin well sums up: “Everyone who, by the entanglement of a twofold righteousness, prevents miserable souls from resting entirely on the mere mercy of God, mocks Christ by putting on him a crown of plaited thorns.”

Heresies and Evasions of Papists and Schoolmen. – That justifying “righteousness is compounded by faith and works.” But “there is so wide a difference between justification by faith and by works, that the establishment of the one necessarily overthrows the other” (Phil. 3:8–9, Rom. 10:3, Rom. 3:27, Rom. 4:2). That “man is justified by faith as well as by works, provided these are not his own works, but gifts of Christ and fruits of regeneration.” “But they observe not that in the antithesis between Legal and Gospel righteousness, all kinds of works, with whatever name adorned, are excluded” (Gal. 3:11–12, Rom. 10:5–9). That “faith is assurance of conscience while waiting to receive from God the reward of merits, and divine grace means not the imputation of gratuitous righteousness, but the assistance of the Spirit in the study of holiness.” But “Scripture, when it treats of justification by faith, leads us in a very different direction. Turning away our view from our own works, it bids us look only to the mercy of God and the perfection of Christ.”

Scripture order of Justification. – “First God of his mere gratuitous goodness is pleased to embrace the sinner, in whom he sees nothing that can move him to mercy but wretchedness, because he sees him altogether naked and destitute of good works. He, therefore, seeks the cause of kindness in himself, that thus he may affect the sinner by a sense of his goodness, and induce him, in distrust of his own works, to cast himself entirely upon his mercy for salvation. This is the meaning of faith by which the sinner comes into the possession of salvation, when, according to the doctrine of the Gospel, he perceives that he is reconciled by God; when, by the intercession of Christ, he obtains the pardon of his sins, and is justified; and, though renewed by the Spirit of God, considers that, instead of leaning on his own works, he must look solely to the righteousness which is treasured up for him in Christ.”

The relation between Faith and the Gospel. – “Faith is said to justify because it receives and embraces the righteousness offered in the Gospel. By the very fact of its being said to be offered by the Gospel, all consideration of works is excluded. This Paul repeatedly declares, and in two passages, in particular, most clearly demonstrates” (Rom. 10:5–6, 9; Gal. 3:11–12).

Papistical objection to the doctrine of Justification by Faith ALONE. – “They dare not deny that *a man is justified by faith*, seeing Scripture so often declares it; but as the word alone is nowhere expressly used, they will

not tolerate its being added. [French. Mais pource que ce mot Seule, n'y est point exprimé, ils nous reprochent qu'il est adjousté du notre; – but because this word *alone* is not expressed, they upbraid us with having it added of our own accord.] Is it so? What answer, then, will they give to the words of Paul, when he contends that righteousness is not of faith unless it be gratuitous? ... By what cavils, moreover, will they evade his declaration, that in the Gospel the righteousness of God is manifested? (Rom. 1:17). If righteousness is manifested in the Gospel, it is certainly not a partial or mutilated, but a full and perfect righteousness. The Law, therefore, has no part in it, and their objection to the exclusive word *alone* is not only unfounded, but is obviously absurd. ... What, I would ask, is meant by the expressions, 'The righteousness of God without the law is manifest'; 'Being justified truly by his grace'; 'Justified by faith without the deeds of the law'? (Rom. 3:21, 24, 28). Here ... they pretend that the works excluded are ceremonial, not moral works ... Do they think the Apostle was raving when he produced, in proof of his doctrine, these passages?" – Gal. 3:12, Gal. 3:10. "Unless they are themselves raving, they will not say that life was promised to the observers of ceremonies, and the curse denounced only against the transgressors of them. If these passages are to be understood of the Moral Law, there cannot be a doubt that moral works also are excluded from the power of justifying. To the same effect are the arguments which he employs" – Rom. 3:20, 4:15; Gal. 3:21–22. "Let them maintain, if they dare, that these things apply to ceremonies, and not to morals, and the very children will laugh at their effrontery. The true conclusion therefore is, that the whole Law is spoken of when the power of justifying is denied to it."

Nature and value of Good Works. – "However highly works may be estimated, they have their whole value more from the approbation of God than from their own dignity. ... It is owing entirely to the goodness of God that works are deemed worthy of the honour and reward of righteousness; and, therefore, their whole value consists in this, that by means of them we endeavour to manifest obedience to God. ... In vain do the Papists lay hold of the frivolous subtilty, that the *faith alone*, by which we are justified, 'worketh by love,' and that love, therefore, is the foundation of justification. We, indeed, acknowledge with Paul that the only faith which justifieth is that which works by love (Gal. 5:6); but love does not give it its justifying power. Nay, its only means of justifying consists in its bringing us into communication with the righteousness of Christ. Otherwise the whole

argument, on which the Apostle insists with so much earnestness, would fall. ‘To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.’ Could he express more clearly than in this way, that there is justification in faith only where there are no works to which reward is due, and that faith is imputed for righteousness only when righteousness is conferred freely without merit?”

Definition Confirmed. – “Namely, that justification by faith is reconciliation with God, and that this consists solely in the remission of sins. We must always return to the action that the wrath of God lies upon all men so long as they continue sinners. This is elegantly expressed by Isaiah” – Isa. 59:1–2. “We are here told that sin is a separation between God and man; that His countenance is turned away from the sinner; and that it cannot be otherwise, since to have any intercourse with sin is repugnant to his righteousness. Hence the Apostle shows that man is at enmity with God until he is restored to favour by Christ (Rom. 5:8–10). When the Lord, therefore, admits him to union, he is said to justify him, because he can neither receive him into favour, nor unite him to himself, without changing his condition from that of a sinner into that of a righteous man. We add that this is done by remission of sins. For if those whom the Lord hath reconciled to himself are estimated by works, they will still prove to be in reality sinners, while they ought to be pure and free from sin. It is evident, therefore, that the only way in which those whom God embraces are made righteous, is by having their pollutions wiped away by the remission of sins, so that this justification may be termed in one word the remission of sins.

(a) *By express passages of Scripture.* – 2 Cor. 5:19–21, Rom. 4:6, Psa. 32:1–2, Luke 1:77, Acts 12:38–39.

(b) *By the writings of the ancient Fathers.* – “Thus Augustine says: ‘The righteousness of the saints in this world consists more in the forgiveness of sins than the perfection of virtue’ (August. de Civitate Dei, lib. xix. cap. 27). To this corresponds the well-known sentiment of Bernard: ‘Not to sin is the righteousness of God, but the righteousness of man is the indulgence of God’ (Bernard, Serm. XXII, XXIII, in Cant.) He previously asserts that Christ is our righteousness in absolution, and, therefore, that those only are just who have obtained pardon through mercy.”

Conclusion: man is justified by faith, not because he is made righteous, but because by faith he lays hold of the righteousness of Christ. –

“Hence also it is proved that it is entirely by the intervention of Christ’s righteousness that we obtain justification before God. This is equivalent to saying that man is not just in himself, but that the righteousness of Christ is communicated to him by imputation, while he is strictly deserving of punishment. Thus vanishes the absurd dogma that man is justified by faith, inasmuch as it brings him under the influence of the Spirit of God by whom he is rendered righteous. This is so repugnant to the doctrine above laid down that it never can be reconciled with it. For there can be no doubt that he who is taught to seek righteousness out of himself does not previously possess it in himself. This is most clearly declared by the Apostle, when he says that he who knew no sin was made an expiatory victim for sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him (2 Cor. 5:21). You see that our righteousness is not in ourselves, but in Christ; that the only way in which we become possessed of it is by being made partakers with Christ, since with him we possess all riches. There is nothing repugnant to this in what he elsewhere says: ‘God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us’ (Rom. 8:3–4). Here the only fulfillment to which he refers is that which we obtain by imputation. Our Lord Jesus Christ communicated his righteousness to us, and so by some wondrous way, in so far as pertains to the justice of God, transfuses its power into us. That this was the Apostle’s view is abundantly clear from another sentiment which he has expressed a little before: ‘As by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous’ (Rom. 5:19). To declare that we are deemed righteous, solely because the obedience of Christ is imputed to us as if it were our own, is just to place our righteousness in the obedience of Christ.”

The above epitome of the eleventh chapter of the third book of the *Institutes* (Beveridge’s Translation), will afford a fair outline of Calvin’s masterly and Scriptural treatment of the doctrine of Justification by Faith; but it will be well, as we intimated at the outset, for the earnest student who has time and opportunity, to work out the details, not only in the *Institutes*, but in the *Antidote to the Council of Trent* (vol. iii. of Calvin’s Tracts). In the latter he will find a most able refutation of the Tridentine doctrine, that Justification consists not merely in forgiveness of sins, but includes renovation and sanctification; and convincing arguments in favour of the following positions: – That Justification cannot be obtained by the works of

the Law; that though it is inseparable from, yet it is not to be confounded with, Sanctification, but simply denotes our gracious acceptance by God; that Baptism is not the instrumental cause thereof; that the Righteousness of Christ is the sole ground of it; that Faith is the instrument; that no human merit precedes or follows; and that it is the fruit alone of God's rich, free, and sovereign Grace.

The English Reformation.

(1) *The Ten Articles of 1536.* – Considering that these Articles were the result of a compromise, we can only rejoice to find the Reforming party coming off so victoriously; although the “Item” certainly vacillates: –

“Fifthly, As touching the order and cause of our justification, we that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us to their spiritual charge that this word Justification signifieth remission of our sins, and our acceptation or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God, that is to say, our perfect renovation in Christ.

“*Item,* That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith joined with charity, after such sort and manner as we before mentioned and declared; not as though our contrition, or faith, or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily merit or deserve to attain the said justification; for the only mercy and grace of the Father, promised freely unto us for His Son's sake Jesu Christ, and the merits of His blood and passion, be the only sufficient and worthy causes thereof: and yet that notwithstanding, to the attaining of the same justification, God requireth to be in us not only inward contrition, perfect faith, and charity, certain hope and confidence, with all other spiritual graces and motions, which, as we said before, must necessarily concur in remission of our sins, that is to say, our justification.”

(2) *The Homily of the Salvation of Mankind.* – Analysis: –

General Proposition. – “Because all men be sinners and offenders against God, and breakers of his law and commandments, therefore can no man by his own acts, works, and deeds (seem they never so good) be justified, and made righteous before God: but every man of necessity is constrained to seek for another righteousness or justification, to be received at God's own hands, that is to say, the forgiveness of his sins and trespasses, in such things as he hath offended. And this justification or righteousness, which we so receive of God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by faith,

is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full justification.”

Objection. “If a ransom be paid for our redemption, then it is not given us freely.”

Answer. “God provided a ransom for us that was the most precious body and blood of His own most dear and best beloved Son Jesus Christ, who, besides this ransom, fulfilled the law for us perfectly. And so the justice of God and his mercy did embrace together, and fulfilled the mystery of our redemption” [Psa. 85:10].

Three elements in Justification. – “Upon God’s part, his great mercy and grace: upon Christ’s part, justice, that is, the satisfaction of God’s justice, or the price of our redemption, by the offering of his body, and shedding of his blood, with fulfilling of the law perfectly and thoroughly: and upon our part, true and lively faith in the merits of Jesus Christ, which yet is not ours, but by God’s working in us. ... And so the grace of God doth not shut out the justice of God in our justification, but only shutteth out the justice of man, that is to say, the justice of our works, as to be merits of deserving our justification.”

How Works are Excluded. – “And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that although they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether.”

Proof from Holy Scripture (of the aforesaid positions). Gal. 3:21, 2:21, 5:4; Ephes. 2:8–9, Rom. 11:6, Acts 10:43.

Proof from old Fathers. “And after this wise, to be justified only by this true and lively faith in Christ, speak all the old and ancient authors, both Greeks and Latins. Of whom I will specially rehearse three, Hilary, Basil, and Ambrose. St. Hilary saith these words plainly in the ninth canon upon Matthew, ‘Faith only justifieth.’ And St. Basil, a Greek author, writeth thus, ‘This is a perfect and whole rejoicing in God, when a man advanceth not himself for his own righteousness, but acknowledgeth himself to lack true justice and righteousness, and to be justified by the only faith in Christ. And Paul (saith he) doth glory in the contempt of his own righteousness, and that he looketh for the righteousness of God by faith’ (Phil. 3:8–9). These be the very words of St. Basil. And St. Ambrose, a Latin author, saith these words, ‘This is the ordinance of God, that they which believe in

Christ, should be saved without works, by faith only, freely receiving remission of their sins.’ Consider diligently these words, ‘without works, by faith only, freely’ we receive remission of our sins. What can be spoken more plainly, than to say that freely, without works, by faith only, we obtain remission of our sins? These and other like sentences, that we be justified by faith only, freely, and without works, we do read oftentimes in the best and ancient writers.”

How they understood “Faith Alone”. – “When they say, that we be justified freely, they mean not that we should or might afterward be idle, and that nothing should be required on our parts afterward: neither mean they that we are so to be justified without good works, that we should do no good works at all, like as shall be more expressed at large hereafter. But this saying, that we be justified by faith only, freely and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, as being unable to deserve our justification at God’s hands, and thereby most plainly to express the weakness of man, and the goodness of God; the great infirmity of ourselves, and the might and power of God; the imperfectness of our own works, and the most abundant grace of our Saviour Christ; and therefore wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only, and his most precious blood-shedding.”

Value of the doctrine and character of its impugnors. – “This is the strong rock and foundation of Christian religion. ... This doctrine advanceth and setteth forth the true glory of Christ, and beateth down the vain glory of man. This whosoever denieth, is not to be accounted for a Christian man, nor for a setter-forth of Christ’s glory; but for an adversary to Christ and his gospel, and for a setter-forth of men’s vain-glory.”

The right understanding of this doctrine. “*Faith without works justifieth.*” – “First, you shall understand that in our justification by Christ it is not all one thing, the office of God unto man, and the office of man unto God. Justification is not the office of man, but of God; for man cannot make himself righteous by his own works, neither in part, nor in the whole; for that were the greatest arrogance and presumption of man, that antichrist could set up against God, to affirm that a man might by his own works take away and purge his own sins, and so justify himself. But justification is the office of God only, and is not a thing which we render unto him, but which we receive of him; not which we give to him, but which we take of him, by his free mercy, and by the only merits of his most dearly beloved Son, our

only Redeemer, Saviour, and Justifier, Jesus Christ. So that the true understanding of this doctrine, ‘We be justified freely by faith without works,’ or that ‘we be justified by faith in Christ only,’ is not that this our own act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth justify us, and deserve our justification unto us (for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within ourselves), but the true understanding and meaning thereof is that although we hear God’s word, and believe it; although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread, and fear of God within us, and do never so many works thereunto; yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues ... which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak and insufficient and imperfect to deserve remission of our sins and our justification; and therefore we must trust only in God’s mercy, and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God’s grace and remission. ... So that our faith in Christ (as it were) saith unto us thus, It is not I that take away your sins, but it is Christ only; and to him only I send you for that purpose, forsaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works, and only putting your trust in Christ.”

Conclusion: the true and justifying faith, and its fruits. – “The right and true Christian faith is, not only to believe that Holy Scripture, and all the foresaid articles of our faith are true, but also to have a sure trust and confidence in God’s merciful promises, to be saved from everlasting damnation by Christ: whereof doth follow a loving heart to obey his commandments. And this true Christian faith neither any devil hath, nor yet any man, which in the outward profession of his mouth, and in his outward receiving of the sacraments, in coming to the Church, and in all other outward appearances, seemeth to be a Christian man, and yet in his living and deeds showeth the contrary. ... These be the fruits of true faith; to do good as much as lieth in us to every man, and above all things, and in all things, to advance the glory of God, of whom only we have our sanctification, justification, salvation, and redemption. To whom be all glory, praise, and honour, world without end. Amen.” [The reader cannot fail duly to estimate the importance of this Homily, when he remembers how closely it is identified with our Article.]

(3) *Parallel Passages from other semi-authoritative or standard Contemporary Documents:* –

(a) *Reformatio Legum*: “Nor are they to be heard, whose impiety calls in question the salutary doctrine, founded also on Holy Scripture, of our justification, with regard to which it is to be held, that the righteousness of men is not to be attributed to the power of works (*operum momentes*).”

(b) *Edw. VI's Catechism*: “As oft as we used to say that we are justified and saved by faith only, it is meant thereby that faith, or rather trust alone, doth lay hold upon, understand, and perceive our justification to be given us of God freely; that is to say, by no merits of our own, but by the free grace of the Almighty Father.”

(c) *Confessio Variata*: “When therefore we say, We are justified by Faith, we do not understand this, that we are justified. on account of the dignity of that virtue; but this is the meaning, that we obtain remission of sins and imputation of righteousness through mercy for Christ's sake.”

(d) *Jewell's Apology*: “There is no mortal who can be justified in the sight of God by his own deserts; and therefore our only refuge and safety is in the mercy of our Father by Jesus Christ, and in the full assuring ourselves that he is the propitiation for our sins, by whose blood all our stains are washed out: that he has pacified all things by the blood of his Cross; that he by that only sacrifice, which he once offered on the Cross, hath perfected all things; and, therefore, when he breathed out his soul, he said, ‘It is finished,’ as if by these words he would signify, Now is the price paid for the sins of mankind.” – And *Defence*: “St. Paul saith, ‘We are justified freely by his grace; we judge that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law; we know that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Christ.’ It will be said that hitherto of *sola fides*, that is of faith alone, we hear nothing. Notwithstanding, when St. Paul excludes all manner of works besides only faith, what else then leaves he but faith alone? Howbeit, if it be so horrible a heresy to say we are justified before God by faith only, that is to say, only by the merits and cross of Christ, let us see what the holy learned Fathers of the Church, so many hundred years ago, have taught us thereof.”

(e) *Nowell's Catechism*: “The profit we get of this faith is righteousness before God, by which we are made heirs of eternal life. Our own godliness toward God, and leading of our life honestly and holily among men, doth not justify us before God. Seeing we are all most far from perfection of life, and so oppressed with conscience of our sins, we must take another course, and find another way, how God may receive us into

favour. We must flee to the mercy of God, by which he freely embraceth us with love and goodwill in Christ, without any merit in us, or respect of works, both forgiving us our sins and endowing us with the righteousness of Christ, through faith in him; so that, for this same righteousness of Christ, as if it were our own, we are accepted in him. On account of the Divine mercy through Christ, we ought to hold that we have received all our righteousness. And this we know to be true by the Gospel, which containeth the promises of God by Christ, to the which when we adjoin faith, we do, as it were, take state and possession of this justification. But faith is not the principal cause of this justification, so as by the merit of faith we are counted righteous before God; for that were to set faith in the place of Christ. But the springhead of this justification is the mercy of God, which is conveyed to us through Christ, offered to us by the Gospel, and laid hold of us by faith, as if with a hand.”

(4) *Consensus of the Articles*: –

Seventh: “The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man.”

Eleventh: “We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.” [Homily of the *Salvation of Mankind*; analyzed above.]

Eighteenth: “They also are to be had accursed that presume to say, That every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of Nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.”

Thirty-first: “The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that Alone.”

Post-Reformation Theology.

Here we must only mention and very rapidly dismiss a few of the leading writers.

(1) The “judicious” Hooker may well be taken as the great exponent of the Reformation now settled. His Discourse on Justification is a strong protest against Rome’s heresy of justification by infusion of righteousness, as perverting the Gospel of the grace of God; an able defense of the doctrine of imputation; and a clear exposition of the difference between the righteousness of justification as external to us, and the righteousness of sanctification as internal.

“When the Romanists are required to show what the Righteousness is whereby a Christian man is justified, they answer that it is a divine spiritual quality. This grace they will have to be applied by infusion. The first receipt of grace in their divinity is the first justification; the increase thereof, the second justification. It is applied to infants through Baptism without either faith or works. It is applied to infidels and wicked men in the first justification, through Baptism, without works, yet not without faith. Unto such as have attained the first justification, that is to say, this first receipt of grace, it is applied further by good works to the increase of former grace, which is the second Justification.” But, Answer: “Whether they speak of the first or second justification, they make it the essence of a divine quality inherent, they make it righteousness which is in us. If it be in us, then it is ours, so our souls are ours, though we have them from God and can hold them no longer than pleaseth Him. But the righteousness wherein we must be bound, if we will be justified, is not our own. Therefore, we cannot be justified by any inherent quality. The Church of Rome, in teaching justification by inherent grace, doth pervert the truth of Christ; and, by the hands of the Apostles, we have received otherwise than she teacheth.” *And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the Law, but that which is through, the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God through faith* (Phil. 3:8–9). *God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* (2 Cor. 5:21). “Such we are in the sight of God the Father as is the very Son of God Himself.”

(2) But half a century passed, during which there was a reaction from the principles of the Reformation, promoted chiefly by Laud and the Sacramental School, and which culminated in Bishop Bull’s *Harmonia Apostolica*, the ostensible object of which was to reconcile St. Paul’s

Justification by Faith without Works, with St. James's Justification by Works; but unhappily accommodating the former to the latter – and so stretching St. Paul's "Faith" to include St. James's "Works". A jumble of theology; whose loose and strange concessions, on the one hand, constructed an easy though clumsy bridge to Rome; and whose injudicious harmonizings, on the other hand, ultimately precipitated "the condition of semi-Socinianism and apathy into which the Church of England lapsed under the first Georges."

Bull's true Christian doctrine, and the foundation of his argument is that Justification before God is by Works and not by faith only.

"Good works, piety, sanctity, and obedience, are the conditions necessarily required that anyone should be acceptable unto God to salvation, i.e. be justified, for these are synonymous terms."

The Decalogue, as perfected by Christ, is the law by which Christians will be judged.

"The words of St. James (2:24) being express, clear, and evident, whatever obscurity there is must be attributed to the Epistles of St. Paul."

"St. Paul uses the words Faith and Works with a different meaning upon different occasions."

"Faith, to which justification is attributed by St. Paul, is not to be understood as one single virtue, but denotes the whole condition of the Gospel covenant; that is, comprehends in one word all the works of Christian piety." Well might the Bishop add: "If we prove this point, we shall find less difficulty with the other passages of St. Paul!"

"There is another difficulty in the word Works as used by St. Paul, and this is indeed the consequence of what we have already proved; namely, that Faith in St. Paul's Epistles means all the works of Christian piety. ['Proved' and repeated, notwithstanding the assertion, as above, that St. Paul uses the word Faith 'with a different meaning upon different occasions!'] This being allowed, it is certain that the works which St. Paul excludes from justification are not all kinds of works, but of a certain description only. Distinctly to explain of what kind these are is a matter of no little labour, and we have now arrived at the chief difficulty of our work." [Although, as above, when the Bishop had proved St. Paul's 'Faith to comprehend all the works of Christian piety,' there was to be '*less difficulty*' for the future!] But this "chief difficulty" is easily solved, if we are to give ear to our author. St. Paul excludes from justification, in the case

of the Jew, the works of the Mosaic law; and in the case of the Gentile, works done by the light of nature. And all this, after putting forth the Decalogue, in the hands of Christ, as the fixed and positive law of our acquittal or condemnation! Here, verily, Bishop Bull does deserve to be credited with “no little labour.”

The First and Second Justification of Rome: “It must be understood that only the internal works of faith, repentance, hope, charity, etc., are absolutely necessary to the first justification; but the other external works, which appear in outward actions, or in the exercise of the above-named virtues, are only the signs and fruits of internal piety, being subsequent to justification, and to be performed provided opportunity be given.” – Whatever does the Bishop mean? If anything at all, that his leading thesis of Justification by Works is a phantom; that the sinner’s justification before God primarily depends upon “*internal works*,” whatever we are to understand by that phrase, whereas the justification of St. James, which he professes so literally to follow, rests upon “*external works*” (James 2:18); yea, moreover, the external works are in reality no factor with the Bishop after all, unless and “provided opportunity be given” for their display! How lamentable to see a great mind, which could produce the *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae*, thus floundering.

But Bishop Bull’s comment on our present Article, is sufficient of itself to stamp the character of this painful “Harmony,” jarring as it does not only with itself, but with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and the express teaching of Holy Scripture: “Although other virtues are no less necessary to justification than faith, and faith in reality has no more effect in it than any other virtue; but yet of all the virtues faith is that one by which we embrace the Gospel promise, by which promise we are justified: therefore by a *convenient phrase* (!!) our justification may be and is usually attributed to faith only.”

And yet, thanks to the High as well as to the Latitudinarian churchmen of those and following days, *Bull-ism* triumphed – none coming to the breach thus made in the walls of Zion. So that, in the words of Dr. Boulton, “when the great Reformation doctrine of Justification by Faith was again preached by the forerunners of the Evangelical revival in the last century, it was received by the mass of the so-called orthodox divines, as though some new and strange heresy were promulgated.”

(3) Barrow. The Conditions of Justification are Baptism and Faith – faith being *formata*, or including its effects.

(4) Waterland. Baptism and Faith are the Instruments of Justification; its Conditions, Faith and Obedience.

(5) Alexander Knox, Newman (before his secession), and Bishop Forbes. The full Tridentine doctrine.

(6) Faber. Justification in its strictly forensic sense, and ascribed to Faith alone, is the doctrine of the Primitive Fathers, from Clement of Rome downwards.

(7) Bishop Browne. Unhappily vacillates.

The Protestant doctrine: “Hence, we conclude, that, in the language of St. Paul, ‘justification by faith,’ and ‘free salvation by grace’ are (as it has been seen, that Melancthon, the Confession of Augsburg, and our own Article and Homilies, teach) correlative or convertible expressions. The former means the latter.”

Toned down: “Therefore, we may perhaps fairly conclude, that salvation is not of works, not merely not as the cause, but not even as the terms or conditions of our justification.”

And shaded off towards Tridentine-ism: “But Scripture seems rather to represent justification, as a *state* of acceptance before God. ... If therefore the premises are correct, we may define justification to be a state of pardon and acceptance in the presence of God, bestowed upon us freely for Christ’s sake, by the mercy of God, which is accepted by the faith, which rests only on the Saviour, which continues so long as the subject continues in a state of faith, which fails when he falls from the state of faith, and which is restored again, when by grace and repentance he is restored to a state of faith. So that we may say, whilst in a state of faith, so long in a state of justification: whilst a believer, so long a justified person.” Or as he puts it more briefly, after some references to Scripture: “From all which we can hardly fail to conclude, that justification before God is a *state* [that is, rather than an *act* of God’s free grace], in which a person continues, so long as he continues united to Christ, abiding in Him, having Christ dwelling in his heart, being the subject of His grace, and of the Sanctification of the Spirit.”

The Tractarian Movement.

The following extracts from the Rev. Archibald Boyd’s *England, Rome, and Oxford*, seem to us so masterly on this subject, and so well

adapted as a winding up of the historical part of our Article, that we here gladly incorporate them.

“With this (the Romish) system we compare the ideas of the Tractarian Divines. If there be little difficulty in arriving at the opinions of the Church of Rome on this question (Justification), there is exceeding difficulty in determining those of the Tractarians. Whether it be that the theologians of that school do not clearly apprehend their own ideas, or that they labour under some strange inability in defining them, or that, startled by finding themselves so near to a state of argument with the Tridentine Fathers, they feel it necessary to qualify and explain, and shade away the broad lines of definition, until their course is no longer clearly discernible, it is of course impossible to determine. But this must be admitted, that a student of those treatises which purport to convey the expression of their sentiments, feels himself somewhat perplexed, if not unequal, to affirm, what those sentiments really are. The definition of one page appears to be at variance with that of another. The opinion of one chapter seems to be so diluted by the qualifications of the subsequent, as oftentimes to make it doubtful whether the bold and open paragraph, or the cautious and hesitating one, is to be taken as best representing the mind of the author. However, by the selection of a few quotations from the principal work of that school on the subject of Justification, we shall put ourselves in a position for deciding whether those Divines be justified in claiming the Church of England as sympathetic with their opinions. These quotations we shall arrange in reference to the same points which have been brought out by the citations given before from the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent: –

“Whereas Justification is the application of Christ’s merits to the individual, that application is *the imparting of an inward gift* – in other words, Justification is a real and actual communication to the soul of the atonement through the ministration of the Spirit. ... Now, in truth, a privilege is most explicitly promised us in Scripture, which accurately answers to this description as being at once the special fruit of Christ’s sacrifice, and also an inward gift possessed and residing within us; I mean the habitation in us of God the Father and the Word Incarnate through the Holy Ghost. If this be so, we have found what we sought. This is to be justified, to receive the Divine presence within us, and to be made a temple of the Holy Ghost. ‘Christ then is our Righteousness by dwelling in us by

the Spirit; He justifies by entering into us, He continues to justify by remaining in us. This is really and truly our justification: not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation; but, through God's mercy, the very presence of Christ.' [Newman's "Lectures on Justification," pp. 160, 167.]

"It is clear, from these passages, that Tractarian Justification is not the simple imputation of the righteousness of another. It is, on the contrary, a righteousness communicated, and resident within ourselves. It is true that it excludes not Christ from the process of rendering the sinner righteous; but the place and office which it assigns to Christ in this work, is (as will presently be shown) totally different from that attributed to Him by the Church of England. In a word, Tractarian Justification is not acquittal, or the accounting of a person spotless, because the virtue of the atonement has been applied to his condition; but it is a certain moral and spiritual change effected by the indwelling of the Saviour.

"But, this is not all. If there be something in this view of Justification to which we are unaccustomed, there is something equally strange in the method by which it is obtained. To illustrate this point, we shall cite but two passages: –

"Faith secures to the soul continually those gifts which Baptism primarily conveys. The Sacraments are the immediate; Faith is the secondary, subordinate, or representative instrument of Justification: or, we may say, varying our mode of expression, that the Sacraments are its instrumental, and Faith its sustaining cause. Faith, then, being the appointed representative of Baptism, derives its authority and virtue from that which it represents. It is justifying, because of Baptism. ... Justifying Faith does not precede Justification, but Justification precedes Faith, and makes it justifying. And here lie the cardinal mistakes of the views on this subject which are now in esteem. They make Faith the sole instrument, not after Baptism, but before; whereas Baptism is the primary instrument, and creates Faith to be what it is, and otherwise is not, giving it power and rank, and, as it were, constituting it its own successor.' Again: – 'If Justification is conveyed peculiarly through the Sacraments, as Holy Communion conveys a more awful presence of God than Holy Baptism, so must it be the instrument of a higher Justification. On the other hand, those who are declining in their obedience as they are quenching the light within them, so are they diminishing their Justification.' [Ibid. pp. 169, 257.]

“The language of these passages is sufficiently explicit. It is impossible to pause upon them without perceiving that the procuring cause of Justification is not an apprehending quality (itself the gift of God), but the administration of ordinances. Justification is conveyed through the Sacraments; Faith is but ‘the successor and representative of Baptism.’ So that this benefit which we have been in the habit of considering an act of God in our favour, cancelling our iniquities and placing us in possession of forgiveness, is, according to this school, a certain sustained religious condition. And so, indeed, it is formally stated to be. ‘The new birth is an *act*, an initiatory act; forgiveness is an act, but justification is a *state*, [Compare Browne, as above, etc.] being in God’s favour is a *state*. It is nothing to the purpose then to show that Faith is connected in Scripture with Justification or with God’s favour. Is it connected with the new birth, with the washing away of sin? ... I repeat, the act of Justification is expressly ascribed to Baptism as an immediate means. Is it anywhere ascribed to Faith?’ [Newman, pp. 271, 272.]

“Upon a review, then, of these several quotations – the first class expressing the opinions of the Church of Rome [cited in a previous part of Mr. Boyd’s Lecture], the second those of the Tractarian Divines, it is surely neither unreasonable or unjust to conclude that there is no essential difference between them. They coincide in the view of the nature of Justification; they attribute it to the same instrumental causes, and they harmonize in regarding it as a moral state instead of a gracious and simple act. These coincidences are so many and so important, as to justify us in considering the views of the two parties to be identical.

“And now let us proceed to the examination of another point, the question whether these opinions can, by any possibility, be reconciled with those confessed by the Church of England. That the Church of Rome owns no correspondence between her own doctrine and that of our Articles needs no demonstration; but that the Divines of Oxford should affirm that our formularies express their views must create no slight surprise in those to whom these formularies are familiar. Let the following quotation speak for itself” – Article XI. “This declaration stands in broad contrast with those which have been already placed before us. It affirms that the nature of Justification is acquittal from sin, rather than impartation of righteousness; for it says not that we are made righteous, or that we are righteous by virtue of any inherent quality, but that we are ‘accounted’ or reckoned righteous. It

says not that we are righteous because that works wrought in us by the Holy Spirit have a meritorious efficacy, and a power to keep us in a justified condition; but it does say, that the imputation of righteousness is on account of the merit – only on account of the merit – of our Lord Jesus Christ, and not our own works or deservings. It says not that our Justification flows from ‘Baptism as its primary instrument, or is conveyed through the Sacraments’; but it does say that we are ‘justified by Faith,’ and ‘only by Faith.’ It contains not one syllable sanctioning the idea that Justification is a state into which we are put by means of sacramental efficacy, and wherein we are continued by means of meritorious actions; but it refers us for fuller explanation to another document, which contains this statement, ‘Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly believe in Him: He for them paid their ransom by His death: He for them fulfilled the law in His life; so that now, in Him, and by Him, every true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the law; forasmuch as that, which their infirmity lacked, Christ’s justice hath supplied.’ [Homily of Salvation.] From a comparison, then, of these respective explanations, it seems clear, that on all essential points connected with the dogma under review, Rome and Tractarianism harmonize; while upon the same points England dissents from both; that Rome holds in inherent, England an extrinsic righteousness; that Rome holds a righteousness imparted, England a righteousness imputed; that Rome denies Justification by Faith alone, while England affirms it; that Rome relies upon good works as an essential element of Justification, while England in her Articles declares that ‘we are not righteous for our own works,’ and, in her Homily, ‘shutteth them out from the office of justifying.’ It is impossible to conceive distinctions more palpable, differences more serious than these. And we know not whether most to be astonished at the mental dimness which can see no differences, or to be indignant at the uncandid ingenuity which struggles to make things identical that are plainly irreconcilable. Certain it is, that men, disinclined to tread in the doubtful and ill-defined middle way which the Tractarians have laid down for themselves, saw in these two schools of opinion broad and substantial discrepancies. The Divines of Trent, dealing with the views of Justification adopted in common by the Church of England and the Continental Reformers, fulminated their reiterated anathemas against all who dissented from their own definitions; and a sound and discriminating Prelate of our Church gives this as his conviction, ‘It is not the logic we strive for, it is not

the grammar. It is the Divinity; what that is whereby we stand acquitted before the Righteous Judge, whether an inherent justice or Christ's imputed justice apprehended by Faith. The Divines of Trent are for the former; all antiquity with us, for the latter. A just volume would scarce contain the pregnant testimonies of the Fathers to this purpose. Bellarmine himself grants them ours, and they are worth our entertaining.' [Hall's Works, vol. ix. p. 322.]

“Having thus put ourselves in satisfactory possession of these several views, our next point must be to go into the reasons which compel us to reject the Justification recommended by the advocacy of the Tractarian theologians. The first ground of objection we shall rest upon is the inadaptation of such a Justification to man's spiritual condition. To estimate this we must look back to that period in the moral history of our race, when such a term as Justification could have had no place in man's vocabulary, and such a process as the term implies could not have been applied to man's condition. In the days of his original and maintained innocence, man needed not to be accounted 'righteous,' or to be 'made righteous,' because he was righteous. There was no necessity for esteeming or reckoning a being just, who was unfallen. It was change in man's conduct, which created, as a necessary consequence, a change in man's condition. The first transgression which defiled this world inflicted upon our race a double calamity: it destroyed the innocence of our state, and it vitiated the purity of our nature. With the second of these results, we have at present no concern. That it is to be viewed rather as a disease of the moral constitution, than as a feature of man's condition. But with the first, our argument has much concern, because it involves the very question at issue, how the guilty can appear guiltless before his Judge. The sinlessness which was the character of man's state antecedent to the Fall was his natural, proper, inherent justice. It was part of man's nature, of his habits, of his being, of himself. And the disobedience which changed all this, converted, as in a moment, the guiltless into the guilty, the loyal subject into the rebel, the confiding child into the conscience-stricken criminal. All this created the necessity for Justification; for no alternative remained but the tremendous one of eternal alienation from God. Man's destinies turned upon the adoption of one or other of these principles: 'The soul that sinneth it shall die'; 'The just by Faith shall live.' Now is it our point to inquire, whether any other measure, but that of an imputation of extrinsic merits, would have met this case of

necessity. The remedy suggested by the mediciners of Rome and Oxford is sanctification; the renovation of nature, not the alteration of condition. Let us test the suitability of this remedy by reference to the original necessity. It was open to God to give the corrupt transgressor a new nature; to remove, as it were, medicinally, and by the infusion of alteratives, the virus of the disorder with which he had become fatally inoculated. What then should we have had? A return to man's original state, a restoration of his lost condition? No; corrupt nature might have been repaired, but perpetrated sin, involving guilt and liability to punishment, still remained outstanding. By a process of renewal we might have obtained amendment, improvement, purity for the future; but there is no power in all this to cancel the iniquity of the past. The product of the application of this remedy would have been a creature pure as to nature, but guilty as to condition. In other words, the infusion of holiness or intrinsic righteousness will not make the being who has committed sin righteous before God. For that a totally different process is required, the endowing of the guilty with a righteousness intrinsic, which being in itself meritorious, is therefore propitiatory, and the imputation whereof cancels all sin. We are not now arguing the question of the capacity of a sinner for the possession and enjoyment of eternal purity. That is a totally different consideration, and to be settled upon the ground of an implantation of that 'holiness without which no man shall see the Lord.' And for the necessity of that, in order to ultimate salvation, the advocates for Justification by Faith alone, will contend as strenuously as others. But looking at the single point before us – the means by which the sinner can stand acquitted before God – we maintain that man must be justified by Faith alone, because no other process revealed to us appears adequate to meet the necessity of the case. Any infused righteousness, any renewal of nature, any Justification which 'consists in God's inward presence and which lives in obedience,' falls short of the Justification we require, because it leaves the guilt of committed sin unremoved. The Tractarian remedy, therefore, for man's state is objectionable, because it touches not the emergency, or meets the peculiar wants of man's condition.

“On a second ground, we object to the Tractarian and Romish view of Justification. As Churchmen, it ought to be to us a persuasive, if not a coercive argument against that view, that it is opposed to the decisions of our own Church. On this point some considerations have already been advanced, based upon the language of the eleventh Article, and to that

expression of the Church's opinion it is not necessary to revert. But it may be advisable to gather her mind from another document, next in authority to the Articles, especially as the Article has stamped upon it the value of its own express reference." After quoting from the Homily of Salvation, Mr. Boyd proceeds: "This passage, one would think, is abundantly definite. It seems to meet the question in all the points whereon controversy is maintained. Its idea of Justification is comprehended in the declaration, 'It is the forgiveness of sins and trespasses in such things as men hath offended.' It knows of no addition to the imputation of the righteousness of Christ; that, 'embraced by Faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full justification.' It proclaims the instrument of Justification to be one, and but one, 'true and lively' faith in the merits of Jesus Christ – faith which proves its truth or genuineness by the fruits of 'repentance, hope, love, dread and fear of God'; but which fruits of that justifying instrument 'it shutteth out from the office of justifying.' How diametrically opposed is all this to the Tractarian theory: – 'This (the indwelling of Christ) is really and truly our justification; not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation, but through God's mercy, the very presence of Christ.' 'The Sacraments are the immediate, Faith the secondary instrument of Justification.' 'The act of justifying is expressly ascribed to Baptism as an immediate means. Is it anywhere ascribed to Faith?' [Newman's "Lectures on Justification," pp. 147, 257, 272.]

"It is not uninstrucive to observe, how passages, such as these, so clear; so dogmatic, so decisive, are met by the advocates of these opinions. Reduced to admit that the Articles do undoubtedly support the interpretation ordinarily put upon them, they are also reduced to the necessity of pleading that possibly that interpretation, though true, is not true to the exclusion of other interpretations. That is, they protect themselves against the decision of these authorities, on the ground that they assert one thing, and yet design to assert some other thing along with it. A quotation will best illustrate this system of exposition. 'Certain it is, that our Eleventh Article puts forward the reputative idea. But is it, or is it not, subordinately to an understood moral justification which precedes in order of nature? I grant that the Article emphatically excludes all human merit; that is, all efficiency or value of self-wrought performances; all merit, undoubtedly, is exclusively ascribed where it ought. But, is the reckoning, which God is there said to make of us, *independent of His own work in us*? Is it independent of any

root of true righteousness, already planted in our hearts by the omnipotent grace of God? I mean – is it so in the view of the Article? for it is to that point that I confine myself. I conceive that the reckoning is not meant to be independent of a previously wrought root of righteousness; because it is not merely said, “only for the merits of our Lord, and not for our own works and deservings are we accounted righteous before God,” but “by Faith” comes in as a qualification on our part, without which the merit of Christ will not avail for us.’ [Newman’s “Lectures on Justification,” pp. 147, 257, 272.] Why what is all this, but the Tridentine doctrine again? Every consistent Romanist will admit that self-wrought performances are devoid of merit; but he will hold that, being the result of spiritual influences, they are so distinctly meritorious, as to be entitled to present grace and eternal blessedness. Had our Article regarded Faith as an inherent righteousness *on account of which* a man was justified then might these writers have claimed, with some appearance of reason, the Article as in their favour. But this is not the use that the Article makes of Faith. It does not regard it as the cause of Justification, but as the instrument of it. It says not that we are justified on account of faith, but that we are justified ‘by’ or by means of faith. And when this plain expression of the Church’s views goes on to enunciate that proposition negatively, as well as positively, when it says that ‘we are justified by faith only,’ and ‘not counted righteous for our own deservings,’ it seems difficult to comprehend how men, professing to be candid, can maintain that a different method and order of Justification may possibly be included. If there be clear meaning in plain words, these words would seem to affirm that our Church knows of one method of Justification, viz., by faith only, and is neither acquainted with, or will recognize, any other.

“The same perverse ingenuity is applied to the other document to which we have appealed, the coordinate authority of the Homily. The language employed by it is so clear, and so thoroughly harmonious with that in which the Article is couched, that we are reduced, despite of ourselves, to admire the steady courage which has adventured upon the desperate enterprise of explaining it away. ‘It may be said,’ observes the same writer, ‘that the Article refers to the Homily, and the Homily speaks apparently a different language. For it asserts, “that through faith, which justifieth, implies repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; yet it shutteth them out from the office of justifying.” To this I answer, that neither there or elsewhere in the

Homilies, is it the object to lay down theological definitions, but rather to furnish popular useful instruction. These words, therefore, cannot be intended to limit the reckoning made in the mind of God. For who hath known the mind of the Lord any further than He has declared it to us; and where has He told us, that He does not value everything that is valuable in His creatures? Whatever strong expressions, of the humiliating kind, occur in this Homily or in others, I hesitate not to say, must be thus understood; inasmuch as no human work contends more strenuously for the essential morality of faith, or more uniformly represents it as the vitality of holiness.’ [Knox’s *Remains*, vol. i. p. 293.] This is truly humiliating. In every sentence of this bad defense of a wrong cause, misstatement or inaccuracy is obvious. It is not the fact that the Homilies were not intended to lay down theological definitions. The Preface to them, published in 1562, assigns this as among the reasons that induced their composition, ‘to avoid the manifold enormities, which heretofore by false doctrines have crept into the Church, to drive away erroneous and poisoned doctrines.’ It is not logical to argue from negatives; to lay down the proposition that God values in his creatures everything that is valuable, then to assume that inherent righteousness is valuable, and then to conclude that it justifies before God. It is not candid to carry off the mind into the mistiness of a sophistical syllogism, and that apparently for the purpose of making it forget that the Homily has said – and that is the point to attend to – that ‘Christ is the righteousness of all them that believe in him,’ and ‘that faith shuts out repentance, hope, love, etc., from the office of Justifying.’ It is not just to conclude, that because a sermon or a homily contends ‘for the essential morality of faith,’ therefore it makes that morality the ground of Justification. If so, St. Paul has renounced the doctrine of Justification by faith alone, because he asserts its sanctifying power, and ‘establishes’ instead of detracts from the obligations of the Law.”

Here is a splendid display of forcible and legitimate argument. How is it that Bishop Browne, who eulogizes Mr. Knox as “a writer of great originality and piety,” has not come to the rescue of his friend, and taken up the gauntlet, thrown clown since 1846 to Knox’s *Remains* and the Tractarian Movement?

Lengthened as are these extracts, we cannot but follow Mr. Boyd in the closing pages of his Lecture. After quoting Nowell, Jewell, and Hooker, he proceeds: –

“To these testimonies, it is unnecessary to add. It were easy to fill pages with quotations from the writings of the sixteenth century, all combining to prove that these men to whom we owe the Reformation, and the subsequent definition and support of our Church’s Creed, were of one mind on the character of that process by which a man is justified before God, and the means by which it is applied. All repudiate the Tridentine view, all maintain the popular interpretation put upon the Articles and the Homilies. Strange would it have been, if views so opposed to each other, as to become the subject of elaborate controversy and logical investigation, should be, if not absolutely identical, yet not irreconcilable with each other. Surely such men as Cranmer, Jewell, and Hooker did not spend their years and energies in contests about notions, in maintaining distinctions wherein were no differences, in proving that to be error, which after all was but another aspect of truth, and in widening separations, which Christian charity might have softened down, or unprejudiced scholarships removed. Surely, when so many circumstances, political, social, and prudential, dictated the expediency (if only it could be done with regard to the right of truth), of effecting an accommodation on disputable points, it was not likely to be left to the acuteness and learning of the nineteenth century to discover the grounds of reconciliation. And if there were room to doubt, that, in maintaining the view of Justification, which it has been the object of this Lecture to defend, we have mistaken the position adopted by our Church, we should find that last remnant of apprehension removed by the harmony existing on this point between her and those religious bodies on the Continent, which, contemporaneously with herself, dissented from the theology of Rome, as improved by the Creed of Trent. We admit that it by no means amounts to a proof that the popular view of Justification is right, because espoused by the Confessions of the foreign Churches. But it is calculated to strengthen our convictions that we have not mistaken the truth, that we find those communities – each one searching the Bible for itself, each one for itself dissecting the theology of Rome, and testing it by the decisions of Scripture, each one for itself investigating the evidence of antiquity, and tracing out for itself the commencement and progress of doctrinal corruptions – arriving at the same conclusion as ourselves; and in the exercise of their separate and independent judgment, protesting against the principle and adaptation of an inherent Justification. Thus, the Helvetic Confession maintains – ‘Properly speaking, God alone justifies us, and only

justifies us on account of Christ, not imputing to us our sins, but imputing his righteousness to us. As we receive this Justification not through any works, but through faith in God's mercy, and Christ; so we teach and believe, with the Apostle, that man as a sinner is justified by faith alone in Christ, not by the Law or works.' Thus, the Augsburg Confession of 1531 – 'Men are freely justified on account of Christ, through faith, when they believe that they are received into favour, and their sins remitted on account of Christ, who by his death made satisfaction for our sins. This faith God reckons for righteousness before Himself.' And in that of 1540 – 'Although contrition or repentance be necessary: yet we must believe, that remission of sins is granted to us, and that from unjust we become just, that is, reconciled or accepted, and the sons of God, freely, on account of Christ, not on account of the worth of contrition or of other works preceding or consequential. ... When we say that 'we are justified by faith,' we mean not this, that we are justified on account of the worth of that virtue; but this is our opinion, that we obtain remission of sins, and imputation of righteousness, by compassion on account of Christ. But this compassion cannot be received except by faith.' Consonant with this is the Saxon Confession – 'From being unrighteous, that is, guilty and disobedient, and without Christ, man becomes righteous, that is, absolved from guilt on account of the Son of God, and his apprehension of Christ by faith, who is our Righteousness, because by His merit we have remission; and God imputes righteousness to us, and on account of Him, reckons us righteous. ... Although contrition and many other virtues are kindled with faith, or together with this reliance; yet those virtues are not the cause, or the merit, of the remission of sins, neither on account of them is the person acceptable; but the person has remission and acceptance on account of the Mediator, who must be apprehended by faith.' The same careful and clear definition of Justification, and of the channel by which it reaches us, distinguishes the clauses of the Belgic Confession which bear upon that subject – 'We are justified by faith alone. But, properly speaking, we by no means understand that Faith by itself, or from itself, justifies us. It is but a kind of instrument, by which we apprehend the righteousness of Christ; which faith embraces Christ with all His merits, and claims Him to itself as a proper effect, and seeks for nothing outside of Him. For it must be, that all things which are required to our salvation, are not in Christ, or else that they

are so in Him, that he who possesses Christ by faith, has together (with Him) perfect salvation.’

“The harmony of all these confessions with the avowed opinion of the Church of England, is no less self-evident than satisfactory. Admitting, that all the religious communities of the sixteenth century, which threw off the creed and despotism of Rome, had intercourse and consultation with each other; yet there is, in points both doctrinal and ecclesiastical, that discrepancy between them, which proves that there was no slavish submission of one to another, no secret agreement to produce strict uniformity by the adoption of a common creed or code of discipline. Brotherly and Christian difference, doubtless, there was; but all this within the lines of manly independence. And it is this which makes their harmony on such a vital point as Justification so valuable and persuasive. For it must go far to convince us that that view, which such men as the compilers of these several confessions, after due deliberations, adopted, is that which represents the mind of God as unfolded in his volume of Inspiration. In maintaining, therefore, Justification to be an act of God towards us, not a quality conveyed into us; a privilege conferred, not a grace imparted; that it flows not from Baptism or obedience, but from religious reliance on the merits of the Redeemer; that Faith’s place in this process of salvation is that of an instrument, and not a meritorious virtue – in maintaining all this, we hold that our Church discharges faithfully her proper office of being a protester against error, and a witness for the ‘faith once delivered to the Saints’.”

Thus, then, Tractarian Justification is proved to be identical with the doctrine of Rome; inadequate to the necessities of man’s spiritual conditions; and diametrically opposed to our Article and the Homily, and the great luminaries of our own Church, as well as those eminent men who composed the Continental Confessions.

One solemn question especially must suggest itself here to every honest mind – How can men who so unfaithfully hold such doctrine remain within the pale of the Church of England? How is it that conduct and principles which would be scouted on Change, branded in camp, and condemned by the first and most natural verdict of all common decency, probity and honour, are the rule of life of many Churchmen? Let us be honest Englishmen first, and avowed, not masked, Romanists after, if you please.

Scriptural Proof.

The reader who has followed us in the foregoing part of this Article will be at no loss for abundant Scriptures in proof of Justification by Faith Alone. Nevertheless, it may be of advantage to the student especially to have at hand a ready and explicit statement of the doctrine as founded on God's Word. With this view we cordially and confidently place in his hands the following very valuable compendium from the *Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism Explained*, in keeping with the announcement in our Preface, and sufficiently sustained we hope throughout the Exposition that our object is not so much to produce original matter, as to cull from every quarter within our reach, whatever may best tend to establish the Truth.

Drawn up about the middle of the last century, the Assembly's Catechism Explained is a complete Body of Divinity which has been seldom equaled, and never perhaps excelled.

We dispense with the usual marks of quotation, and omit "Q" and "A", for Question and Answer; but give the text verbatim throughout. The brackets [] enclose the words of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, as set forth at the outset.

What Is Justification?

Justification is an act of God's free grace; wherein he pardoneth all our sins and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us, and received by faith alone.

1. From whence is the word [*justification*] borrowed?

Being a *law word*, it is borrowed from courts of justice among men, when a person arraigned is *pronounced righteous*, and, in court, openly *absolved*.

2. How doth it appear, that justification denotes an *act of jurisdiction*, and not an *inward change* upon the soul?

From its being opposed to *condemnation*, which all own to consist, not in the *infusing* of *wickedness* into a person, but in *passing sentence* upon him, according to the demerit of his crime, Psa. 109:7.

3. What is it then to *justify* a person?

It is not to *make* him righteous, but to *declare* him to be so, upon a law ground and trial of a judge, Isa. 43:26.

4. Who is the *author*, or *efficient cause*, of our justification?

It is God himself; for, *it is God that justifieth*, Rom. 8:33.

5. Whether is it God *essentially*, or *personally* considered?

God *essentially* considered, in the *person* of the Father, is the *justifier*, in respect of judiciary power and authority, Rom. 3:26: and. our Lord Jesus Christ, in respect of the dispensation, or exercise of that power, Acts 5:31.

6. In what respect is the *Spirit* said to justify, 1 Cor. 6:11.

As the *applier* of the blood or righteousness of Christ, whereby we are justified, Titus 3:5.

7. In what *state* is a sinner *before* justification?

In a state of sin and guilt, Rom. 3:9, and consequently in a state of wrath and condemnation, Gal. 3:10.

8. How can God justify the *ungodly*?

Every elect sinner, however ungodly in himself, yet, upon union with Christ, has communion with him in his righteousness, and on this account he is justified, Isa. 45:25, *In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified.*

9. Why have elect sinners communion with Christ in his righteousness, upon their union with him?

Because their sins having been imputed unto him from eternity, he became *legally* one with them, transferring their debt on himself, and undertaking to pay the same, Isa. 53:6; wherefore, upon union with him by faith, his perfect satisfaction is imputed to them, as if they had made it themselves, 2 Cor. 5:21.

10. Why is justification called an [*act*]?

Because, like the sentence of a judge it is *completed at once*, and not carried on gradually like a work of time, Deut. 25:1.

11. What is the *moving cause* of justification; or, what kind of an *act* is it?

It is [*an act of God's free grace*], Rom. 3:24, *Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.*

12. How can *free grace* be the moving cause of our justification, when it is *through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ*?

Because the redemption that is in Christ, is the *channel* through which justifying grace runs *freely* unto us, Eph. 1:7.

13. What are the *constituent parts* of justification?

They are *two*; that [*wherein he pardoneth all our sins*], Rom. 6:7; and that, wherein he [*accepteth us as righteous in his sight*], Eph. 1:6.

14. What is the pardon of sin?

It is God's absolving the sinner from the condemnation of the law, on account of Christ's satisfaction for sin, Rom. 8:1.

15. Why is the pardon of sin *set before* the accepting us as righteous in the *answer*?

Because, till the sentence of the broken law be dissolved by pardon, it is impossible that our persons can be accepted or any blessing of the covenant conferred upon us, Heb. 8:10–13; where, after a great many other promised blessings, it is added, verse 12, For *I will be merciful to their unrighteousness*, etc.; intimating that the pardon of sin led the way to other covenant blessings.

16. What is it *in sin* that pardon removes?

The *guilt* of it, which is a person's actual obligation, or liableness to eternal wrath, on account thereof, Eph. 2:3.

17. Can the guilt of sin ever *recur* upon a pardoned person?

No: the obligation to punishment, being once taken off, can never recur again; because *there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus*, Rom. 8:1.

18. Will after sinning *revoke* a former pardon?

No: after sinning may provoke the Lord to withdraw the *sense* of former pardon, but can never revoke the pardon *itself*; because *the gifts and calling of God are without repentance*, Rom. 11:29.

19. *What sins* are pardoned in justification?

[*All our sins*] whatsoever, Psa. 103:3, *Who forgiveth ALL thine iniquities*.

20. How are sins *past* and *present* pardoned?

By a *formal* remission of them, Psa. 32:5, *Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin*.

21. How are sins *to come* pardoned?

By securing a *not imputing* of them, as to the guilt of eternal wrath, Rom. 4:8, *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin*.

22. If a *not imputing* of eternal wrath as to future sins be secured, why do the saints *pray* for the pardon of them when committed?

Because the *guilt* or liableness to *fatherly anger*, is contracted by the commission of them; and therefore *they pray* for the removal of that guilt, Psa. 51:12, *Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation*.

23. Is *repentance* a *condition* of pardon?

No: because this would be to bring in *works* into the matter of our justification before God, quite contrary to *scripture*, which tells us, that *a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ*, Gal. 2:16.

24. How do you *prove*, that repentance hath not the same *interest* with faith in our justification?

From this, that in scripture we are frequently said to be *justified by faith*, but *never* said to be *justified by repentance*.

25. Is it not affirmed in our *Confession* [Westminster Confession of Faith.] that “*repentance*” is of such necessity to all sinners, that none may expect pardon without it?

The meaning is, that repentance is such an *inseparable concomitant* of pardon, that no pardoned person continues to be impenitent, 2 Sam. 12:13, Matt. 26:75.

26. If none can expect pardon, without expecting repentance along with it; will it not therefore follow, that repentance is a *condition* of pardon?

Not at all; for if repentance cannot so much as have the least *instrumentality* in pardon, it can never be the *condition* thereof, nor have the smallest *casual influence* thereupon. [Ibid., chap. 15, sect. 3: “Repentance is not to be rested in, as any satisfaction for sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof.”]

27. How doth it appear that repentance hath not the least *instrumentality* in pardon?

It appears evidently from this, that *faith* is the *sole instrument* of receiving Christ and his righteousness; without receiving of which there can be no pardon, John 8:24, *If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins*.

28. Doth God any more in justification, than freely to pardon all our sins?

Yes; he likewise [*accepteth us as righteous in his sight*], Eph. 1:6.

29. Why is the *accepting us as righteous* joined with *pardon* in justification?

Because though among men a criminal may be pardoned, and neither declared righteous, nor received into favour: yet it is not so with God, for, whom he forgives, he both accounteth their persons righteous in his sight, and receives them into perpetual favour, Rom. 5:8–10.

30. How can a holy and righteous God, whose *judgment is according to truth*, accept sinners as *righteous* without a perfect righteousness?

He accepts them as *righteous* [*only for the righteousness of Christ*], which is perfect, and becomes *truly theirs* through *faith*, Jer. 23:6, Isa. 45:24.

31. By what *right* doth the surety righteousness become *theirs*?

By the right of a free *gift* received, and the right of *communion* with Christ.

32. How doth it become theirs by the right of a *gift received*?

In as much as Christ's righteousness being made over in the gospel, as God's gift to sinners, it is by faith actually claimed and received; hence called *the Gift of righteousness*, Rom. 5:17.

33. How doth Christ's surety righteousness become theirs by right of *communion with him*?

In as much as sinners being *united* to him by faith, have thereby *communion*, or a *common interest* with him in his *righteousness*, Phil. 3:9.

34. When is it then, that, *according to truth*, God accepts us as righteous in his sight?

When Christ's surety righteousness is actually *reckoned ours*, and we made *the righteousness of God in him*, 2 Cor. 5:21; upon this account precisely, and no other, are we accepted of God as *righteous*; *the righteousness of God being upon all them that believe*, Rom. 3:22.

35. What is the *matter* of our justification, or that for which we are justified?

The Righteousness of Christ *only*: hence is he called, *The Lord our Righteousness*, Jer. 23:6.

36. Wherein doth [*the righteousness of Christ*] consist?

In the *holiness* of his *human nature*, his *righteous life*, and *satisfactory death*.

37. Can law or justice reach the person, who is under the covering of the surety righteousness?

By no means: for, *who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?* – *It is Christ that died, yea, rather, is risen again*, Rom. 8:33–34.

38. Is the righteousness of Christ *meritorious* for our justification?

Yes: because of the infinite dignity of his person: for, though he took upon him the form of a servant, yet, being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, Phil. 2:6–7.

39. How is the righteousness of Christ *commonly divided*?

Into his *active* and *passive* obedience.

40. What is his *active* obedience?

The holiness of his nature and righteousness of his life, in full and perfect conformity to the whole law, without the least failure, either of parts or degrees of obedience, unto the end, Matt. 5:17–18.

41. What is his *passive* obedience?

His satisfaction for sin, by enduring the infinite execution of the curse upon him in his death, Gal. 3:13, to the full compensation of all the injuries done to the honour of an *infinite* God, by all the sins of an elect world, Eph. 5:2.

42. Why doth this satisfactory death get the name of obedience, Phil. 2:8, as well as his righteous life?

Because his sufferings and death were entirely voluntary, and in most profound submission to the commandment, which he had received of his Father, John 10:18.

43. What is the formal cause of our justification, or that whereby Christ's righteousness is made ours?

It is its being [*imputed to us*], Rom. 4:6.

44. What is it to impute Christ's righteousness unto us?

It is God's accounting or reckoning it unto us, as if we had obeyed the law, and satisfied justice in our own persons, and dealing with us accordingly, Rom. 8:4; 2 Cor. 5:21.

45. Upon what *ground* or foundation is Christ's righteousness imputed to us?

Upon the ground of his *representing* us from eternity, and our union with him in time, Isa. 53:5.

46. What necessity is there for the *imputation* of Christ's *passive* obedience?

Because without the imputation thereof, we could have no legal security from eternal death, Rom. 5:9.

47. What necessity is there for the *imputation* of Christ's *active* obedience?

Because without the imputation thereof, we could have no *legal title* to eternal *life*, Rom. 6:23.

48. If Christ, *as man*, gave obedience to the law for *himself*, how can his *active* obedience be *imputed* to us?

Though the *human nature abstractly* considered, be a creature, yet, never subsisting by itself, but in the person of the Son of God, the acts of

obedience performed therein, were never the acts of a mere man, but of him who is *God-man*, Mediator: and consequently acts of obedience, not for himself, but for us, Gal. 4:4–5.

49. If Christ's active obedience be *imputed* to us, are we not loosed from any obligation to give obedience to the law in our *own persons*?

We are only loosed from an obligation to yield obedience to the law as a *covenant of works*, but not loosed from obedience thereunto as a *rule of life*, Gal. 2:19.

50. Whether is the righteousness of Christ itself imputed to us, or only in its effects?

As the guilt itself of Adam's first sin is imputed to all his posterity, whereby judgment comes upon all men to condemnation; so, the righteousness of Christ himself is imputed to all his spiritual seed, whereby the free gift comes upon them all unto justification of life, Rom. 5:18.

51. What is the difference betwixt the imputation of our sins to Christ, and the imputation of *his righteousness* to us?

Our sins were imputed to Christ as our Surety, only for a time, that he might take them away; but his righteousness is imputed to us to abide with us forever, hence called an everlasting righteousness, Dan. 9:24.

52. Why are we said to be pardoned and accepted [*only*] for the righteousness of Christ?

Because a sinner can have no other plea before God, for pardon and acceptance, but Christ's fulfilling all righteousness, as the only condition of the covenant, Isa. 65:24.

53. What is the instrumental cause of our justification?

It is twofold.; namely, *external* and *internal*.

54. What is the *external instrumental cause*?

The Gospel; because therein is the righteousness of God revealed, and brought near to us as a free gift, Rom. 1:17, and 5:17, and 10:8.

55. What is the *internal instrumental cause* of our justification?

It is [Faith], Rom. 10:10.

56. Why is faith the instrument of our justification?

To show that our justification is wholly of grace; it being the nature of faith to take the gift of righteousness freely, *without money*, and *without price*; therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, Rom. 4:16.

57. What then is the *instrumentality* of faith in our justification?

It is no more than to be the *hand* that receives and applies the righteousness of Christ, whereby we are justified.

58. Is the grace of faith, or any act thereof, imputed. to a sinner for justification?

No: for to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness, Rom. 4:5.

59. What is the difference between saving faith, and justifying faith?

Saving faith [Another term, evidently, for sanctifying faith according to Acts 15:9 – *Purifying their hearts by faith.*] receives and rests upon Christ in all his offices, as of God made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; but justifying faith receives and rests upon him, more particularly, in his priestly office, for pardon. and acceptance, on account of his meritorious righteousness, Phil. 3:9. And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.

60. Why is the righteousness of Christ said to be received by faith [*alone*]?

That works may be wholly excluded from having any share in our justification, less or more, Rom. 3:28. Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law.

61. If good works have no influence upon our justification, of what use are they to the justified?

Though they cannot justify us before God, yet they are good “*evidences*” of our justification, being “the fruits of a true and lively faith,” James 2:18; they “adorn the profession of the gospel,” Titus 2:11–12; “stop the mouths of adversaries,” 1 Peter 2:15; and “glorify God,” John 15:8. [Confession, xvi. 2.]

62. If faith’s receiving of Christ’s righteousness justify us, doth not faith justify as a work?

It is not properly the receiving, or any other act of faith, that justifies us, but the righteousness of Christ Received, Rom. 3:22; even as it is not the *hand* that nourishes us, but the *food* which we take thereby.

63. If we are justified by faith alone, why is it said, James 2:24, That by works a man is justified, and not by faith only?

This is to be understood of justifying, or evidencing the reality of our faith before men, and not of justifying our persons before God.

64. When is it that God justifies the ungodly?

“Though from eternity God *decreed* to justify all the elect,” yet they are not “*actually*” justified, until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, apply Christ “and his righteousness” unto them, Titus 3:5–7. [Confession, xi. 4.]

65. How were believers, under the Old Testament, justified?

“Their justification was in all respects the same with the justification of believers under the New Testament,” Gal. 3:9, Heb. 13:8. [Confession, xi. 5.]

66. What may we learn from this important doctrine of justification?

That all ground of pride and boasting is taken away from the creature, Rom. 3:27: that faith itself, by laying hold upon the surety righteousness without us, is nothing else but a solemn declaration of our poverty and nakedness; and that therefore it is our duty, to glory only in Christ Jesus, saying, *Surely – in the Lord have we righteousness and strength*, Isa. 45:24.

Article XII.

Of Good Works. – Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

De Bonis Operibus. – Bona opera, quae sunt fructus fidei, et justificatos sequuntur, quanquam peccata nostra expiare, et divini iudicii severitatem ferre non possunt; Deo tamen grata sunt, et accepta in Christo, atque ex vera et viva fide necessario profluunt, ut plane ex illis, aequae fides viva cognosci possit, atque arbor ex fructu iudicari.

Article XIII.

Of Works before Justification. – Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

De Operibus ante Justificationem. – Opera quae fiunt ante gratiam Christi, et Spiritus ejus afflatum, cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant, mimime Deo grata sunt, neque gratiam (ut multi vocant) de congruo merentur. Immo cum non sunt facta ut Deus illa fieri voluit et praecepit, peccati rationem habere non dubitamus.

History.

We shall, we think, better grasp the meaning of these Articles by taking them together; or at all events, by the condensation, we may minimize, so far as is expedient, the student's labours. Nor indeed after the lengthened consideration of the last Article, and the intimate connection thereof, as well as of the two that precede it, with the present Articles, will it be necessary to extend our observations to any very great length. Curtailed and therefore diluted repetitions of history or doctrine prove, as a rule, insipid; weaker their effect; and tend not unfrequently to abate the interest of the reader in the main and continuous thread of the performance. And a like disturbing feature, we grieve to say, mars to a certain extent some later expositions of the Articles. Where we should expect moderately full information, we often find only disjointed fragments, and are referred forward or backward with much of the same inconvenient result. We know that occasionally the Articles are considerably interlaced; and on this account as on others they might perhaps not unprofitably be recast. Still, a little thoughtful arrangement would overcome all the difficulty; and therefore, wherever we perceive combination to be possible or advisable, we shall have recourse to it.

The Twelfth Article is an Elizabethan supplement to our Eleventh; the Thirteenth may be fairly taken as the original supplement to the Edwardine Articles that preceded it, on man's lost condition and salvation. The former is an argument for Good Works; the latter is a dividing line, marking out where and when Good Works do spring. While both are levelled against the Scholastic and Romish heresies of Congruity and Condignity, the Twelfth is also a protest against the Antinomian excesses of the sixteenth century.

Our course therefore is plain. We need not repeat our comments on Pelagian, Scholastic, Tridentine, or Anabaptist exaltations of man to the annulling of the Gospel of God. It will be sufficient, and may be of service by the contrast, briefly to note the mind of some of God's most honoured servants, and Christ's allegiant Church, on the question of Good Works – their Value and Place.

Mosheim has been censured for writing *down* Christianity, by disclosing only the dissensions of the Christian Church; but just or otherwise as may be the charge, there is, we feel assured, a rich vein of gold – of consistent and consentient testimony to the truth however mineralized and imbedded at times, awaiting the mattock of some future historian.

Clement of Rome.

“What, therefore, shall we do, brethren? Shall we be slothful in well-doing, and lay aside charity? God forbid that this should be done by us. Rather let us hasten with all earnestness and readiness of mind, to perfect every good work. For even the Creator himself, the Lord of all things, rejoices in his own works. By his Almighty power he established the heavens; and by his incomprehensible wisdom he adorned them. He also divided the earth from the water, which encompassed it as a secure tower, upon the foundation of his own will. All the living creatures also that are upon it, by his appointment, he commanded to exist. So, likewise, the sea, and all the creatures that are in the same, having first created them, he enclosed therein by his power. And above all, that which is most excellent, and greatest of all, Man, he formed with his holy and pure hands, the character of his own image. For thus he spake: ‘Let us make man in our image, after our own likeness. So God created man, male and female created he them.’ And having thus finished all these things he commended all that he had made, and blessed them, and said, ‘Increase and multiply.’ We see how all righteous men have been adorned with good works; wherefore even the Lord himself, having adorned himself with works, rejoiced. Having, therefore, this example, let us without delay fulfill his will: with all our strength, let us work the work of righteousness” (Eph. I a. ad Corinth. s. 33).

Ignatius.

“Perfect faith and charity, in Jesus Christ, are the beginning and the end of life. For the beginning is faith, the end charity; and these two joined in one, are of God; and all other things which concern a holy life, are the outcome of these. No man in the profession of faith, sinneth; nor in the possession of charity, hateth. ‘The tree is manifest by its fruit.’ So, they who profess themselves to be Christians, will be seen by what they do. For it is not the work of an outward profession, but a life in the power of faith, if a man be found faithful unto the end” (Ep. ad Ephes. s. 14).

“They who are carnal cannot do the things that are spiritual; neither can they who are spiritual do the things that are carnal; nor can unbelief do the works of faith” (ibid. c. 8).

Polycarp.

“I rejoiced greatly with you, in our Lord Jesus Christ, that the firm root of your faith, which was declared from ancient times, remaineth until now, and bringeth forth fruit in our Lord Jesus Christ” (ad Philipp. s. 1).

Justin Martyr.

“Whosoever are found not to live as Christ taught, let them know they are not Christians, though they profess with their tongue the doctrines of Christ. For he hath declared, that not they who only profess his religion, but they who do the works which he hath commanded them, shall be saved” (Apol. I a. s. 16).

Irenaeus.

“This faith, they that have believed without learning, as to our language they are barbarous, but as to their judgment, walk, and conversation, by reason of their faith, they are very wise, and please God, having their conversation in righteousness, chastity, and wisdom” (adv. Haeres I. iii. 4, 2).

“As the wild olive, if it be not grafted, continues useless to the owner, by reason of its wild quality, and as unfruitful wood is cut down, and cast into the fire; so man, who receives not by faith the grafting of the Spirit, continues to be what he was before: and being flesh and blood, he cannot inherit the kingdom of God” (ibid. 1, v. 10, 2).

Clement of Alexandria.

“Faith is the foundation of charity, bringing forth well-doing” (Strom. 1, ii. c. 6).

“When we hear it said, ‘Thy faith hath saved thee,’ we do not understand him to say, that they will be absolutely saved who believe in any way whatsoever, unless indeed the works also (of faith) follow” (ibid. I, vi. c. 14).

Origen.

“And this faith, when it is justified, sticks in the ground of the soul, as a root that hath received the shower into it, that when it begins to be tilled by the law of God, the branches may rise from it that bear the fruit of good works. The root of righteousness, therefore, doth not grow from works, but the fruit of works from the root of righteousness, to wit, that root of

righteousness, whereby God. accepts of righteousness, without works, viz., Faith” (in Ep. ad Rom. 1, iv. c. 1.

“I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.’ When did he say unto them, ‘Ye shall die in your sins,’ except when he said, ‘Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins’? (John 8:21). And what is the cause that men die in their sins, except that they do not believe, that Jesus is the Christ? For he himself says, ‘If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.’ But if he that believeth not, that Jesus is the Christ, shall die in his own sins, it is plain that he who dieth not in his sins hath believed in Christ; but he who dieth in his sins, although he says that he believeth in Christ, of a truth hath not believed in him. For if that may be called faith which is without works, such is a dead faith, as we read in the general Epistle of James” (Idem. Corn. in Evang. Joan. tom. xix. 6).

Cyril of Jerusalem.

“The worship of God consists of these two parts, pious doctrine and good works. Neither are doctrines without good works acceptable to God, nor does he accept works unless they be united with pious doctrines. For what advantage is there in rightly knowing the doctrines concerning God, if you be shamefully guilty of fornication? Again, what good is there in being properly chaste and impiously blasphemous? The knowledge of doctrines is therefore an acquisition of the greatest importance, and there is need of a sober and watchful mind, since many spoil others through philosophy and vain deceit” (Catech. 4).

Gregory Nazianzen.

“As works are not accepted without faith, seeing many do what is right for the sake of glory, or from natural disposition, so faith without works is dead. And let no one deceive you by the vain reasoning of those, who readily grant everything for the single purpose of adopting impious doctrines, and propose a trifling reward for a trifling thing. Show therefore faith by works, the produce of your soul (της χώρας υμων το γόνιμον – the fertile laud of your country), if we have not sown in vain” (Orat. 21).

“Upon this foundation of doctrines, build good works, since faith without works is dead; as are works without faith” (Idem, Orat. 41).

Chrysostom.

“Knowest thou not, that they who are in their sins, although they live, are dead? But those who are in righteousness, although they die, yet do they live. Nor is this my saying, it is the declaration of Christ, who said to Martha, He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.’ Is what I say then a fable? If thou art a Christian, believe in Christ: if thou believest in Christ, show me thy faith by thy works” (ad Pop. Antioch. Hom. 5).

Jerome.

“Let us pronounce our sentence against those that do not believe in Christ, and yet think themselves valiant, and wise, and temperate, and just, that they may know that there is none can live without Christ, apart from whom all virtue lies in vice” (in Gal. c. 3).

“It is not sufficient to have the wall of faith, unless faith itself be confirmed by good works” (Idem, in Isa. c. 26).

Augustine.

“Paul himself hath laid down that not any faith whatsoever whereby God is believed in, but that whose works proceed of love, is saving, and truly according to the Gospel; ‘And faith,’ he says, ‘which worketh through love.’ Whence that faith which seems to some to be sufficient unto salvation, he so asserts to be of no avail, as that he says, ‘If I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing.’ But where faithful love worketh, there without doubt is a good life, for ‘love is the fullness of the law’” (de Fide et Operibus, xiv. 21).

“For then is a work truly good, when the purpose of the doer is shot forth from love, and, as if returning to its own place, again rests in love” (Idem, Catech. Rudibus, xi. 16).

“All the life of unbelievers is sin, and there is nothing good without the chief good: for where the knowledge of the eternal and unchangeable truth is wanting, there is but false virtue even in the best manners” (Idem, de Vera Innocent, c. 106).

“The man is first to be changed, that his works may be changed, for if a man remain in that estate that he is evil, he cannot have good works” (Idem, de Verbis, Evang. Matt. Serm. 72).

“But be it far from us to think that true virtue should be in any one unless he be a just man. And let it be as far from us to think that any one is truly just, unless he live by faith: ‘for the just shall live by faith.’ And who of those who would be accounted Christians, unless it be the Pelagians, and amongst them perhaps thyself, Julian, only, will say that any infidel is just, will say that a wicked man is just, will say that a man enslaved to the devil is just? Yea, though he were Fabricius, though he were Fabius, though he were Scipio, though he were Regubus, with whose names thou thinkest to terrify me, as if we were talking in the old Roman court” (Idem, contra Julian, Pelag. 1, iv. c. 3).

“There cannot be true virtuous Actions, where there is not true Religion. – For although the mind may seem to rule over the body, and reason over the passions, if the mind and reason itself does not serve God, as God himself hath commanded that he should be served, it by no means rightly rules over the body and the passions. For how can the mind be mistress over the body and the passions, if it be ignorant of the true God, and be not subdued to his obedience, but prostituted to the corruption of the most sinful demons? The virtues, therefore, which it seems to have of its own, whereby it rules over the body and the passions, so as to acquire or retain anything, if it does not refer them to God, are indeed themselves rather vices than virtues. For although some think that they are true and real virtues, when they are referred to themselves alone, and are not affected for any other account; yet even then are they puffed up and proud; and therefore are not to be accounted virtues, but vices” (Idem, de Civitate Dei, I, xix. c. 25).

Luther and Calvin.

He who would fully comprehend the utter antagonism between the Romish and the Scriptural doctrine of Good Works, must make himself familiar with these veteran guards of the Reformation. Here as before we cannot follow them in the details of their skilled strategics; but in selecting some portions of their argument, we may again assure the reader, it is only on such lines that the strongholds of Protestantism are by us to be retaken and maintained. And it is on this account especially, that we so earnestly commend the labours of the old masters, feeling sure that the field is safe in their hands. To know Rome, you must be *converted* at Rome – have stood face to face with the great apostasy, and seen its hideous features

unveiled. And this, less or more literally, was the natural vantage ground of the sixteenth and contextual centuries. Nor is it at all improbable in the present day, could we shift Dr. Pusey from Oxford to the full penetralia of the Papal court and city of the Tiber, that he might not come back, like Luther, shaken in his faith, and ultimately lay upon his “altars” of England an elaborate recantation of “The Tracts for the Times” – an apology for his so sadly errant and inconsistent career.

Luther.

Sins are not taken away by Works. – “That he might deliver us from this present evil world,” Gal. 1:4. “Here again you see that no man is able, by his own works or his own power, to put away sin, because this present world is evil, and. (as St. John saith) ‘is set upon mischief.’ As many therefore as are in the world are the bond slaves of the devil, constrained to serve him, and do all things at his pleasure. What availed it then to set up so many orders of religion for the abolishing of sin; to devise so many great and. most painful works, as to wear shirts of hair, to beat the body with whips till the blood followed, to go on pilgrimage to St. James in harness, and such other like? Be it so that thou doest all these things, yet notwithstanding this is true, that thou art in this present evil world, and not in the kingdom of Christ. And if thou be not in the kingdom of Christ, it is certain that thou belongest to the kingdom of Satan, which is this evil world. Therefore all the gifts, either of the body or of the mind, which thou enjoyest, as wisdom, righteousness, holiness, eloquence, power, beauty, and riches, are but the slavish instruments of the devil, and with all these thou art compelled to serve him, and to advance his kingdom. ...

“By these words then, ‘That he might deliver us,’ etc., Paul showeth what is the argument of this Epistle; to wit, that we have need of grace and Christ, and that no other creature, neither man nor angel, can deliver man out of this present evil world. ... That Christ hath put away sin, and hath delivered us from the tyranny and kingdom of the devil; that is to say, from this wicked world, which is an obedient servant, and a willing follower of the devil his God. ... And the more wise, righteous, and holy that men are without Christ, so much the more hurt they do the gospel. So we also, that were religious men, were double wicked in the papacy, before God did lighten us with the knowledge of his gospel, and ye, notwithstanding under the colour of true piety and holiness. ...

“Therefore let us praise God the Father, and give him hearty thanks for this his unmeasurable mercy, that hath delivered us out of the kingdom of the devil (in the which we were holden captives) by his own Son, when it was impossible to be done by our own strength. And let us acknowledge, together with Paul, ‘that all our works and righteousness are but loss and dung.’ Also let us cast under our feet, and utterly abhor all the power of freewill, all pharisaical wisdom and righteousness, all religious orders, all masses, ceremonies, vows, fasting, and such like (Phil. 3:8), as a most filthy defiled cloth (Isa. 64:6), and as the most dangerous poison of the devil. Contrariwise, let us extol and magnify the glory of Christ, who hath delivered us by his death, not from this world only, but from this evil world.

“Paul then by this word, *evil*, showeth that the kingdom of the world, or the devil’s kingdom, is the kingdom of iniquity, ignorance, error, sin, death, blasphemy, desperation, and everlasting damnation. On the other side, the kingdom of Christ is the kingdom of equity, light, grace, remission of sins, peace, consolation, saving health, and everlasting life, into the which we are translated (Col. 1:13) by our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory, world without end. So be it.”

The mingling of Faith with Works, a subversion of the Gospel. – “And intend to pervert the gospel of Christ,” Gal. 1:7. “For either Christ must remain, and the law perish, or the law must remain, and Christ perish; for Christ and the law can by no means agree and reign together in the conscience. Where the righteousness of the law ruleth, there cannot the righteousness of grace rule; and again, where the righteousness of grace reigneth, there cannot the righteousness of the law reign; for one of them must needs give place unto the other. And if thou canst not believe that God will forgive thy sins for Christ’s sake, whom he sent into the world to be our High Priest; how then, I pray thee, wilt thou believe that he will forgive the same for the works of the law, which thou couldst never perform; or for thine own works, which (as thou must be constrained to confess) be such as it is impossible for them to countervail the judgment of God?”

“Wherefore, the doctrine of grace can by no means stand with the doctrine of the law. The one must simply be refused and abolished, and the other confirmed and established. For as Paul saith here, to mingle the one with the other, is to overthrow the gospel of Christ. ...

“It seemeth to be a light matter to mingle the law and the gospel, faith and works, together; but it doth more mischief than a man’s reason can

conceive; for it doth not only blemish and darken the knowledge of grace, but also it taketh away Christ, with all his benefits, and it utterly overthroweth the gospel, as Paul saith in this place. The cause of this great evil is our flesh, which, being plunged in sins, seeth no way how to get out, but by works, and therefore it would live in the righteousness of the law, and rest in the trust and confidence of her own works. Wherefore, it is utterly ignorant of the doctrine of faith and grace, without the which, notwithstanding, it is impossible for the conscience to find rest and quietness.”

St. Paul's and Luther's "Works done before the Grace of Christ and the Inspiration of His Spirit." – “But when it had pleased God (which had separated me from my mother’s womb, and called me by his grace) to reveal his Son in me,” Gal. 1:15–16. ““When it had pleased God,” saith he. As if he would say: I have not deserved it, because I was zealous of the law of God without judgment; nay rather, this foolish and wicked zeal stirred me up, that, God so permitting, I fell headlong into more abominable and outrageous sins; I persecuted the church of God, I was an enemy to Christ, I blasphemed his gospel, and to conclude, I was the author of shedding much innocent blood. This was my desert. In the midst of this cruel rage, I was called to such inestimable grace. What! was it because of this outrageous cruelty? No, forsooth. But the abundant grace of God, who calleth, and showeth mercy to whom he will, pardoned and forgave me all those blasphemies: and for these my horrible sins, which then I thought to be perfect righteousness, and an acceptable service unto God, he gave unto me his grace, the knowledge of his truth, and called me to be an apostle.

“We also are come at this day, to the knowledge of grace by the selfsame merits. I crucified Christ daily in my monkish life, and blasphemed God through my false faith, wherein I then continually lived. Outwardly I was not as other men, extortioners, unjust, whoremongers; but I kept chastity, poverty, and obedience. Moreover, I was free from the cares of this present life. I was only given to fasting, watching, praying, saying of masses, and such like. Notwithstanding, in the meantime, I fostered under this cloaked holiness, and trust in my own righteousness, continual mistrust, doubtfulness, fear, hatred, and blasphemy against God. And this my righteousness was nothing else but a filthy puddle, and the very kingdom of the devil. For Satan loveth such saints, and accounteth them for his dear darlings, who destroy their own bodies and souls, and deprive themselves of

all the blessings of God's gifts. In the meantime, notwithstanding wickedness, blindness, contempt of God, ignorance of the gospel, profanation of the sacraments, blaspheming and treading of Christ under foot, and the abuse of all the benefits and gifts of God, do reign in them at the fall. To conclude, such saints are the bond slaves of Satan, and therefore are driven to speak, think, and do whatsoever he will, although outwardly they seem to excel all others in good works, in holiness and strictness of life.

“Such we were under the Popedom: verily no less, if not more contumelious and blasphemous against Christ and Ins gospel, than Paul himself, and specially I: for I did so highly esteem the Pope's authority, that to dissent from him, even in the least point, I thought it a sin worthy of everlasting death. And that wicked opinion caused me to think that John Huss was a cursed heretic; yea, and I accounted it a heinous offence, but once to think of him; and I would myself, in defense of the Pope's authority, have ministered fire and sword, for the burning and destroying of that heretic – [after repeated Bulls and Excommunications, seized by the Council of Constance, in violation of the safe-conduct given him by the Emperor, and burned alive on the sixth day of July, 1415] – and thought it a high service unto God so to do. Wherefore if you compare publicans and harlots with these holy hypocrites, they are not evil. For they, when they offend, have remorse of conscience, and do not justify their wicked doings; but these men are so far from acknowledging their abominations, idolatries, wicked will-worshipings and ceremonies, to be sins, that they affirm the same to be righteousness, and a most acceptable sacrifice unto God, yea, they adore them as matters of singular holiness, and through them, do promise salvation unto others, and also sell them for money, as things available to salvation.

“This then is our goodly righteousness, this is our high merit, which bringeth unto us the knowledge of grace; to wit, that we have so deadly and so devilishly persecuted, blasphemed, trodden under foot, and condemned God, Christ, the gospel, faith, the sacraments, all godly men, the true worship of God, and have taught and stablished quite contrary things. And the more holy we were, the more were we blinded, and the more did we worship the devil. There was not one of us, but he was a bloodsucker, if not in deed, yet in heart.”

True Faith, however, is not idle; and the Good Works which “do necessarily spring” from it, are inestimable. – “Thus I live, yet not I now, but Christ liveth in me” (Gal. 2:20). “Faith therefore must be purely taught: namely, that thou art so entirely and nearly joined unto Christ, that he and thou art made as it were one person; so that thou mayest boldly say, I am now one with Christ, that is to say, Christ’s righteousness, victory, and life are mine. ... This faith therefore is not an idle quality, but the excellency thereof is such, that it utterly confoundeth these foolish dreams of the sophisters touching their formed faith and counterfeit charity, their merits, works, and worthiness. ...

“Hitherto we have declared this to be the first argument of Paul, that either Christ must needs be the minister of sin, or else the law doth not justify. When he had finished this argument, he set forth himself for an example, saying, ‘that he was dead unto that old law by a certain new law.’ Now he answereth two objections which might have been made against him. His first answer is against the cavillations of the proud, and the offence of the weak. For when remission of sins is freely preached, then do the malicious by and by slander this preaching, as Rom. 3:8, ‘Let us do evil that good may come thereof.’ For these fellows, as soon as they hear that we are not justified by the law, forthwith do maliciously conclude and say, why then let us reject the law. Again, if grace do there abound, say they, where sin doth abound, let us then abound in sin, that we may become righteous, and that grace may the more abound. These are the malicious and proud spirits which spitefully and wittingly slander the scriptures and sayings of the Holy Ghost, even as they slandered Paul whilst the apostles lived, to their own confusion and condemnation, as it is said, 2 Peter 3.

“Moreover the weak, which are not malicious, are offended when they hear that the law and good works are not to be done as necessary to justification. These must be holpen, and must be instructed how good works do not justify; how they ought to be done, how not to be done. These ought to be done, not as the cause, but as the fruits of righteousness; and when we are made righteous, we ought to do them, but not contrariwise, to the end that when we are unrighteous, we may be made righteous. The tree maketh the apple, but not the apple the tree.”

Again: “When we are out of the matter of justification, we cannot sufficiently praise and magnify those works which are commanded of God. For who can sufficiently commend and set forth the profit and fruit of only

one work, which a Christian doth through faith and in faith? ... But works done without faith, although they have never so goodly a show of holiness, are under the curse. Wherefore, so far off it is, that the doers thereof should deserve grace, righteousness, and eternal life, that rather they heap sin upon sin. After this manner the Pope, that child of perdition, and all that follow him, do work. So work all merit-mongers and heretics which are fallen from the faith” (see on Gal. 3:22).

Calvin.

Good Works proceed from Faith as their Root. – “Assuredly a bad tree can only produce bad fruit. But who will be so shameless as to deny that we are bad trees until we are ingrafted into Christ? Therefore, if any good fruit is praised in man, let the root of it be sought in faith, as Augustine admonishes (in Psalm 31. Serm. 1). There God so often declares that he regards not the outward appearance, but looketh on the heart. This is said expressly by Jeremiah (Jer. 5). But what can be the cleanness and sincerity of a heart which Peter tells us is purified only by faith? (Acts 15:9). Admirably, therefore, does Augustine say to Boniface, ‘Our religion distinguishes the just from the unjust, not by the law of works, but by the law of faith, without which the works which seem good turn to sin.’ He adds, ‘Therefore unbelievers sin in whatever they do, because they do not refer their doings to a lawful end’ (Lit. ad. Bonif. 3, c. 5). He treats copiously of the same subject in his tract against Julian. Hence, also, in another place he describes theirs as a wandering course, inasmuch as the more active they are, the further they are carried from the goal, and the more therefore their condition becomes hopeless. At last he concludes, that ‘it is better to limp in the course than keep running out of it’ (Praef. in Psalm 31). And what more would we have? Let them (the Fathers of Trent) anathematize the Apostle, who declares that without faith it is impossible to please God! (Heb. 2:6). Let them anathematize Christ and Paul, who declare that all unbelievers are dead, and are raised from death by the gospel! (John 5, Eph. 2:1)” (Antidote to the Canons of the Council of Trent; Canon 7).

Good Works necessary, and a Proof of Justification. – “Nor, when we say that men are justified by the benefit of Christ, are we to be silent as to the grace of Regeneration; nay, rather, we must take care not to separate what the Lord perpetually conjoins. What then? Let men be taught that it is

impossible they can be regarded as righteous by the merit of Christ, without being renewed by his Spirit unto a holy life; and that it is in vain for any in whom the Spirit of regeneration dwells, not to glory in the free adoption of God; in short, that God receives none into favour who are not also made truly righteous. But there is need of distinction, lest the one of the two gifts should derogate from the other. Let the children of God consider that Regeneration is necessary to them, but that, nevertheless, their full righteousness consists in Christ – let them understand that they have been ordained and created unto holiness of life and the study of good works, but that, nevertheless, they must recline on the merits of Christ with their whole soul – let them enjoy the righteousness of life which has been bestowed upon them, still, however, distrusting it so as not to bring before the tribunal of God any other trust than trust in the obedience of Christ.

“In order that ambiguities may be removed, it is necessary that the Righteousness which we obtain by faith, and which is freely bestowed upon us, should be placed in the highest rank, so that, as often as the conscience is brought before the tribunal of God, it alone may shine forth. In this way the righteousness of works, to whatever extent it may exist in us, being reduced to its own place, will never come, as it were, into conflict with the other; and certainly it is just that as righteousness of works depends on righteousness of faith, it should be made subordinate to it, so as to leave the latter in full possession of the salvation of man. There can be no doubt that Paul, when he treats of the Justification of man, confines himself to the one point – how man may ascertain that God is propitious to him? Here he does not remind us of a quality infused into us; on the contrary, making no mention of works, he tells us that righteousness must be sought without us; otherwise that certainty of faith, which he everywhere so strongly urges, could never stand; still less could there be ground for the contrast between the righteousness of faith and works which he draws in the tenth chapter to the Romans.

“But we must obviate their cavil, when they bring forward James, and collect other passages in Scripture, where the term *justify* is taken differently, to establish what they call *concurrency*. James does not mean that man acquires righteousness with God, even in the minutest degree, by the merit of works; he is only treating of the approval of righteousness (James 2:21). And who denies that every man proves what he is by his actions? But to furnish men with credible evidence of your disposition is a

very different thing from meriting salvation in the sight of God. Hence, not to be imposed upon by the different meanings of the word, we must always observe whether reference is made to God or to men. Moreover, we deny not that the righteous are called the children of God, in respect of holiness of life, as well as in respect of a pure conscience: but as no work, if weighed in the Divine balance, will be found otherwise than maimed, and even defiled by impurities, we conclude, that this name of righteousness, when given to works, is founded on free pardon. Believers, therefore, are righteous by works, just because they are righteous without any merit of, or without any respect to works, seeing that the righteousness of works depends on the righteousness of faith” (The True Method of giving Peace to Christendom).

The Thirteen Articles of 1538
(*Conferences with the Lutherans*).

“Good Works are necessary to salvation, not because they justify a wicked man, nor because they are a satisfaction for sins, or the cause of Justification; but because it is necessary, that he who is now justified by faith and reconciled to God through Christ, should study to do the will of God, according to that: ‘Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.’ He assuredly who does not endeavour to do these works, but lives according to the flesh, has neither true faith, nor is justified, neither shall he obtain eternal life, unless he heartily reforms, and truly repents” (Art. 4).

The Homilies.

“Thy deeds and works must be an open testimonial of thy faith: otherwise thy faith, being without good works, is but the devil’s faith, the faith of the wicked, a fantasy of faith, and not a true Christian faith.” “Be sure of your faith, try it by your living, look upon the fruits that come of it, mark the increase of love and charity by it towards God and your neighbour, and so shall you perceive it to be a true lively faith” (Homily on Faith, Part Third).

“Without faith no work is good before God, as saith St. Augustine: ‘We must set no good works before faith, nor think that before faith a man may do any good works; for such works, although they seem unto men to

be praiseworthy, yet indeed they be but vain, and not allowed before God. They be as the course of an horse that runneth out of the way, which taketh great labour, but to no purpose. Let no man therefore,' saith he, 'reckon upon his good works before his faith: whereas faith was not, good works were not. The intent,' saith he, 'maketh the good works; but faith must guide and order the intent of man.' And Christ saith, *If thine eye be naught, thy whole body is full of darkness* (Matt. 6:23). 'The eye doth signify the intent,' saith St. Augustine, 'wherewith a man doth a thing.' So that he which doth not his good works with a godly intent, and a true faith that worketh by love, the whole body besides, that is to say, all the whole number of his works, is dark, and there is no light in them. For good deeds be not measured by the facts themselves, and so discerned from vices; but by the ends and intents for the which they be done" (Homily on Good Works, Part First).

Rome's "Good Works". – "Keeping in divers places, marts or markets of merits, full of holy relics, images, shrines, and works of overflowing abundance ready to be sold. ... Holy cowls, holy girdles, holy pardons, holy beads, holy shoes, holy rules, and all full of holiness. ... But to pass over the innumerable superstitiousness that hath been in strange apparel, in silence, in dormitory, in cloister, in chapter, in choice of meats and drinks, and in such like things, let us consider what enormities and abuses have been in the three chief principal points, which they called the three essentials, or three chief foundations of religion, that is to say, obedience, chastity, and willful poverty.

First, under pretense or colour of obedience to their Father in religion (which obedience they made themselves), they were made free, by their rule and canons, from the obedience of their natural father and mother, and from the obedience of emperor and king, and all temporal power, whom of very duty by God's laws they were bound to obey. And so the profession of their obedience not due, was a forsaking of their due obedience. And how their profession of chastity was kept, it is more honesty to pass over in silence, and let the world judge of that which is well known, than with unchaste words, by expressing of their unchaste life, to offend chaste and godly ears. And as for their willful poverty, it was such, that when in possessions, jewels, plate, and riches, they were equal or above merchants, gentlemen, barons, earls, and dukes; yet by this subtle sophistical term, *Proprium in Communi*, that is to say, 'Proper in common,' they mocked the world,

persuading, that notwithstanding all their possessions and riches, yet they kept their vow, and were in willful poverty. But for all their riches, they might never help father nor mother, nor other that were indeed very needy and poor, without the license of their father abbot, prior, or warden; and yet they might take of every man; but they might not give aught to any man, no not to them whom the laws of God bound them to help. ...

“And briefly to pass over the ungodly and counterfeit religion, let us rehearse some other kinds of Papistical superstitions and abuses, as of beads, of lady psalters, and rosaries, of fifteen O’s, of St. Bernard’s verses, of St. Agathe’s letters, of purgatory, of masses satisfactory, of stations and jubilees, of feigned relics, of hallowed beads, bells, bread, water, palms, candles, fire, and. such other, of superstitious fastings, of fraternities or brotherhoods, of pardons, with such like merchandise, which were so esteemed and abused to the great prejudice of God’s glory and commandments, that they were made most high and most holy things, whereby to attain to the everlasting life, or remission of sins: yea also vain inventions, unfruitful ceremonies, and ungodly laws, decrees, and councils of Rome, were in such wise advanced, that nothing was thought comparable in authority, wisdom, learning, and godliness, unto them” (ibid. Part Third).

Christ’s Good Works. – “First you must have an assured faith in God, and give yourselves wholly unto him, love him in prosperity and adversity, and dread to offend him evermore. Then for his sake love all men, friends and foes, because they be his creation and image, and redeemed by Christ, as ye are. Cast in your minds, how you may do good unto all men unto your powers, and hurt no man. Obey all your superiors and governours; serve your masters faithfully and diligently, as well in their absence as in their presence, not for dread of punishment only, but for conscience’ sake, knowing that you are bound so to do by God’s commandments. Disobey not your fathers and mothers, but honour them, help them, and please them to your power. Oppress not, kill not, beat not, neither slander nor hate any man; but love all men, speak well of all men, help and succour every man as you may, yea, even your enemies that hate you, that speak evil of you, and that do hurt you. Take no man’s goods, nor covet your neighbour’s goods wrongfully; but content yourselves with that which ye get truly; and also bestow your own goods charitably, as need and case requireth. Flee all idolatry, witchcraft, and perjury; commit no manner of adultery, fornication, or other unchasteness, in will nor in deed, with any other man’s wife,

widow, maid, or otherwise. And travelling continually during your life, thus in keeping the commandments of God (wherein standeth the pure, principal, and right honour of God, and which wrought in faith, God hath ordained to be the right trade and pathway unto heaven), you shall not fail, as Christ hath promised, to come to that blessed and everlasting life, where you shall live in glory and joy with God forever: to whom be praise, honour and empery, forever and ever. Amen.” (Ibid.)

Jewell’s Apology.

“Though we say there is no trust to be put in the merits of our works and actions, and place all the hopes and reason of our salvation only in Christ; yet do we not therefore say, that men should live loosely, and dissolutely, as if baptism and faith were sufficient for a Christian, and there were nothing more required. The true faith is a living faith, and cannot be idle.”

Nowell’s Catechism.

“So far, therefore, is faith from withdrawing our hearts from living uprightly, that contrariwise, it doth most vehemently stir us up to the endeavour of good life; yea, and so far, that he is not truly faithful that doth not also to his power both shun vices and embrace virtues, so living always as one that looketh to give an account.

“In good works, two things are principally required. First, that we do those works that are prescribed by the law of God; secondly, that they be done with that mind of faith which God requireth: for no doings or thoughts enterprised or conceived without faith can please God.

“It is evident, therefore, that all works whatsoever we do, before that we be born again and renewed by the Spirit of God, such as may probably be called our own works, are faulty. For whatsoever show of gayness and worthiness they represent and give to the eyes of men, since they spring and proceed from a faulty and corrupted heart, which God chiefly considereth, they cannot but be defiled and corrupted, and so grievously offend God. Such works, therefore, as evil fruits, growing out of an evil tree, God despiseth and rejecteth from him.”

The Irish Articles of 1615.

“All that are justified, are likewise sanctified: their faith being always accompanied with true Repentance of good Works.

“Repentance is a gift of God, whereby a godly sorrow is wrought in the heart of the faithful, for offending God their merciful Father by their former transgressions, together with a constant resolution for the time to come to cleave unto God, and to lead a new life.

“Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot make satisfaction for our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment: yet are they pleasing to God and accepted of him in Christ, and do spring from a true and lively faith, which by them is to be discerned, as a tree by the fruit.

“The works which God would have his people to walk in, are such as he hath commanded in his holy Scripture, and not such works as men have devised out of their own brain, of a blind zeal and devotion, without the warrant of the word of God.

“The regenerate cannot fulfill the law of God perfectly in this life. For in many things we offend all: and if we say, we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.”

Such, then, is an index, and only an index, to the mind of the church and people of God, from the earliest age of Christianity downwards, on the subject of our present Articles.

How sadly has Rome caricatured and corrupted the truth of the Gospel, and departed from the pale of Catholic Christianity, in teaching that good works fully satisfy the law of God, and of themselves merit eternal life; and that the plenary absolution of the filthy confessional imparts a power of perfection to the absolved, so that their works are free from all admixture of sin! Into what depths of depravity can the human heart, in pride, in ignorance, and in superstition, descend!

And this is something of the mire and degradation into which Doctor Pusey and the Ritualistic School would attempt to drag the Church of England, whose Articles here and throughout, so clearly and emphatically proclaim – No Peace with Rome!

“Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.”

The great secret, we believe, of England’s gravitation towards Rome is Political Expediency, with its background of Infidelity. Our statesmen

bow down before the idol of party, instead of the “saving sign” of religion and national weal; men are promoted to high and commanding offices in the Church from all schools of thought, except as the exception from the school of Christ; and, as a consequence, the floods of ungodliness flow fast over the land; the rapids of revolution, anarchy and atheism, are nearing; and the evangelical and only true life of England, as well as the state, is in danger.

We want Faith and Prayer brought back again to their Prevalence with God. We want a Conference and an Organization of the Faithful and Praying Men and Women of Christendom to command a blessing from on high, and stem the tide at once of Lawlessness, Infidelity, and Superstition. And we want, as we have said, another Luther, with a clear head, and a lion heart, to lead us, in God’s name, “Once more unto the Breach!”

Shall it be told by the future historian that, at the close of the nineteenth century, British, and European, and American Christianity, failed in outspoken allegiance to Christ and God; that as the hordes of the Philistines shouted for the battle, there was not one champion, having proved his armour, even though but a sling and a stone from the brook, to come out and meet them in the name of the Lord of Hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom they defied?

An objection and a side issue grounded on the tenor of our thirteenth Article, may be briefly noted. The objection is that Cornelius, Naaman, and the Ninevites, are examples in favour of the grace of congruity. And the side issue, If we accept the Article, must we not condemn the whole heathen world?

The Objection. Here the words of Luther are, we think, well balanced:

—

Cornelius. — “The Popish schoolmen are deceived, when they say, for the maintenance of their *opus congruum*, or merit before grace, that Cornelius, by the natural or moral work of reason, deserved grace and the sending of the Holy Ghost. For to be a just man and fearing God, are the properties, not of a Gentile or of a natural man, but of a spiritual man, who hath faith already. For unless he did believe in God, and fear God, he could not hope to obtain anything of him by prayer. The first commendation therefore that Luke giveth unto Cornelius, is this, ‘That he is a righteous man and fearing God’: afterwards he commendeth him for his works and alms deeds. This our adversaries do not consider, but lay hold upon this sentence, ‘that he gave alms unto the poor’: for that seemeth to make for the

establishing of their merit of congruence or desert going before grace. But first the person or the tree must be commended, and then the works and the fruit. Cornelius is a good tree, for he is righteous and feareth God: therefore he bringeth forth good fruit, he giveth alms, he calleth upon God, and these fruits please God, because of his faith. Wherefore the angel commendeth Cornelius for his faith in Christ to come, and bringeth him from that faith, to another faith in Christ which was already come, when he saith: ‘Call for Simon, whose surname is Peter: he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do’” (Comment. on Gal. 3:2).

Naaman the Syrian. – “Likewise Naaman the Syrian was, no doubt, a good and godly man, and had a religious and reverent opinion of God. And although he was a Gentile, and belonged not to the kingdom of Moses, which then flourished; yet notwithstanding his flesh was cleansed, and the God of Israel was revealed unto him, and he received the Holy Ghost. For thus he saith: ‘Now I know assuredly that there is no other God in all the world but in Israel’ (2 Kings 5:15, etc.) ... Moreover it appeareth that faith was not idle in him. For thus he speaketh to the prophet Heliseus: ‘Thy servant will henceforth neither offer burnt sacrifice nor offering unto any other God, saving the Lord’” (ibid.).

The Ninevites, etc. – “Therefore God, when the kingdom of Moses was yet standing and flourishing, did show that he justified men without the law, as indeed he justified many kings in Egypt and in Babylon: also Job, and many other nations of the East. Moreover, Nineveh, a great city, was justified, and received the promise of God, that it should not be destroyed. By what means? Not because it heard and fulfilled the law: but because it believed the word of God which the prophet Jonas preached. For so saith the prophet: ‘And the Ninevites believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth’; that is to say, they repented. Our adversaries do craftily pass over this word [believed], and yet the effect of all together resteth therein. Thou readest not in Jonas: and the Ninevites received the law of Moses, were circumcised, offered sacrifice, fulfilled the works of the law: but believing the word, they repented in sackcloth and ashes” (ibid.).

Calvin also well remarks: – “Some examples are brought forward as repugnant to this view. When Naaman the Syrian made inquiry at the prophet as to the true mode of worshipping God, we cannot (it is said) suppose that he was informed of the Mediator, and yet he is commended for his piety (2 Kings 5:17–19). Nor could Cornelius, a Roman heathen, be

acquainted with what was not known to all the Jews, and at best known obscurely. And yet his alms and prayers were acceptable to God (Acts 10:31), while the prophet by his answer approved of the sacrifices of Naaman. In both, this must have been the result of faith. In like manner, the eunuch to whom Philip was sent, had he not been endued with some degree of faith, never would have incurred the fatigue and expense of a long and difficult journey to obtain an opportunity of worship (Acts 8:27, 31); and yet we see how, when interrupted by Philip, he betrays his ignorance of the Mediator. I admit that in some respects their faith was not explicit either as to the person of Christ, or the power and office assigned him by the Father. Still it is certain that they were imbued with principles which might give some, though a slender, foretaste of Christ. This should not be thought strange; for the eunuch would not have hastened from a distant country to Jerusalem to an unknown God; nor could Cornelius, after having once embraced the Jewish religion, have lived so long in Judea without becoming acquainted with the rudiments of sound doctrine. In regard to Naaman, it is absurd to suppose that Elisha, while he gave him many minute precepts, said nothing of the principal matter. Therefore, although their knowledge of Christ may have been obscure, we cannot suppose that they had no such knowledge at all” (Instit. I. 3, c. 2, sect. 32).

Side Issue: Can the Heathen be saved? The foregoing considerations throw, we think, as much light on this subject as is possible for us to obtain. It is a question which Revelation has not fully answered; and therefore one which we may not attempt dogmatically to solve. Still the examples quoted show us, as Luther says, that “Gentiles were justified without the Law, and received secretly the Holy Ghost.” Ethiopia, Nineveh, Rome, and Syria had saved ones: why, therefore, may not God’s saved ones be found throughout all the earth? “In every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him” (Acts 10:35). But we must ever bear in mind the universal truth, that “the preparations (or, disposings) of the heart in man” – heathen, as well as Jew and Christian – “are from the Lord” (Prov. 16:1). And therefore the acceptability of a virtuous heathen arises not from his natural light and moral purity, but clearly from God’s preventing grace. Thus we have the possibility of the affirmative to the question demonstrated; but that is all.

The language of St. Paul, Rom. 2:14, 26–27, has been taken by some in a much stronger light; but we should remember that the reasoning of the

Apostle is altogether hypothetical, and grounded indeed upon a manifest impossibility – the Gentile (much less than the Jew) fulfilling all the (moral) requirements of Law.

We may add that the question is one which has been long agitated: Clement of Alexandria holding that Philosophy was given to the Gentiles, for the same purpose for which the Law was given to the Jews – to prepare them for Justification by Faith under the Gospel. Nor does the inquiry necessarily arise out of our Article, which treats rather of those within, than without, the Church. And it may be that one reason why God has not fully revealed the matter to us is, that our love for his children in their blindness may be a test of our love to him in us who say, “We see.”

Scriptural Proof.

Article XII.

(1.) Good Works are the fruits of Faith, and follow after the Justification of the Person (“*justificatos*” – not *justificationem* – “*sequuntur*”).

Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification]

“And put no difference between us and them [Jews and Gentiles], purifying their hearts by faith (*τηπίστις* – the *faith* [in Christ]: the fountain of all Sanctification)” (Acts 15:9).

“Seeing ye have purified your souls” (*τας ψυχας* – “the centers of personality”) “in obeying the truth through the Spirit [the agent of Sanctification] unto unfeigned love of the brethren [the one great practical proof of our love to God]. ... Being born again [the unquestionable origin and only begetting cause of the new life of holiness], not of (*εκ* – out of, as the origination) corruptible seed [the *semen humanum* of the natural heart], but of incorruptible [superhuman and Divine], by means of (*δια*, as the instrument, not *εκ* as above – the origination here being the will of God the Father who ‘begat us,’ James 1:18) the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever” (1 Peter 1:22–23).

“The Gospel is come unto you, as it is in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit, as it doth also in you, since the day ye heard of it, and fully knew (*επιγειώσκω* – the objective exchanged for the subjective transforming knowledge) the grace of God in truth” (Col. 1:6). “Christ gave himself for

us, that he might redeem us from all lawlessness (ἀνομία), and purify unto himself a people peculiarly his, zealous of good works” (Titus 2:14).

(2) Good Works have no merit to justify us.

Cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment]

“O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord: my good extendeth not to thee” – or, My good is not beyond or beside thee; or, as the Arab, “Thou needest not my good actions”; or, as the Chald., “My good is not given save of thee”: the soul’s response to Ex. 20:2, “I am the Lord thy God” – “Yea, Lord, thou alone art my salvation, my goodness, my acceptability, my all in all” (Psa. 16:2).

“So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do” (Luke 17:10). “Enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified” (Psa. 143:2). “If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?” (Psa. 130:3). “And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through (διὰ – the medium) the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God upon (ἐπι – on condition of) my faith” (Phil. 3:9).

“Because (διότι) by the works of the law [‘God’s Law: whether in the partial revelation of it written in the consciences of the Gentiles, or in the more complete one given by Moses to the Jews’ – Alford], there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the full knowledge (επίγνωσις – the clear detection of revelation) of sin. But now [as things are ordained] the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by the faith in Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. ... Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law” (Rom. 3:20–24, 28).

(3.) Good Works, nevertheless, are pleasing to God in Christ; and are necessary as the evidences of faith.

Yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit]

“Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; and that ye may become disciples unto me (και γένηθε εμοι μαθηταί)” (John 15:8). “In every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him” (Acts 10:35). “For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God before prepared, that we should walk in them” (Eph. 2:10). “As we might say of the trees, they were created for fruits which God before prepared that they should bear them: i.e., defined and assigned to each tree its own, in form, and flavour, and time of bearing. So in the course of God’s providence, our good works are marked out for and assigned to each one of us.” – Alford.

“Not that I desire the gift, but I do desire the fruit which abounds to your account” (Phil. 4:17). “But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased” (Heb. 13:16). “Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. ... Wherefore by their fruits ye shall thoroughly know them (επιγνώσεσθε)” (Matt. 7:17–18, 20). “Whoso hath this world’s good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?” (1 John 3:17). “These things I would have thee positively affirm, in order that they who have believed God may be careful to maintain good works” (Titus 3:8). “Now the end of the commandment is Love, out of a pure heart, and good conscience, and faith unfeigned” (1 Tim. 1:5).

Article XIII.

(1.) Works done before Justification are not pleasing to God.

Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ]

“Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?” (Matt 7:16). “They that are in the flesh cannot please God” (Rom. 8:8). “Except a man be born afresh (άνωθεν – from the very beginning), he cannot see the kingdom of God” (John 3:3). “The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week [voluntarily: ‘on the Mondays and Thursdays; the only prescribed fast in the year being the great day of atonement. So that he is boasting of his works of

supererogation’ – Alford], I give tithes of all that I acquire (κτώμαι – see Deut. 14:22). And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me, sinner that I am. I tell you, this man went down to his house justified, rather than the other” (Luke 18:11–14). “Without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must have believed (πιστευσαι – aorist: his coming was the fruit of faith) that he is, and becomes (γίνεται) a rewarder of them that seek him out (εκζητουσιν)” (Heb. 11:6). “Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the Vine, ye are the Branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for separate from me (χωρις εμου) ye can do nothing” (John 15:4–5).

(2.) And, therefore, such works not being acceptable to God, because not done in Christ’s faith and strength “unto the glory and praise of God” (Phil. 1:11), cannot, it is clear, deserve or procure grace and favour from Him.

Neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School authors say) deserve grace of congruity]

“If ye were blind, ye should have no sin; but now ye say, We see. Therefore, your sin remaineth” (John 9:41). “For in the Gospel is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:17). “For they being ignorant of (or, not recognizing God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, subjected not themselves (υπετάγησαν – passive Aorist, with Middle meaning: against Alford’s merely historical ‘were not subjected’) to the righteousness of God” (Rom. 10:3). “For we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousness, but for thy great mercies” (Dan. 9:18). “But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags” (Isa. 64:6). “For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory. But not before God. ... To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” (Rom. 4:2, 4–5). “If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness would have been by the law. But on the contrary (αλλά) the Scriptures shut up all under sin, in order that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe” (Gal. 3:21–22). “Not by virtue of (εξ) works in righteousness which we did

(εποιήσαμεν – aorist), but on the contrary, according to his mercy, he saved us” (Titus 3:5).

(3.) Yea, rather, such works being done in self-righteousness, belong doubtless to the category of sin.

Yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin]

“Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin” (Rom. 14:23). “The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord: but the prayer of the upright is his delight” (Prov. 15:8). “Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Put your burnt offering unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you. But they hearkened, not, nor inclined their ear, but walked in the counsels and in the imagination of their evil heart” (Jer. 7:21–24). “O Ephraim, what shall I do unto thee? O Judah, what shall I do unto thee? for your goodness is as a morning cloud, and as the early dew it goeth away. ... For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings” (Hosea 6:4, 6). “Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in thy name? and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name do (the three verbs are Aorists) many wonderful works? And then will I confess unto them (ομολογήσω αυτοις – plainly tell them), I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity” (Matt. 7:22–23). “So then they which be of Faith, are blessed together with (συν – in the same fellowship and heirship with) faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the Law, are under the curse” (Gal. 3:9–10).

Article XIV.

History and Doctrine, With Scriptural Proof.

Of Works of Supererogation. – Voluntary Works, besides, over and above God’s Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake, than of bounden duty is required;

whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

De Operibus Supererogationis. – Opere, quae Supererogationis appellant, non possunt sine arrogantia et impietate praedicari. Nam illis declarant homines, non tantum se Deo reddere, qua; tenentur, sed plus in ejus gratiam facere, quam deberent; cum aperte Christus dicat, lum feceritis omnia quaecunque praecepta sunt vobis, dicite, Servi inutiles sumus.

History.

When we consider what has already been said on Justification and Good Works in previous Articles, and what must necessarily be said under the fifteenth Article of Christ alone without Sin, it would seem to be indeed supererogatory to devote a chapter to the Doctrine of Supererogation. Nay more, were it not that the Romish Church has had the effrontery to formulize and flaunt the delusion in the face of Christendom, and that a School of the English Church has seriously endorsed it, we might safely pass it over as one of those hallucinations which belong rather to the history of frenzy and fanaticism than to that of theology. But though, as elaborated, the wildest and most monstrous of all Papal pretensions, it is nevertheless, strange to say, just the one which has proved most prolific to the Church of Rome, being the veritable fountainhead of her traffic in Pardons and Indulgences, and Purgatorial impostures. And therefore, on this account also, we may reconcile ourselves to a brief examination and exposure of it.

Rogare Populum or *Legem*, was the formula for the introduction of a bill or law in the Roman Comitia. *Erogare* was the term used for expending, or paying out money from the public treasury after asking the consent of the people. While *Supererogare* meant to spend or pay out over and above the amount thus granted. “Si quid forte supererogasti” (Codex Justinus. – See White and Riddle’s Lat. Dict.).

Bishop Browne sees “in the admiration of the early Church for martyrdom, and in the admission of the intercession of the martyrs for the deliverance of others from church censures, and in the respect paid to virginity, the germ of the doctrine of works of supererogation.”

But we venture to think that neither the germ nor first development of the delusion is here. Rather is the germ to be found in that vanity of the human heart, begotten of Satan, which would be wise above that which is written, and that consequent pride which must have something to do in God’s salvation. And the whole history of religious fanaticism gives

abundant evidence of the fruit. All fond inventions of the uncircumcised heart, whether under the Law or the Gospel, and all undue magnifying of God's ordinances, are of the righteousness that is "overmuch" – a supererogating over and above of the righteousness of God. And this we find all along the whole line of Old and New Testament times: from Cain to the age of Christ; from the days of the Apostle down to our own persistent and rampant Ritualism. And in Heathenism as we proceed, we shall find, far prior to the infant Church of Christ, distinct and historic parentage, if we mistake not, of the imposture.

For the Church of Rome, however, it remained here as elsewhere to graduate in the wilds of error; and to mold first into a system the doctrine of a Treasury of the Supererogation of the Perfect. Let us not be misunderstood either in our history or diagnosis. We look deeper into human nature than to accredit Rome with the high element of creative genius, that is rather the gift of God to His humble children. If we are asked for proof, her *one* scholar Bellarmine seldom rises above the level of a commonplace interpreter. But we do accredit Rome with being able to grasp the floating and, existent elements of the atmosphere of aberrant thought, and precipitate these into dangerous and potent crystallizations of dogma. Take any article of her anti-Catholic creed, and the merest tyro in history will find for it superabundant paternity in fanaticism.

It may be asked, Why all this "onslaught"? Our answer is, PATRIOTIC AND RIGHTEOUS DEFENCE. Our answer is, The Church of God and the Church of Rome are simply, the one the Church of Christ and the other the Confederation of Antichrist. Our answer is, The one is the Kingdom of God, and the other is the travestied antagonistic Kingdom of Satan. Our answer is, The one is National, Social, and Spiritual Life, the other is National, Social, and Spiritual Death.

And it may be well here to digress for a little, and once for all realize our situation, and earnestly proclaim the duty of the followers of Zion's King.

Nationally, then, as we have elsewhere said: "We are in evil and un-English haste to declare that religion forms no part whatever of the business of statesmanship. We began by forsaking the old paths of distinguishing between Christ and Antichrist – of living as a nation for God, and stamping out every vestige of him who exalteth himself above all that is called God; and we bid fair to end by striking God altogether out of the 'knowledge' of

our constitution. And the wretched veneer with which we would cover this latitudinarianism and sin we misname liberalism. Time was when England and purity of faith, or at all events to staunchness for the faith, obtained as synonyms throughout Christendom. Now, we are not only becalmed, but in part also in direct and frenzied antagonism to our best characteristics hitherto as a nation; in a state, on the one hand, of politico-religious coma, and on the other, as regards large and important sections of our countrymen, bordering on the verge of politico-religious libertinism. The intoxication of wealth and power, like the intoxication of alcohol in different subjects, has had these two dissimilar results. It has brought to the surface a class of men whose lifeblood is stimulated to a heat that threatens destruction to the best interests of society; who forget or despise the fountains of England's strength, the steps and the monuments of England's greatness; whose motto when practically translated is, Anarchy for the present, for the stake of anything or nothing in the future, and all this even though we play the dark dread card of mobocracy. But another and equally deplorable result has been to stupefy the quondam exponents of true liberty. A reign of peace and plenty, and of the all but unclouded triumphs of Protestantism, has lulled them into a sleep of fatal security; they complacently rest on the laurels which their fathers on a hundred hard-fought battlefields won, and have transmitted them; they have yet to learn the lesson that victory gained is victory to be sustained, that they are sons of sires whose sacred testament, sealed with their best energies and their blood, may be best epitomized. Remember how you have received and heard, and hold fast ...

“And in the train of these *avant-couriers* of our decadence – this grand army of Americanized Englishmen – we have the Freethinker and the Mediaeval Priest: the puerile copyists on the one hand of the state and long-exploded platitudes and crude postulates of aberrant thought, and the pigmy intellects on the other hand which would swell themselves into importance by the assumptions of sacerdotalism. Nor does it require any depth of philosophy of men and manners to depict the effect of these two classes upon society, and the aid they render the anarchists. It may be graphically written in one word, they *unhinge*: the obvious tendency is to unfasten and cut away the religious and the rational moorings of the English mind.

“And now for the lesson. *Un grand destin commence, un grand destin s'achève*. The epoch of Reformation peace and purity has closed; the epoch of a struggle – violent and protracted it may be, though ultimately

triumphant on the side of truth it must be, for God and reason cannot fail to rule the right – between national order and national chaos impends” (Extracted from “Letters for the Times,” published some years ago in the *Liverpool Daily Courier*.)

But on the other hand, when we turn to the Signs of the Times, as they less or more plainly unveil the Second Coming of the Lord; and especially when we reflect on the deadly shocks which the Romish power once and again is now righteously receiving – a sure presage of the nearing final doom of the Man of Sin, and that the Day of Christ is at hand – we cannot but here emphatically repeat what we have also written, in the series as noted above, solemnly calling upon the churches to unite in one grand Protestant Scriptural Confederacy, to prepare for the events which are approaching: –

“We are on the eve of the downfall of mystical Babylon, and of the Jubilee of the world.

“Direst – yet brightest – most eventful hour of time!

““And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.’

“A very little while, and the knell may be sounded of the kingdom of Satan, in its culmination of the Papacy; and the sweet gladsome notes pealed forth of the Millennium – the culmination of the kingdom of Christ – the era of the Church’s liberty, release, rest. ...

“Our object on the present occasion is not to attempt to fix the precise limits of the judgment day of Papal Europe; for, after all, this perhaps were to be wise above that which is written. Nevertheless, as intimated, we are free to confess that, from a careful reading of God’s Bible of inspiration, and God’s Bible of everyday demonstration, we are not without hope that – if only indeed Christians will but ‘quit them as men’ in this the most momentous crisis of the church and of the world – a very brief space may suffice to usher in the outbursts of the rending chorus of heaven and earth, ‘Alleluia! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!’

“Our object is to bespeak attention to the cry, ‘Behold the Bridegroom cometh! Go ye out to meet him!’

“When Christ was about to enter on his first great personal world mission, that of humiliation, his forerunner was a solitary individual from the wilderness. When Christ is (now) about to inaugurate his second Coming, that of triumphant glory, he will be met and welcomed by a company of ‘virgins’ – the faithful throughout the churches who have not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither have received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands.’

“Let us scan for a moment the situation and its history.

“On the theatre at least of earth, ever since the Fall, two principles have been in utter antagonism – the power of evil and the power of good – the kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of Christ. In the deeply mysterious but wise Providence of God, the former, with few and far between and comparatively fitful exceptions, has been permitted to eclipse the latter.

“The obverse. ‘Antediluvian giantism – the wisdom and the wealth of Egypt – the splendour of Babylon – the consolidations and brilliancy of the Medo-Persian empire – the culture and refinement of Greece – the military genius of Rome pagan – the superstition and will-worship and astuteness of Rome papal: centuries of age – pyramids of power and despotism – dark and uncouth, or gorgeous and artistic colossal pantheons of demonolatry: in a word, the kingdoms of this world, and the material and spiritual glory of them, all have been subordinated to, laid at the feet of Satan, to demonstrate, not only to man, but to the principalities and powers in heavenly places, one of the high problems of the universe – The Impotency of Evil.

“And the reverse is – Christ on the Cross, of suffering and salvation, from the Fall to the Millennium.

“‘In all their affliction He was afflicted: and the Angel of his Presence saved them.’ ‘Afflicted’ in the expulsion of our first parents from paradise, yet whispering words of comfort to the fallen. ‘Afflicted – grieved at his heart,’ as the tide of antediluvian wickedness overwhelms His church, yet building an ark for eight solitary witnesses. ‘Afflicted’ by the groaning of Israel as they rear the stately monuments of Egypt – an infant nation’s baptism of suffering, a people’s servitude for their domestic and social sins, yet sending them a deliverer, in the plenitude of his power, and the wondrous condescension withal of his office, as the Angel of God. ‘Afflicted’ in his theocracy being swept away into Babylon – the independence of his church sunk in the tyrannical or tolerating rule of

idolatry from Nebuchadnezzar even to the present, yet on Calvary, the while ratifying with his blood the charter of his church's final and everlasting liberty. Thus demonstrating throughout, not only to man, but to the principalities and powers in heavenly places, the other high problem of the universe, that GOD ALONE IS GOOD – that GOD IS LOVE.

“And now that these high problems are solved, and only hourly, as it were, await their actual solemn ratification amid the throes of a dissolving world; that the end of the present dispensation has thus far, in the main, been served; that the Seed of the Woman hastens, in righteous retribution, and in the outgoings of the justice of the Eternal, finally to bruise the Head of the Serpent; that the judgment of the ‘great whore’ closes; and that the kingdoms of this world are about to become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ, what is the duty of the Christian in the crisis? Assuredly not either unbelief or mere stoical spectatorship. Recurring to the parable of our Lord, the duty of Christians at the present especially appears to be –

“1. *Wisdom*. Five of the virgins are *wise*. ‘Wise’ to beware of the false Christs and false prophets of the day, who say, ‘Behold, he is in the desert’ – the desert of ceremonial observances – the desert of a sacramental corporal presence; ‘Behold, he is in the secret chambers’ of the polluted confessional. ‘Wise’ to trim their lamp of external profession, not with the oil of priestly absolution, but with the oil of the Spirit of God.

“2. *The exhibition of a joint faithful testimony*. FIVE of the virgins are WISE. A holy confederacy, displaying unity of sentiment, unity of purpose, unity of action; and, in marked antithesis, in direct antagonism to the corrupt confederacy of carnal and unsanctified combinations.

“In these last days we have had a renewal and reorganization of the confederacy of Antichrist. Not only has the order of the Jesuits been restored, and the Bull for their reestablishment been of late confirmed, but societies in aid are detailed all over the world. A ‘sword whose hilt is at Rome, and whose edge is elsewhere.’ A one mind of sentiment – power and strength unto the Beast; a one mind of purpose – the suppression of liberty – the annihilation of Protestantism; a one mind of action – the end justifies the means.

“Now, we cannot conceive of a more fitting development of the age, a grander or more interesting or more dutiful display on the part of the Church of Christ, than an organization in distinct and definite contrast and antagonism to this confederacy of Antichrist.

“An organization whose unity of sentiment shall unequivocally affirm the Headship of Messiah the Prince – the keynote of all truth; whose unity of purpose shall be the protection and the extension of liberty and righteousness, the palladium and the propagandism of Protestantism; whose unity of action shall consist in having for its baseline – yea, all its lines and all its angles – the Word of God.

“Christ has been stripped of his crown ever since his theocracy was carried away into Babylon by the Dragon. True, in the cycles of ages which have intervened, some noble and ever-memorable efforts have been made to bring the King back. But the blessing remains for us who come to the ‘thousand three hundred and five and thirty days’ to write on the vesture and the thigh of Jesus the name, ‘King of Kings and Lord of Lords!’ – the blessing remains even for us, the churches ‘at the end of the days,’ to prepare the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight – to be the pioneers of the mighty moral revolution which shall unseat Satan from the thrones and dominions of his usurpation, and place upon the head of Christ, the Mediator, the diadem of universal, uncontrolled, everlasting sovereignty.

“Such, briefly, are the nature and objects of the organization which we would earnestly commend to the prayerful consideration of Christians.

“Such, reading the phenomena and impending issues of the times in the light of revelation, would seem to be the interpretation of the cry now so audibly addressing the Protestant Churches of Christendom ‘Behold! The Bridegroom Cometh! Go Ye Out To Meet Him.’

“The science of prophecy, as it relates to the Time of the End, has been admirably written, and some of the results, so to speak, are here freely embodied; but the age beckons from the life and the lore of the student to the sterner and more material and more glorious work of unfurling among the nations the standard of Christ’s Crown Rights and Prerogatives – of marshalling, in Christian array, the thousands of willing and expectant recruits of liberty, who are at this moment sighing throughout the length and breadth of the Papal earth, and elsewhere, for action – of proclaiming in the ears of princes the imperative duty, the distinguished honour, the unspeakable privilege of consecrating their power and resources to the King of Zion – of raising aloud, in parliaments and assemblies of legislation, despite the sneer of the infidel, or the opposition of determined foes, a voice clear and unmistakable against the world’s statute book of expediency, and

in favour of the statute book of high heaven – of forming a nucleus – a phalanx – an army of faithful and devoted soldiers of the Cross, who shall bear aloft the Banner of Truth, and plant it triumphantly, with its every fold unfurled, on the proudest ramparts of ignorance and despotism, of Antichristian thralldom and superstition – thus ‘looking for and HASTING (as the word is rendered in Isaiah) the Coming of the Day of God.’”

But to return to our history. We frankly admit the early Christian Church soon fell into extravagant notions respecting Martyrdom, Celibacy, and Fasting. But these were a rebound to the idols of the den – the idols of preconceived opinions in which the first converts had been educated in heathendom or heretical philosophy; and formed no part whatever of Christianity. To the Pythagorean and Essene philosophy, both we think fairly traceable to Babylon and Buddhism, must we attribute the historic origin of these strange prepossessions; which though at the outset, in the Christian Church, contemplated little more than a larger accession of blessing to the individual, yet soon afterwards prepared the way for still more gracious error.

That the leaders of opinion in the primitive Church had no *bona fide* intention however of undervaluing the Atonement of the Saviour, is abundantly clear.

Thus the blessed Polycarp, who at the advanced age of perhaps over four score and ten years, suffered martyrdom with the utmost cheerfulness and constancy, writes: “Abstaining from all wrath, respect of persons, and unrighteous judgment, being far from all covetousness, not easily believing anything against any, nor over severe in judgment, knowing that *we are all debtors in point of SIN*” (ad Philip. s. 6).

And Clement of Alexandria, who, though he stood aloof from many of his age and incurred the epithet of Sensualist, because among other things he would not court but avoid persecution, and yet with the general Church of the second century held martyrdom to be in some way efficacious as an expiatory act, still ever testifies throughout his writings to the fullness of Christ’s righteousness.

Tertullian even, who on the other hand vehemently taught that it was sinful to fly from persecution, as counteracting the purpose of infinite wisdom, and whose language is otherwise not without severe reprehension, thus writes: “Sufficient be it for a martyr to have wiped away his own sins. – Who looses another’s death by his own, except the Son of God alone? For

he freed the malefactor in his very Passion. For this cause he came, that being himself free from sin, and holy in all things, he might be obedient for sinners. Thou, therefore, who dost emulate him in pardoning sins, if thou hast thyself sinned in nothing, by all means suffer for me. But if thou art a sinner, how can the oil of thy touch [the flames of martyrdom] be sufficient both for thee and me?" (de Pudicit, c. 22).

But the leaven was already at work – the leaven of the Doctrine of Christian Perfection. A perfection only to be attained by the crown of Martyrdom or the mortifications of Asceticism: the one assimilating to the Divine impassibility of suffering; the other elevating to the Divine impassibility of evil impressions.

Thus the angel of Hermas, whose teaching is in full point, whether we assign his revelations to the commencement of the second century or a higher antiquity, engrafts upon Christianity the wild olive tree of Gentile tradition; is eager to add to the words written in the Book of Life; and enlarges the "commandment which is exceeding broad" by the Stations. (*Dies Stationarii* – half fasts to the ninth hour, the time of the supernatural darkness; on Wednesday, when the Jews took council against Christ; and on Friday, when our Saviour was crucified.) "Keep the commandments of God and thou shalt be approved, and shalt be written in the number of those that keep his commandments. But if, besides those things which the Lord hath commanded, thou shalt add some good thing, thou shalt purchase to thyself a greater dignity, and shalt be more in favour with the Lord than thou shouldst otherwise have been. ... The Station, therefore, is good and pleasing, and acceptable to the Lord."

But it remained for Tertullian, towards the close of the second century, to reveal the prevalent and dangerous opinions of the Church on the value of Fasting – fondly cherished, but not yet enacted by law. For though in all the furious excess of an ultra-ritualism, he pushes the delusion to the extremes of Montanus and his prophetesses, and in the coarse language of licentious fanaticism, not unfrequently unfit for us to transcribe, yet was he never called to account, nor accused of heresy in the matter: but stood to the general Church, in something of the same position as the extreme Ritualist of our own day stands to not a few of our Bishops – if not favoured, yet not condemned.

To the argument – "I will believe with all that is within me; I will love God and my neighbour as myself: on these two commandments hang all the

Law and the Prophets, and not on the emptiness of my stomach and bowels,” Tertullian answers: “Adam ate, and fell; we must fast, that we may be recovered. Adam’s sin consisted in eating, all men must abstain from eating, that they may expiate that offence. Man must atone to God in the same matter as that wherein he first offended; that is, by abstinence.” To the objection, If fasting recovers the favour of God, how is it, that while God permitted Adam only herbs and fruits, he yet extended that permission, after the Deluge, to Flesh? our author ingeniously replies: “God conceded this greater liberty, in order that man might acquire more merit by fasting; and that by the practice of a greater abstinence, upon the occasion of a greater license, he might make a greater expiation of the primary offence!” And this is his coarse and irreverent, frantic Paean, in the praises of Fasting, as a sort of prelude to a passage too disgusting to reproduce: “O Saint! God is thy belly, and thy lungs are his temple, and thy stomach is his altar, and his priest is thy cook, and the Holy Spirit is thy savour of cooked meats, and his grace is thy sauce, and prophecy is the eructation of thy full stomach! But O thou that indulgest thy gorge! thou art like Esau, thou wilt sell thy birthright, any day, for a mess of pottage; thy charity boils in thy pots, thy faith warms in thy kitchens, thy hope lies in a cradle spit.”

The reader will not fail to observe, what is every way most important to note, that all these nostrums of Asceticism, whether Stations or Fastings, as well as the impassibility of Martyrdom, were not Means of Grace, but mere acts of bodily sufferings and macerations acceptable, in themselves, unto the God of Love! and efficacious in his sight, not, we have reason to conclude, as superseding the merits of Christ, but as an additional ground of reward on the one hand, and on the other as a sort of individual following up of the one great Propitiatory Sacrifice.

But an essential point in the development of the doctrine of Perfection was to secure a foothold, or something which might show and serve as such, in the New Testament. Nor was this so difficult. Once diverge, by ever so little, from the express Word of God, and fallacies are never wanting to make the Bible say anything.

St. Paul had written: “Concerning virgins, I have no commandment (*praeceptum* – precept) of the Lord, yet I give my judgment (*consilium* – counsel)” (1 Cor. 7:25). A very simple and candid statement, one would think; yet upon this was solemnly constructed the doctrine, that Scripture distinguishes between Precepts and Counsels and in the sense, that while

the former are binding upon all men, with penalties for their neglect, the latter are desirable, with reward for their observance!

Thus Cyprian: "The Lord does not command celibacy, but exhorts to it. He does not impose a yoke of necessity, when the free will of the choice remains. But when he says, that in his Father's house are many mansions, he points to the hospitalities of the better mansion. Those better mansions ye seek, expurgating the desires of the flesh, the reward of the greater in heaven ye obtain" (*de Habitu Virginum*).

And Augustine: "For not as, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill,' can it be so said, Thou shalt not wed. The former are demanded, the latter is offered. If the one is observed, there is praise. If the other is neglected, there is condemnation. In the former the Lord commands us what is due. But in the latter, if ye shall have spent anything more (*supererogaveritis*), on his return he will repay you. Think of (whatever that be) within his wall 'a place named, much better than of sons and of daughters.' Think of 'an eternal name' there. Who unfolds of what kind that name shall be? Yet, whatever it shall be, it shall be eternal. By believing and hoping and loving this, ye have been able, not to shun marriage, as forbidden, but to fly past it as allowed" (*de Virginitate*, s. 30). But further on he speaks in language we think more to be trusted, and is Augustine still: "Who shall boast that he hath a chaste heart? or who shall boast that he is clean from sin?' Holy virginity is indeed inviolate from the mother's womb; but 'no one,' saith he, 'is clean in thy sight, not even the infant whose life is of one day upon the earth.' There is also in faith inviolate a certain virginal chastity, whereby the Church is joined as a chaste virgin unto One Husband: but that One Husband hath taught, not only the faithful who are virgin in mind and body, but all Christians altogether, from spiritual even unto carnal, from Apostles even unto the last penitents, as though from the height of heaven even unto the bounds of it, to pray, and in the prayer itself hath admonished them to say, 'And forgive us our debts, even as we also forgive our debtors': where, by this which we seek, he shows what also we should remember that we are. ... But whereas it is what baptized persons pray, rulers and people, pastors and flocks; it is sufficiently shown that in this life, the whole of which is a trial, no one ought to boast himself as though free from all sins" (*ibid.* s. 48).

But the transition, in time, was easy. From particulars to generals. From individual merit and reward, to a reserve fund for satisfactions for

other men's sins. Out of the superabundant merits of the supereminently holy, gained and obtained by their "voluntary works, besides, ever, and above God's commandments," to supply as by a check, in the shape of indulgences, upon the Bank of Supererogations, value sufficient for the salvation of souls in necessity. And this was exactly what Rome did in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, and since continues to do.

In the twelfth century. "The bishops when they had occasion to raise money, either for good and laudable or for base and criminal objects, allowed transgressors to buy off the penalties enjoined by the canons, by advancing money for certain religious purposes; that is, they published indulgences; and what mighty enterprises and expensive works were accomplished in this century by means of indulgences, is known. to all. ...

"The Roman pontiffs, perceiving what advantages the inferior bishops derived from their indulgences, concluded that the power of the bishops to remit ecclesiastical penalties ought to be circumscribed, and the prerogative be almost wholly transferred to the Roman see. Accordingly they began, as the necessities or convenience of the church or their own interests required, to publish not merely the common and ordinary but likewise the entire and absolute, or the plenary remission of all finite or temporal penalties; and they cancelled not only the punishments which the canons and human tribunals inflict, but also those to be endured after death, which the bishops had never attempted to set aside. They first resorted to this power for the sake of promoting the crusades, and were sparing in the use of it; but afterwards they exerted it for objects of far less importance and of various kinds, and very often merely for their private emolument. Upon the introduction of this new policy, the ancient system of canonical and ecclesiastical penances was wholly subverted; and the books of canons and the penitentials being laid aside, transgressors were no longer under restraints. To support this proceeding of the pontiffs an unheard-of doctrine was devised in this century, and improved and polished in the following century by St. Thomas (Aquinas); namely, that there is an immense treasury of good works which holy men have performed over and above what duty required; and that the Roman pontiff is the keeper and the distributor of this treasure, so that he is able, out of this inexhaustible fund, to give and transfer to every one such an amount of good works as his necessities require, or as will suffice to avert the punishment of his sins. This miserable

and pernicious fiction, it is to be lamented, is still retained and defended” (Mosheim, cent. xii., chap. iii.).

In the thirteenth century. “The Aristotelian divines readily entered on the task of vindicating dogmatically this most monstrous of all Papal pretensions. Alexander of Hales [an Englishman of Gloucestershire, but who spent most of his life in teaching theology at Paris] and Albert Magnus invented [first molded into a system?] the doctrine of the *Thesaurus Supererogationis Perfectorum*, out of which, by virtue of the power of the keys, not only the temporal penalties of the living for sin, but agreeably to the extension of the power of the keys over the dead long ere now established, the penalties also of men suffering in purgatory were discharged. Thomas Aquinas completed this theory” (Gieseler).

And this is how, as Gieseler quotes, Aquinas “polished” this soul-ruinous and blasphemous dogma: “Indulgences hold good both ecclesiastically and in respect of the judgment of God, for the remission of the residuum of punishment after contrition and absolution and confession. The reason why they hold good is the unity of the mystical body in which many have supererogated in works of penitence beyond the measure of their debts, and have patiently endured many unjust tribulations, by which a multitude of punishments could have been discharged, had they been owing. Of whose merits so great is the abundance, that they exceed the punishment now due to the living, and especially by reason of the merit of Christ. ... But the saints, in whom a superabundance of works of satisfaction is found, wrought not works of this kind definitely for him who needs remission (otherwise he would obtain remission without an indulgence), but in common for the whole Church; and so the aforesaid merits are the common property of the whole Church. But that which is the common property of a number is distributed to individuals of that number, at the will of him who presides over it” (Thomas Aquinas, Comm. in Sent. I, iv. – See Gieseler’s Eccl. Hist. Period 3, Div. iii.).

Pope Boniface VIII., in 1300, proclaimed the first jubilee of Indulgences, by which he drew vast crowds of pilgrims to Rome, and granted plenary indulgence to all whose pockets were not empty.

Succeeding Pontiffs (Clement V and Boniface IX), in pecuniary mercy to themselves, shortened the intervals of celebration ultimately to thirty-three years, or one generation; until at last, in the eloquent words of Adolphus, “the cry for a Reformation, which had been gradually growing

louder and louder, silenced forever the shouts of jubilee which had been so long raised over the foul mass of Papal corruption, and so long had prevented that blessed voice to be heard in the consciences of men, which tells of the jubilee in heaven over every sinner that repenteth.”

Leo X published throughout Europe general indulgences for lengthened periods, amassing immense treasure; and on the 9th of November 1518, issued a special Edict, that “the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, and vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, hath power to pardon, by virtue of the keys, the guilt and punishment of sin, the guilt by the sacrament of penance, and the temporal punishments due for actual sins by indulgences. That these indulgences are taken from the overplus of the merits of Jesus Christ and his saints, a treasure at the Pope’s own disposal, as well by way of absolution as suffrage; and that the dead and the living, who properly and truly obtain these indulgences, are immediately freed from the punishment due to their actual sins, according to the divine justice, which allows these indulgences to be granted and obtained.” And ordains, “that all the world shall hold and preach this doctrine, under the pain of excommunication reserved to the Pope.” But the sordid traffic gave birth to Luther’s Reformation; who, in his first Thesis, publicly exposed at Wittenberg on the memorable 31st day of October 1517, so boldly maintained “that the Pope could release no punishment but what he inflicted; and so indulgences could be only a relaxation of ecclesiastical penalties: that Christians are to be instructed: that the purchase of a pardon is not to be compared to works of mercy, and that it is better to give to the poor, than to buy pardons: that no confidence should be placed in indulgences, which cannot remit the least venial sin in respect of the guilt: that those who believe they shall be saved by indulgences only, shall be damned with their masters; and that it is a matter of indifference whether men buy or not buy any indulgences.”

The Council of Trent was exceedingly hurried at its close, but passed the following Decree on Indulgences: – “Since the power of conferring indulgences hath been granted by Christ to the Church, and since even from the most ancient times the Church hath used a power of this kind, divinely delivered to her, the Holy Synod teaches and enjoins that the use of indulgences, most salutary to Christian people, and approved by the authority of sacred Councils, shall be retained in the Church; and it anathematizes those who either assert that they are useless, or deny that the Church hath the power of granting them.” The remainder of the decree

vaguely “desires the abuses to be corrected, by occasion of which this illustrious name of indulgences is blasphemed by heretics” – a proof, however, that even the most holy and infallible council had quailed under the thunders of the Saxon Reformer.

The Creed of Pope Pius IV, issued in November 1564, as an epitome of the decisions of the Council of Trent, finally and authoritatively determined the question, in its twelfth Article: “I also affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church; and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.”

And again in the Rhemish Testament, 1582, we have the following open and if possible still more dangerous reassertion of the doctrine of supererogation and transfer of human merit: holy Saints, or other virtuous persons, may in measure and proportion of other men’s necessities and deservings, allot unto them, as well the supererogation of their spiritual works, as those that abound in worldly goods may give alms of their superfluities to them which are in necessity” (Note on 2 Cor. 8:14).

We need add nothing here. To write the history of the practical working of the doctrine of Supererogation, and of the sale of Indulgences, would be to write the sickening history of Rome’s traffic in the souls of men! Besides, the student will find some additional illustrations, under the twenty-second Article. Meantime let him take the following item of business actually done in one of the departments of this System of Iniquity. Copy of a Paper which was posted up in the churches of Madrid, in Spain: – “The *Sacred and Royal Bank of Piety* has relieved from Purgatory, from its establishment in 1721, to November 1825, 1,030,395 souls, and this has been done at the expense of £1,720;437.” (!!)

Scriptural Proof.

It seems to us almost like a profanation of the Word of God to quote it against supererogation; or attempt to vindicate it from the charge of teaching such an absurd and impious doctrine. Bellarmine bewilders himself in a sea of texts – builds houses of cards, if we may so put it, which his own breath and *petitio principii* demolishes. “Let it be granted” is a lever powerful enough for anything. By it Euclid could sweep away innumerable mathematical absurdities. And by it Rome has filled the world with innumerable profane absurdities. Let it be granted that fallen man can, even under the most favourable conditions, fulfill the law of God; and it

easily follows that he can take up “councils of perfection” by the way – should he be able to find them, which we deny – “*opera Deo gratissima, quae imperata non sint,*” works most pleasing to God which are not commanded! And this verily is the keystone and figment upon which the whole superstructure of Bellarmine and Rome’s ideal doctrine rests. But, Let it not be granted! – as the whole Bible puts it – that there is no man that liveth and sinneth not; then, where is the argument? If, under the Law, the Psalmist could say, “There is none that doeth good, no, not one”; and if, under the Gospel, St. James could say, “In many things we offend, all” – where, we ask, is even the very first step in the ladder of the Doctrine of Supererogation – Individual Sinless Perfection?

And as to the alleged distinction in Scripture between precepts which are binding and counsels which are desirable – a view to which we regret Bishop Browne seems to incline (“The distinction thus early made may have had a legitimate foundation in Holy Writ”) – we shall find it, as we proceed, equally vain, dangerous, and untenable.

But, “Let it be granted,” for the sake of argument, that one man can supererogate in good works for another, and that there are counsels of perfection, What then? To what purpose? Are not the merits of Christ sufficient for the sins of the whole world? Either, confessedly, they are not sufficient, or, God will not accept them. If their infinite value is not sufficient, of what avail is finity added to Infinity? If God will not accept Christ’s merits, how will He, how *can* He accept the merits of man?

Nor does it lessen the absurdity to allege that human merit is rendered efficacious through the merits of Christ. Finity cannot be expanded into infinity; and sin, being transgression against the infinite God, can only be expiated by an infinite atonement.

Besides, and apart in some measure from these considerations, are God’s saints Slaves or Sons? Is salvation the reward of taskwork, or the free and paternal gift of a Heavenly Father of Love?

Crumbling thus as do the ramparts of Rome’s defense at the veriest touch of the analogy of faith and reason, we may not prolong a controversy in dreamland; but content ourselves with citing only a few texts, with a brief note or two on Bellarmine’s perversion of the plain words and meaning of Holy Scripture.

“Can a man be profitable unto God, as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself? (*Marg.* If he may be profitable, doth his good

success depend thereon?) Is it any pleasure to the Almighty, that thou art righteous? or is it gain to him, that thou makest thy ways perfect?" (Job 22:2–3).

"O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord: my goodness extendeth not to thee; but to the saints that are in the earth, and to the excellent, in whom is all my delight" (Psa. 16:2–3). The reader on referring to his Bible will at once see that the "but" here (beginning at verse 3), being printed in italics, is not in the original. And it very materially affects, indeed destroys the sense. Either of the following renderings, preferably perhaps No. 4b, may be adopted: – "As for the saints that are in the earth, and the excellent, all my delight is in them." 2. "As for the saints that are in the earth, they are excellent, in whom is all my delight." 3. "I said to the saints that are in the earth, They are the excellent, in whom is all my delight." 4. Or repeating from the preceding verse, (a) "There is no good beyond Thee to the saints who," etc., as foregoing. (b) "I have no good beyond Thee, belonging as I do to the saints," etc. (See Perowne on the Psalm.)

"None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him: for the redemption of their soul is precious, and it ceaseth forever" (Ps. 99:7–8). We are aware of the literal meaning of this passage, as it stands in the context – that riches cannot redeem from death; but considering the wider context and unbroken consensus of Scripture at large, we cannot but feel that it must be taken as a *doctrinal type* of a far higher and deeper truth – that which our Authorized Version plainly and popularly conveys.

"He that is able to receive it (celibacy), let him receive it" (Matt. 19:12). "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor" (Matt. 19:21). These and their parallel passages are the staple of Bellarmine's argument. It is astonishing how prejudice can cloud the intellect and warp the mind of man. Granted even that all that the Church of Rome so vainly boasts of in her practice, and so excessively urges in her theory, about Celibacy and Voluntary Poverty is true, there is nevertheless not one word in the whole Bible to prove that such vows are counsels, and not precepts. God's moral law cannot change, neither be added to, nor detracted from, either in its matter or its mode of authorization, but is unchangeable as God Himself; and that law throughout is, and must be to the creature, a commandment. The eunuchism of the New Testament then,

was neither on the one hand a counsel of perfection, as Bellarmine idly dreams, nor on the other hand a permission, as Alford negligently assumes, but simply to those who were able to receive it, in the anxieties and “distress” of the infant Church, an imperative necessity. And the Poverty of the New Testament is that practical and ever-abiding Commandment: “Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate: laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life” (1 Tim. 6:17–19). And the only Counsel of Perfection that Rome can claim or prove in the Word of God is that long-suffering Counsel of the Alpha and Omega of all Salvation – the voice of the Faithful and True Witness unto her, as contained in the third chapter of the Book of Revelation: – “Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eye-salve, that thou mayest see.”

“Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect” (Matt. 5:48). It would be derogatory to the nature and attributes of God to give one class of men counsels of perfection, and another class only commandments tending to condemnation; or at best, as Rome herself must confess, with the balance of their strict observance – and this must be ever urged – in favour of death rather than of life. And therefore Infinite Wisdom and Infinite Love thus gives but one precept to all: delivered by our Lord to his disciples directly, but certainly also to “the multitudes” on the Mount, and therefore to universal man.

“Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do” (Luke 17:9–10). A test in itself sufficient to demolish the whole unhallowed structure of Rome’s imposture of Supererogation.

Article XV.

History and Doctrine – Scriptural Proof.

Of Christ alone without Sin. – Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except; from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh and in His spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by the sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin (as St. John saith) was not in Him. But all we the rest, although baptized and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things. And if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

De Christo, qui solus est sine Peccato. – Christus in nostrae naturae veritate, per omnia similis factus est nobis, excepto peccato, a quo prorsus erat immunis, tum in carne, tum in spiritu. Venit ut agnus, absque macula, qui mundi peccata per immolationem sui semel factam tolleret, et peccatum (ut inquit Johannes) in es non erat. Sed nos reliqui etiam baptizati, et in Christo regenerati, in multis tamen offendimus omnes. Et si dixerimus, quia peccatum non habemus nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.

History and Doctrine.

The History and Doctrine of our Article will more conveniently be taken together. It is levelled at three less or more deadly errors: –

First. The Impeccability of Man, as held by the Pelagians. But as this has been fully discussed, it need not be again here entered upon.

We may, however, notice an objection. Perfection is frequently predicated of individuals in Scripture. Yea, our Lord urges all to be “perfect”. Is absolute perfection then not attainable in this life? We can only decidedly answer in the negative.

“Noah,” as we are told, “was a just man and perfect in his generations, and walked with God.” But no sooner was he saved from the Flood, and the Covenant of God established with him and all flesh, than we read: “And Noah began to be an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard: and he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent.” Job was “perfect and upright,” but when his “eye saw God,” he “abhorred himself and repented in dust and ashes.” David was “a man after God’s own heart,” the chosen medium too of some of the most searching as well as many of the sweetest and most saving utterances of inspiration; yet guilty of the most aggravated sin against light and conviction. Zacharias was “righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless,” yet struck dumb, because he believed not the message of God. Perfection then in Scripture, when attributed to man, must have some other meaning than absolute freedom from sin; and

can only denote sincerity, wholeheartedness, earnestness in the service of God, comparative uprightness, evangelical integrity, and the like.

Second. The Peccability of Christ, on the ground of His being a mere man, as alleged by the Socinians. Having already sufficiently proved the Divinity of our Lord, and examined the doctrine of the Atonement, against these heretics, we might also safely pass on, by referring the reader to our argument. But a word or two may be added.

(1.) Christ being God, as we have seen, yea “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world,” it follows as a self-evident proposition that, “In Him is no sin” (1 John 3:5).

(2.) Human Nature, in the history of fallen man, is a synonym for and an equivalent of sin. But human nature is not essentially sin. Being God’s immediate handiwork, it must be holy and good; and sin therefore an accident to all intents and purposes, and no integral part thereof whatever. “Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions” (Eccles. 7:29). “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them” (Gen. 1:27). And even Birth sin is declared by our ninth Article to be “the fault and corruption of our nature”.

(3.) Christ was not only the second Adam – the last Head and Representative of our race, but also the Lord from Heaven (1 Cor. 15:47). In the former capacity, He necessarily subjected Himself to all the sinless accidents of our nature – temptation and suffering; in the latter character, He was as necessarily “without guile”.

(4.) “There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.” But though the organism of the one involves mortality, the attributes of the other have no necessary connection with evil. And it was thus precisely that our first parents originally stood. A condition which shows at least there is nothing either new or unnatural in the catholic opinion of our Saviour’s absolute sinlessness. While on the other hand, to substantiate His peccability as being a mere man demands more than bare abstract reasoning. We must have distinct proof of sin, or inclination to sin – a proposition which no heretic has yet ventured to put forth.

(5.) But Christ, being liable to temptation, incurred also a liability to sin, otherwise a liability to temptation could have no value, nor the conditions of Adam and our race been fulfilled. But this liability to sin, in the human nature of Christ, was met by that other complement of His

Person, the Divine nature. Just as in the garden there was provided for Adam the Tree of Life, of Divine virtue to secure him against mortality, and of Divine influence we doubt not, to secure him also against sin. Nor was it until man had sinned, that the Tree of Life was denied him. For the word of Scripture is express, “And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat [Heb. eating thou shalt eat]: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die” (Gen. 2:16–17). The true history then of the Fall is not only that Adam ate of the Tree that had been forbidden him; but that while within his reach, he neglected or despised to eat of the Tree of Life, which God had not forbidden him, but graciously set before him, and. “commanded” him “freely to eat”. A bond thus mercifully linking him, and inviting him, without forcing his will, to heaven and to God; which bond willfully he broke, and so brought sin and death willfully into the world. And in all this we may see a counterpart, though by contrast, of our Saviour: the pure will of the first Adam willfully inclining to evil; the pure will of the second Adam willfully inclining to good.

(6.) And herein too we behold a still deeper phase of the trial of our Lord. With all the appalling burden of sin upon Him, and the desertion of God, how He came near, and inevitably so? in that solemnest moment of all time, “Let this Cup pass from Me!” to fail? But anon, blessed be His glorious Name, resolutely and triumphantly sprang back from the grasp of the hour and power of Darkness – “Nevertheless, not My will, but Thine, be done!”

(7.) “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree” (1 Peter 2:24). And yet, “He never did (εποίησεν – Aorist = in one single instance) sin, neither was guile ever found in his mouth” (verse 22). Not only negatively but also positively innocent. Just so. The vicarious work of our Great Redeemer brought him into no moral contact with, nor contract from Sin. Nor indeed is there anything in the nature of the vicarious atonement to impart *per se* other than representative defilement. The clean animal, under the law, though substituted for the guilty man, and with that man’s iniquities laid upon it, was nevertheless *de facto* clean still, just as much as before: in other words, the symbolical defilement contracted did not in the nature of the case, and could not impregnate with moral uncleanness the dumb and irresponsible creature. Besides, the very idea of

expiation is surely the very opposite of superadded offence. And the Vicarious Atonement of our Lord, being to expiate human transgression, so as to make at one God and man – or rather, to “bring the forgiveness of transgressors into harmony with all the perfections of the Godhead” – the Divine Atoner, not only as Divine, but as Atoner, must, consequently, be “the Lamb without Spot.”

(8.) Scripture Testimonies.

Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except]

“And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us” (John 1:14). “His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and manifested with power (to be) the Son of God, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead” (Rom. 13:4). “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of blood and flesh, he himself also in like manner took part in the same, that by means of his death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil” (Heb. 2:14). “Who never did sin, neither was guile ever found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but delivered up [All? – Himself, His cause, His murderers] to him that judgeth righteously” (1 Peter 2:22–23). “For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:13). “For such an high priest became us, holy, harmless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens” (Heb. 7:26).

Third. The Romish Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Of the parentage, the life, or the death of the Virgin, we know little or nothing. Scripture only clearly reveals the two important points – that she was the mother of our Lord, and had a right, acquired by marriage with Joseph, to be counted of the seed of David: though it is very highly probable that she was also, by blood, of the royal line. And with scarcely anything of figure, we may say, that is all. True, we have the Magnificat – a hymn which shows devout study of the Holy Scriptures; but the mercy of God her Saviour is the keynote and the theme of this Song of this Virgin: and Salvation and Mercy are not for the Righteous, but for Sinners called to Repentance. Then too on the four occasions when we find our Lord addressing her (in the Temple, at Cana, Capernaum, the Cross), there is, except the last, a less or more distinct undertone of reproof.

Dr. Philip Schaff's concise but exhaustive summaries, culled from various reliable sources, upon the Worship of Mary, though covering somewhat more ground than our subject, are well worthy of perusal, and will form a fitting close to our Article.

“The Exaltation of the Virgin – Mariology.

“The worship of Mary was originally only a reflection of the worship of Christ, and the feasts of Mary were designed to contribute to the glorifying of Christ. The system arose from the inner connection of the Virgin with the holy mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God; though certainly, with this leading religious and theological interest other motives combined. As mother of the Saviour of the world, the Virgin Mary unquestionably holds forever a peculiar position among all women, and in the history of redemption. Even in heaven she must stand peculiarly near to him whom on earth she bore nine months under her bosom, and whom she followed with true motherly care to the cross. It is perfectly natural, nay, essential, to sound religious feeling, to associate with Mary the fairest traits of maidenly and maternal character, and to revere her as the highest model of female purity, love, and piety. From her example issues a silent blessing upon all generations, and her name and memory are, and ever will be, inseparable from the holiest mysteries and benefits of faith. For this reason her name is even wrought into the Apostles' Creed, in the simple and chaste words: ‘Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.’

“The Catholic Church, however, both Latin and Greek, did not stop with this. After the middle of the fourth century it overstepped the wholesome Biblical limit, and transformed the ‘mother of the Lord’ into a mother of God, the humble ‘handmaid of the Lord’ into a queen of heaven, the ‘highly favoured’ into a dispenser of favours, the ‘blessed among women’ into an intercessor above all women, nay, we may almost say, the redeemed daughter of fallen Adam, who is nowhere in Holy Scripture excepted from the universal sinfulness, into a sinlessly holy co-redeemer. At first she was acquitted only of actual sin, afterwards even of original; though the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin was long contested, and was not established as an article of faith in the Roman Church till 1854. Thus the veneration of Mary gradually degenerated into the worship of Mary; and this took so deep hold upon the popular religious life in the Middle Age, that, in spite of all scholastic distinctions between

latria and *dulia*, and *hyperdulia*, Mariolatry practically prevailed over the worship of Christ. Hence in the innumerable Madonnas of Catholic art the human mother is the principal figure, and the divine child accessory. The Romish devotions scarcely utter a *Pater Noster* without an *Ave Maria*, and turn even more frequently and naturally to the compassionate, tender-hearted mother for her intercessions, than to the eternal Son of God, thinking that in this indirect way the desired gift is more sure to be obtained. To this day the worship of Mary is one of the principal points of separation between the Graeco-Roman Catholicism and Evangelical Protestantism. It is one of the strongest expressions of the fundamental Romish error of unduly exalting the human factors or instruments of redemption, and obstructing, or rendering needless, the immediate access of believers to Christ, by thrusting in subordinate mediators. Nor can we but agree with nearly all unbiassed historians in regarding the worship of Mary as an echo of ancient heathenism. It brings plainly to mind the worship of Ceres, of Isis, and of other ancient mothers of the gods, as the worship of saints and angels recalls the hero worship of Greece and Rome. Polytheism was so deeply rooted among the people, that it reproduced itself in Christian forms. The popular religious want had accustomed itself even to female deities, and very naturally betook itself first of all to Mary, the highly favoured and blessed mother of the divine-human Redeemer, as the worthiest object of adoration.

“Let us trace now the main features in the historical development of the Catholic Mariology and Mariolatry.

“The New Testament contains no intimation of any worship or festival celebration of Mary. On the one hand, Mary is rightly called by Elizabeth, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, ‘the mother of *the Lord*’ – but nowhere ‘the mother of *God*,’ which is at least not entirely synonymous – and is saluted by her, as well as by the angel Gabriel, as ‘blessed among women’; nay, she herself prophesies in her inspired song, which has since resounded through all ages of the church, that ‘henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.’ Through all the youth of Jesus she appears as a devout virgin, full of childlike innocence, purity, and humility; and the few traces we have of her later life, especially the touching scene at the cross, confirm this impression. But, on the other hand, it is equally unquestionable, that she is nowhere in the New Testament excepted from the universal sinfulness and the universal need of redemption, and

represented as immaculately holy, or as in any way an object of divine veneration. On the contrary, true to the genuine female character, she modestly stands back throughout the gospel history, and in the Acts and the Epistles she is mentioned barely once, and then simply as the ‘mother of Jesus’; even her birth and her death are unknown. Her glory fades in holy humility before the higher glory of her Son. In truth, there are plain indications that the Lord, with prophetic reference to the future apotheosis of his mother according to the flesh, from the first gave warning against it. At the wedding in Cana he administered to her, though leniently and respectfully, a rebuke for premature zeal mingled perhaps with maternal vanity. On a subsequent occasion he put her on a level with other female disciples, and made carnal consanguinity subordinate to the spiritual kinship of the doing of the will of God. The well-meant and in itself quite innocent benediction of an unknown woman upon His mother He did not indeed censure, but He corrected it with a benediction upon all who hear the word of God and keep it, and thus forestalled the deification of Mary by confining the ascription within the bounds of moderation.

“In striking contrast with this healthful and sober representation of Mary in the canonical Gospels are the numerous apocryphal Gospels of the third and fourth centuries, which decorate the life of Mary with fantastic fables and wonders of every kind, and thus furnished a pseudo-historical foundation for an unscriptural Mariology and Mariolatry. The Catholic church, it is true, condemned this apocryphal literature so early as the Decrees of Gelasius; yet many of the fabulous elements of it – such as the names of the parents of Mary, Joachim (instead of Eli, as in Luke 3:23) and Anna, the birth of Mary in a cave, her education in the Temple, and her *mock* marriage with the aged Joseph – passed into the Catholic tradition.

“The development of the orthodox Catholic Mariology and Mariolatry originated as early as the second century in an allegorical interpretation of the history of the Fall, and in the assumption of an antithetic relation of Eve and Mary, according to which the mother of Christ occupies the same position in the history of redemption as the “The New Testament contains no intimation of any worship or wife of Adam in the history of sin and death. This idea, so fruitful of many errors, is ingenious, but unscriptural, and an apocryphal substitute for the true Pauline doctrine of an antitypical parallel between the first and second Adam. It tends to substitute Mary for Christ. Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, are the

first who present Mary as the counterpart of Eve, as a ‘mother of all living’ in the higher, spiritual sense, and teach that she became through her obedience the mediate or instrumental cause of the blessings of redemption to the human race, as Eve by her disobedience was the fountain of sin and death. Irenaeus calls her also the ‘advocate of the virgin Eve,’ which, at a later day, is understood in the sense of intercessor. On this account this father stands as the oldest leading authority in the Catholic Mariology; though with only partial justice; for he was still widely removed from the notion of the sinlessness of Mary, and expressly declares the answer of Christ in John 2:4 to be a reproof of her premature haste. In the same way Tertullian, Origen, Basil the Great, and even Chrysostom, with all their high estimate of the mother of our Lord, ascribe to her on one or two occasions (John 2:3, Matt. 13:47) maternal vanity, also doubt and anxiety, and make this the sword (Luke 2:35) which, under the cross, passed through her soul.

“In addition to this typological antithesis of Mary and Eve, the rise of monasticism supplied the development of Mariology a further motive in the enhanced estimate of virginity, without which no true holiness could be conceived. Hence the virginity of Mary, which is unquestioned for the part of her life before the birth of Christ, came to be extended to her whole life, and her marriage with the aged Joseph to be regarded as a mere protectorate, and therefore only a *nominal* marriage. The passage, Matt. 1:25, which, according to its obvious literal meaning (the ἕως and πρωτότοκος;), seems to favour the opposite view, was overlooked or otherwise explained, and the brothers of Jesus, who appear fourteen or fifteen times in the gospel history and always in close connection with his mother, were regarded not as sons of Mary subsequently born, but either as sons of Joseph by a former marriage (the view of Epiphanius), or, agreeably to the wider Hebrew use of the term אח, as cousins of Jesus (Jerome).* It was felt – and this feeling is shared by many devout Protestants – to be irreconcilable with her dignity and the dignity of Christ, that ordinary children should afterward proceed from the same womb out of which the Saviour of the world was born. The name *perpetua virgo*, αει παρθένος, was thenceforth a peculiar and inalienable predicate of Mary. After the fourth century it was taken not merely in a moral sense, but in the physical also, as meaning that Mary conceived and produced the Lord *clauso utero*. This, of course, required the supposition of a miracle, like the passage of the risen Jesus through the closed doors. Mary, therefore, in the Catholic view, stands

entirely alone in the history of the world in this respect, as in others: that she was a married virgin, a wife never touched by her husband.

*[“They are always called ἀδελφοί (four in number, James, Joseph or Joses, Simon, and Jude), and ἀδελφαί (at least two), Matt. 12:46–47, 13:55–56; Mark 3:31–32, 6:3; John 7:3, 5, 10; Acts 1:14, etc., but nowhere ἀδελφοί, *cousins*, a term well known to the New Testament vocabulary (Col. 4:10), or συγγενεις, *kinsmen* (Mark 6:4, Luke 1:36, 58; 2:44; John 18:26, Acts 10:24), or υἱοὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς, *sister’s sons* (Acts 23:26). This speaks strongly against the cousin theory.”]

“Epiphanius, in his seventy-eighth Heresy, combats the advocates of the opposite view in Arabia toward the end of the fourth century (367), as heretics under the title of *Antidikomarianites*, opposers of the dignity of Mary, i.e., of her perpetual virginity. But on the other hand, he condemns, in the seventy-ninth Heresy, the contemporaneous sect of the *Collyridians* in Arabia, a set of fanatical women, who as priestesses rendered divine worship to Mary, and, perhaps in imitation of the worship of Ceres, offered little cakes (κολλυρίδες) to her; he claims adoration for God and Christ alone. Jerome wrote, about 383, with indignation and bitterness against Helvidius and Jovinian, who, citing Scripture passages and earlier church teachers, like Tertullian, maintained that Mary bore children to Joseph after the birth of Christ. He saw in this doctrine a desecration of the temple of the Holy Ghost, and he even compares Helvidius to Erostratus, the destroyer of the temple at Ephesus. The Bishop of Bonosus of Sardicia was condemned for the same view by the Illyrican bishops, and the Roman bishop Siricius approved the sentence, A.D. 392.

“Augustine went a step further. In an incidental remark against Pelagius, he agreed with him in excepting Mary, ‘*propter honorem Domini,*’ from actual (but not from original) sin. This exception he is willing to make from the universal sinfulness of the race, but no other. He taught the sinless birth and life of Mary, but not her immaculate conception. He no doubt assumed, as afterwards Bernard of Clairvaux and Thomas Aquinas, a *sanctificatio in utero*, like that of Jeremiah (Jer. 1:5), and John the Baptist (Luke 1:15), whereby, as those two men were fitted for their prophetic office, she in a still higher degree was sanctified by a special operation of the Holy Ghost before her birth, and prepared to be a pure receptacle for the divine Logos. The reasoning of Augustine backward from the holiness of Christ to the holiness of his mother was an important turn, which was afterward pursued to further results. The same reasoning leads as easily to the doctrine of the *immaculate conception* of Mary, though also, just as

well, to a sinless mother of Mary herself, and thus upward to the beginning of the race, to another Eve who never fell. Augustine's opponent, Pelagius, with his monastic, ascetic idea of holiness and his superficial doctrine of sin, remarkably outstripped him on this point, ascribing to Mary *perfect* sinlessness. But, it should be remembered, that his denial of *original* sin to *all* men, and his excepting of sundry saints of the Old Testament besides Mary, such as Abel, Enoch, Abraham, Isaac, Melchizedek, Samuel, Elijah, Daniel, from *actual* sin, so that πάντες in Rom. 5:12, in his view, means only a majority, weaken the honour he thus appears to confer upon the mother of the Lord. The Augustinian view long continued to prevail; but at last Pelagius won the victory on this point in the Roman church. ["The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary was, for the first time after Pelagius, plainly brought forward in 1140 at Lyons, but was opposed by Bernard of Clairvaux (Ep. 174), and thence continued an avowed issue between the Franciscans and Dominicans, till it gained the victory in the papal bull of 1854 by Pope Pius IX."]

“Notwithstanding this exalted representation of Mary, there appear no clear traces of a proper worship of Mary, as distinct from the worship of saints in general, until the Nestorian controversy of 430. This dispute formed an important turning point not only in Christology, but in Mariology also. The leading interest in it was, without doubt, the connection of the virgin with the mystery of the incarnation. The perfect union of the divine and human natures seemed to demand that Mary might be called in *some* sense the mother of God, θεοτόκος, *Deipara*; for that which was born of her was not merely the man Jesus, but the *God-Man* Jesus Christ. The church, however, did, of course, not intend by that to assert that she was the mother of the uncreated divine essence – for this would be palpably absurd and blasphemous – nor that she herself was divine, but only that she was the human point of entrance or the mysterious channel for the eternal divine Logos. Athanasius and the Alexandrian church teachers of the Nicene age, who pressed the unity of the divine and the human in Christ to the verge of Monophysitism, had already used this expression frequently and without scruple, and Gregory Nazianzen even declares every one impious who denies its validity. Nestorius, on the contrary, and the Antiochian school, who were more devoted to the distinction of the two natures in Christ, took offence at the predicate θεοτόκος, saw in it a relapse into the heathen mythology, if not a blasphemy against the eternal and unchangeable Godhead, and prefaced the expression Χριστοτόκος, *mater Christi*. Upon

this broke out the violent controversy between him and the bishop, Cyril of Alexandria, which ended in the condemnation of Nestorianism at Ephesus in 431.

“Thenceforth the θεοτόκος was a test of orthodox Christology, and the rejection of it amounted to the beginning or the end of all heresy. The overthrow of Nestorianism was at the same time the victory of Mary-worship. With the honour of the Son, the honour also of the Mother was secured. The opponents of Nestorius, especially Proclus, his successor in Constantinople († 447), and Cyril of Alexandria († 444), could scarcely find predicates enough to express the transcendent glory of the mother of God. She was the crown of virginity, the indestructible temple of God, the dwelling-place of the Holy Trinity, the paradise of the second Adam, the bridge from God to man, the loom of the incarnation, the scepter of orthodoxy; through her the Trinity is glorified and adored, the devil and demons are put to flight, the nations converted, and the fallen creature raised to heaven. The people were all on the side of the Ephesian decision, and gave vent to their joy in boundless enthusiasm, amidst bonfires, processions, and illuminations.

“With this the worship of Mary, the mother of God, the queen of heaven, seemed to be solemnly established for all time. But soon a reaction appeared in favour of Nestorianism, and the church found it necessary to condemn the opposite extreme of Eutychianism or Monophysitism. This was the office of the council of Chalcedon in 451: to give expression to the element of truth in Nestorianism, the duality of nature in the one divine-human person of Christ. Nevertheless the θεοτόκος was expressly retained, though it originated in a rather monophysite view.

“*Mariolatry.*”

“This much respecting the *doctrine* of Mary. Now the corresponding practice. From this Mariology follows Mariolatry. If Mary is, in the *strict* sense of the word, the mother of God, it seems to follow as a logical consequence, that she herself is divine, and therefore an object of divine worship. This was not, indeed, the meaning and purpose of the ancient church; as, in fact, it never asserted that Mary was the mother of the essential, eternal divinity of the Logos. She was, and continues to be, a created being, a human mother, even according to the Roman and Greek doctrine. But according to the once prevailing conception of her peculiar

relation to deity; a certain degree of divine homage to Mary, and some invocation of her powerful intercession with God, seemed unavoidable, and soon became a universal practice.

“The first instance of the formal invocation of Mary occurs in the passages of Ephraim Syrus († 379), addressed to Mary and the saints, and attributed by the tradition of the Syrian church, though perhaps in part incorrectly, to that author. The first more certain example appears in Gregory Nazianzen (t 389), who, in his eulogy on Cyprian, relates of Justina that she besought the Virgin Mary to protect her threatened virginity, and at the same time disfigured her beauty by ascetic self-tortures, and thus fortunately escaped the amours of a youthful lover (Cyprian before his conversion). But, on the other hand, the numerous writings of Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, and Augustine furnish no example of an invocation of Mary. Epiphanius even condemned the adoration of Mary, and calls the practice of making offerings to her by the Collyridian women blasphemous and dangerous to the soul. The entire silence of history respecting the worship of the Virgin down to the end of the fourth century, proves clearly that it was foreign to the original spirit of Christianity, and belongs among the many innovations of the post-Nicene age.

“In the beginning of the fifth century, however, the worship of saints appeared in full bloom, and then Mary, by reason of her singular relation to the Lord, was soon placed at the head, as the most blessed queen of the heavenly host. To her was accorded the *hyperdulia* (υπερδουλεία) – to anticipate here the later scholastic distinction sanctioned by the council of Trent – that is, the highest degree of veneration, in distinction from mere *dulia* (δουλεία), which belongs to all saints and angels, and from *latria* (λατρεία), which properly speaking is due to God alone. From that time numerous churches and altars were dedicated to the Holy Mother of God, the perpetual Virgin; among them also the church at Ephesus in which the anti-Nestorian council of 431 had sat. Justinian I, in a law, implored her intercession with God for the restoration of the Roman empire, and on the dedication of the costly altar of the church of St. Sophia he expected all blessings for church and empire from her powerful prayers. His general, Narses, like the knights in the Middle Age, was unwilling to go into battle till he had secured her protection. Pope Boniface IV in 608 turned the Pantheon in Rome into a temple of Mary *ad martyres*: the pagan Olympus into a Christian heaven of gods. Subsequently even her images (made after

an original pretending to have come from Luke) were divinely worshipped, and, in the prolific legends of the superstitious Middle Age, performed countless miracles, before some of which the miracles of the gospel history grow dim. She became almost coordinate with Christ, a joint redeemer, invested with most of his own attributes and acts of grace. The popular belief ascribed to her, as to Christ, a sinless conception, a sinless birth, resurrection and ascension to heaven, and a participation of all power in heaven and on earth. She became the center of devotion, cultus, and art, the popular symbol of power, of glory, and of the final victory of Catholicism over all heresies. The Greek and Roman churches vied throughout the Middle Age (and do so still) in the apotheosis of the human mother with the divine-human child Jesus in her arms, till the Reformation freed a large part of Latin Christendom from this unscriptural semi-idolatry, and concentrated the affection and adoration of believers upon the crucified and risen Saviour of the world, the only Mediator between God and man.

“A word more: respecting the favourite prayer to Mary, the angelic greeting, or the *Ave Maria*, which in the Catholic devotion runs parallel to the *Pater Noster*. It takes its name from the initial words of the salutation of Gabriel to the Holy Virgin at the annunciation of the birth of Christ. It consists of three parts:

“(1.) The salutation of the angel (Luke 1:28): –

“*Ave Maria, gratiae plena Dominus tecum!*

“(2.) The words of Elizabeth (Luke 1:42): –

“*Benedicta tu in mulieribus, et benedictus fructus ventris tui, Jesus.*

“(3.) The later unscriptural addition, which contains the prayer proper, and is offensive to the Protestant and all sound Christian feeling: –

“*Sancta Maria, mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc et in hora mortis. Amen.*

“Formerly this third part, which gave the formula the character of a prayer, was traced back to the anti-Nestorian council of Ephesus in 431, which sanctioned the expression *mater Dei*, or *Dei genitrix* (θεοτόκος). But Roman archaeologists now concede that it is a much later addition, made in the beginning of the sixteenth century (1508), and that the closing words, *nunc et in hora mortis*, were added even after that time by the Franciscans. But even the first two parts did not come into general use as a standing formula of prayer until the thirteenth century. From that date the *Ave Maria* stands in the Roman Church upon a level with the Lord’s Prayer and the

Apostles' Creed, and with them forms the basis of the rosary" ("History of the Christian Church," vol. ii. sects. 81, 82).

Article XVI.

History and Doctrine, With Scriptural Proof.

Of Sin after Baptism. – Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may rise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

De Peccato post Baptismum. – Non omne peccatum mortale post Baptismum voluntarie perpetratum, est peccatum in Spiritum Sanctum, et irremissibile. Proinde lapsis a Baptismo in peccata, locus poenitentiae non est negandus. Post acceptum Spiritum Sanctum possumus a gratia data recedere atque peccare, dennoque per gratiam Dei resurgere ac resipiscere; ideoque illi damnandi sunt, qui se, quamdiu hic vivant, amplius non posse peccare affirmant, aut vere recipiscentibus veniae locum denegant.

If we gather up the threads of the previous Article there should be little difficulty in discussing the present one. We have seen that, from grace to glory, the steps or stages are in a measure distinct and separate, yet beautifully harmonizing to the one great and glorious consummation. There is no chasm in the Divine plan, whatever temporary breaks there may be on the human side. Man may and does fall, but the grace of God fails never. His "work" begins with Foreknowledge, and ends with triumphant Glorification. And it could not be otherwise in the hands of the Master Builder. Every stone is squared and unerringly adjusted by Divine wisdom, and laid by the unfailing hands of Divine power. The only element of variation is, His "fullness of time". But whether rapidly or otherwise, the spiritual temple is surely completed, with shoutings of grace, grace unto it.

And here, we think, is an ample answer to the question, "What of sin committed after grace given?" No lapse of God's elected children can be final: otherwise, there would be a *lapse* in God's Omniscience, Omnipotence, Love.

And this indeed might satisfy in the main the greater portion of our Article, were it not that Bishop Browne in his Exposition thrusts in the

doctrine of final perseverance, to attack it; though it is really not within the scope of the Article, nor even touched upon by it.

Our course therefore is clear. To consider – I. The Novatian and Anabaptist errors, against which the Article is levelled. II. Bishop Browne’s attack upon the Doctrine of Final Perseverance. III. The Sin against the Holy Ghost.

I. The Novatian and Anabaptist Errors, against which the Article is levelled.

The Novatians and others, in the early times of the Church, denied communion to those who had lapsed in persecution, or been guilty of heinous sin; and these severe and ascetic opinions were less or more reasserted by the Anabaptists at the period of the Reformation.

Novatian, a presbyter of Rome, in the third century, abetted by Novatus, a presbyter of Carthage, succeeded in founding a new sect, called after his own name, and of which he became the first Bishop. He seems to have been a man naturally of rigid and austere temperament, strengthened and matured by addiction to Stoicism. The sect was not strictly heretical, but differed chiefly from the Church, in the above-mentioned tenets; as also in rebaptizing proselytes from the Catholics, on the ground that their sacraments were invalid, inasmuch as they admitted (after penitence) the lapsed. But it does not appear, notwithstanding the assertion of Eusebius to the contrary, that Novatian denied to the fallen all hope of salvation.

It were long, and perhaps somewhat uninteresting, now that there is no controversy on the subject, to quote at any great length the writings of the Fathers. But the following passages may be taken as an index, in general, of their opinions: –

Clement of Rome: “Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and see how precious is his blood with God, which, being shed for our salvation, hath obtained the grace of repentance for the whole world” (Ep. Ia ad Corinth.).

Cyprian: “We ought to mourn with those that mourn, and to weep with those that weep, and, as far as we are able, to raise them up again by the aid and the consolation of our love, and neither, on the one hand, be over harsh and pertinacious in rejecting their repentance, nor, on the other hand, over ready and easy in hastily conceding the rights of communion. Behold, a brother lies wounded in battle by the adversary. On the one side the devil strives to kill whom he hath wounded; on the other Christ exhorts

him, whom he hath redeemed, not to perish entirely. Which of the two shall we assist, on which side shall we place ourselves? shall we favour the devil that he may destroy, and, like the priest and Levites in the Gospel, shall we pass by our brother who lies half dead? or as priests of God, and Christ, imitating what Christ both taught and did, shall we snatch the wounded from the jaws of the adversary, that we may reserve him, being cured, for God his judge?" (Ep. lii. ad Antonian.)

Again: "But I wonder that there are some so obstinate as not to think repentance ought to be given to such as are fallen, or suppose that pardon should be denied to penitents, when it is written, 'Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the just works'" (Idem, *ibid.*).

Chrysostom: "That he (Judas) might have been saved, if he had lived, is plain from those that crucified our Saviour. For if he saved those that lifted him up on the cross, and, when he was on the cross itself, besought the Father, and asked for pardon for their so great wickedness, it is manifest that he would also have received the traitor, with all kindness, if he had shown his repentance in a becoming manner; but he being overwhelmed with excessive grief, was not able to persevere in the remedy" (Hom. de Poenitentia).

Augustine: "For if ignorance only obtained pardon, and ignorance is not accepted but only before a man be baptized, not only if he speak a word against the Holy Ghost after baptism, but also if he speak against the Son of Man, and moreover if he defile himself with fornication, homicide, or any other sin or fault after baptism, he cannot be cured by repentance. Which such as hold, are excluded from the catholic communion, and it is judged that they cannot be partakers of God's mercy so long as they continue in that cruelty" (Exposit. Epist. ad Rom. inchoat.).

Again: "That the love of our neighbour, that is, the love of man, even unto the love of our enemy, the Lord himself commendeth to us; and we see how many that are baptized both acknowledge them to be true, and reverence them as the commands of the Lord. But when they undergo the enmities of anyone, they are so inflamed with the desire of revenge, that they burn with such flames of hatred, that they cannot be appeased though the Gospel itself be read and recited to them; and the churches are full of such men already baptized; whom, notwithstanding, spiritual men will not cease in a brotherly way to admonish, and, with the spirit of meekness, they constantly instruct, that they would be ready to meet and resist such

temptations, and that they would love rather to reign in the peace of Christ, than to rejoice in the presence of an enemy; which would be done in vain, if there was no hope of pardon nor cure of repentance left for such sins” (Idem, *ibid.*).

These passages then not only admit “the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent,” but they also, as will be apparent, condemn, by implication, those “which say they can no more sin as long as they live here.”

Origen, however, and perhaps also Clement of Alexandria, after Hennis, would seem to have been exceptions to the clemency of the primitive Church, in their severity to the fallen: and so probably paved the way for the Novatian schism.

For the judgment of the modern Church, we cannot do better than refer the reader to our own English Homilies; especially that “Of Repentance,” which should be read throughout.

The Scriptural Proof is abundant, so that he that runs may read it; and need not long detain us.

David sinned, and after sincere repentance, was restored unto the joy of God’s salvation. Peter denied his Lord and Master; yea, “all the disciples forsook him, and fled”: and yet by these frail, fallen, and raised sinners was the Church of God founded. The incestuous man, whom St. Paul ordered, in First Corinthians, to be excommunicated, is, in Second Corinthians, to be admitted again to communion, “lest perhaps such an one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.”

But in fact the Old Testament and the New condemn throughout those who say they can no more sin, or who deny forgiveness to the penitent –

The standing sacrifice under the Law, meant the remission from day to day of sin; just as under the Gospel, the Lord’s Prayer teaches us to ask for daily forgiveness of sins daily committed.

The Book of Judges is a history in detail of Israel’s sins, repentances, and God’s forgivenesses.

“For thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel, In returning and rest shall ye be saved. But ye said, No – therefore shall they that pursue you be swift, till ye be left as a beacon upon the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on an hill. And therefore will the Lord wait, that he may be gracious unto you, and therefore will he be exalted, that he may have mercy upon you” (Isa. 30:15–19). “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy

upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon” (Isa. 55:7). “It may be that the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I purpose to do unto them; that they may return every man from his evil way; that I may forgive their iniquity and their sin” (Jer. 36:3). “Therefore, O thou son of man, speak unto the house of Israel, Thus ye speak, saying, If our transgressions and our sins be upon us, and we pine away in them, how should we then live? Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die, O house of Israel? Therefore, thou son of man, say unto the children of thy people, The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression: as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness; neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth. When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it. Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die: if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right – none of his sins that he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him: he hath done that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live” (Ez. 33:10–14, 16). “And God saw their (the Ninevites’) works, that they turned from their evil way, and God repented of the evil, that he had said that he would do unto them: and he did it not” (Jonah 3:10). “Take heed to yourselves: If thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him” (Luke 17:3–4). “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (1 John 1:9). “Brethren, if a man be even surprised (και προλημφοθη – *caught in the act*) in any transgression, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted” (Gal. 6:1). “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.” – “If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.” – “The Blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin” (1 John 1:8, 10, 7).

True, there are fearful denunciation in Holy Scripture against those who, having received a knowledge of the truth and been subjects of the

common influences and operations of the Spirit of God, finally and wickedly apostatize and maliciously reject the Gospel, and become the avowed enemies of Christ; but these passages belong rather to the discussion of The Sin against the Holy Ghost.

II. Bishop Browne's Attack upon Final Perseverance with some Defence of the Doctrine.

(1.) What comfort is there in the thought that this moment I may be in a state of salvation, and the next that I may be in a state of damnation?

(2.) To bring the matter home to Bishop Browne's own matured reflection, to ourselves, and to our readers, what, if this be the Gospel, is Christianity worth? A child and an heir of God today, and a child and an *heir* of the Devil tomorrow! That Christ died, and shed His precious Blood, at *less* than a venture! What can be the peace of God in believing? What the basis of the hope of glory? How can "we know (*οἶδαμεν* – *objectively*, real, certain, knowledge) that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens?" (2 Cor. 5:1).

These are not light questions, nor are they lightly put. They go to the root of the whole matter. They go to determine for or against the rampant infidelity of the day. It is useless any longer in this practical age to shirk the momentous inquiry, Beyond merely civil and temporal purposes, is Christianity, or is it not, an *Ignis Fatuus*? A slippery ground for things spiritual and eternal, and the sooner we are off it the better? The Rationalists of Germany and England taunt us, and sneer outright at our subjective evidence. And sooner or later will the enemy lure over the masses, unless we can and do bring forward in all its force and power, the objective testimony of the Gospel of the Grace of God – that omnipotent sword of the Spirit which first planted the Cross in Heathendom. One missionary field won, at home or abroad, yea one soul converted from the error of his ways is worth more, is a harder argument, than all the sentiment and feelings of Christendom. The "we know" of St. Paul stops the mouths of lions, and sends terror into the hosts of hell. To the Church then we would say, and to the individual professor, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and *Christ shall give thee LIGHT*" – shine upon thee in fresh victories even in these cloudy and dark days: in rich harvests of

enduring and everlasting glory: in ever-abounding living demonstrations of the Indefectibility of Divine Grace.

(3.) Bishop Browne is less happy in dealing with this subject than with some others. If in these matters we are compelled to adopt the language of criticism, we can only say that the Bishop strings together a number of texts; picks a hole in one; generalizes others; and permits himself to be led away to side issues. The question is not whether many who make a zealous profession of religion may not fall away and be lost. The real question is, Can the elect children of God finally and totally fall away from all grace? Can the sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost be utterly blotted out from the soul? To these and like inquiries the Bishop gives us no pertinent and clear answer. Thus he writes: “Though the true (?) sheep of Christ never perish, yet some (?) may, like Judas, be given Him for a time, and yet finally be sons of perdition.” This sentence certainly is confused and misleading. If the “true sheep of Christ never perish,” we are at one with the Bishop. But how are we to read “some may”? If it means some of the true sheep, it simply stultifies the foregoing assertion. But if it only means some sheep, *not the true*, finally become sons of perdition, there is no controversy. It is the history of all ages, that discipleship is no warranty in itself of heirship.

Again: “God is faithful and will never repent of His mercy to us; and if we do not willfully leave Him, no created power shall be able to pluck us out of His hand.” Here the whole question of salvation plainly rests with *man*. If we persist in good works, God will persist in His mercy. A statement which has a true side, but another, as here, with the Bishop alas, which is not true. Our perseverance in faith and good living is not the cause, but the result of God’s mercy.

Matt. 24:24, “Insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect,” is made to render, as we think, at best, but doubtful service. The words, “it were,” are not in the original; and therefore “the argument is gone”! How so? Does not, “Insomuch that, if possible, thou shalt deceive the very elect,” read at least as strong as “if it were possible”? Besides, we are very much afraid that some even of God’s own children *are* for a time “deceived” by the “false Christs and false prophets” of the day.

“Stronger by far are such passages as 1 Cor. 1:8–9, Phil. 1:6; 2 Thess. 3:3. Yet they are addressed to whole churches, all the members of which are not certainly preserved blameless to the end.” We pass over the construction

of this sentence to what is more important, and observe – That it was not to *all* the members of the Churches of the Epistles that the Holy Ghost wrote assuring words of comfort and of “confirmation unto the end”: but it was expressly and alone “to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours”; “the beloved of God”; “the faithful in Christ Jesus”; the “elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ – who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.” But then, though the believer is “kept or guarded as in a garrison ... we cannot infer that his faith itself is so guarded, that it can by no possibility fail” – everlastingly! Did the Bishop weigh, either metaphysically, or theologically, or rationally, the import of these words? How could a believer be guarded, without his faith? Doth not faith constitute the believer, even as body and soul the man? Yea, what would be the use of a guard and garrison, when the vital spark of faith had flown?

Bishop Browne quotes from “the Homilies and other documents, both before and after the drawing up of the Articles.” We need not follow him. He fails to bring forward one single passage from any authorized document which states expressly and in so many words – or even from which we could legitimately infer the writers held that the children of God may or can finally fall away from grace. All else is simply his lordship’s own reading between the lines. And the whole teaching on the subject is, that we put on the entire armour of God – offensive and defensive – that we may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil; that we are not to mistake carnal liberty for the liberty of the Gospel; and that we are to continue in prayer that we may have a lively faith unto our lives’ end.

The Bishop also, we regret to say, gets unhappily confused in his history. In one place he asserts: “The more ancient predestinarians, like Augustine, though they believed in the irrelative and immutable decrees of God, yet did not teach the doctrine of absolutely indefectible grace.” And in another place writes: “It appears plainly that St. Augustine held two distinct predestinations: one predestination to regeneration and a state of grace, the other predestination to perseverance and to final reward.” Now this mode of argument is certainly not only very loose and weak, but slippery and unsatisfactory. That Augustine held, and did not hold, the

doctrine of Final Perseverance! Well! we are not disposed to be severe. The good Bishop must fight with the valiant Augustine on each side of him.

(4.) But let us hear the more robust, more accurate, and as we think more scriptural and better-read Calvin, on these two subjects of Perseverance and of Augustine: – “As to perseverance, it would undoubtedly have been regarded as the gratuitous gift of God, had not the very pernicious error prevailed that it is bestowed in proportion to human merit, according to the reception which each individual gives to the first grace. This having given rise to the idea that it was entirely in our own power to receive or reject the offered grace of God, that idea is no sooner exploded than the error founded on it must fall. The error, indeed, is twofold. For, besides teaching that our gratitude for the first grace and our legitimate use of it is rewarded by subsequent supplies of grace, its abettors add that after this, grace does not operate alone, but only cooperates with ourselves. As to the former, we must hold that the Lord, while he daily enriches his servants, and loads them with new gifts of his grace, because he approves of and takes pleasure in the work which he has begun, finds that in them which he may follow up with larger measures of grace. To this effect are the sentences, ‘To him that hath shall be given.’ ‘Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things’ (Matt. 25:21, 23, 29; Luke 19:17, 26). But here two precautions are necessary. It must not be said that the legitimate use of the first grace is rewarded by subsequent measures of grace, as if man rendered the grace of God effectual by his own industry, nor must it be thought that there is any such remuneration as to make it cease to be the gratuitous grace of God. I admit, then, that believers may expect as a blessing from God, that the better the use they make of previous, the larger the supplies they will receive of future grace; but I say that even this use is of the Lord, and that this remuneration is bestowed freely of mere goodwill. The trite distinction of operating and cooperating grace is employed no less sinistrously than unhappily. Augustine, indeed, used it, but softened it by a suitable definition – viz., that God, by cooperating, perfects what he begins by operating – that both graces are the same, but obtains different names from the different manner in which they produce their effects. Whence it follows, that he does not make an apportionment between God and man, as if a proper movement on the part of each produced a mutual concurrence. All he does is to mark a multiplication of grace. To this effect, accordingly,

he elsewhere says, that in man good will precedes many gifts from God; but among these gifts is this good will itself. (August. Euchiridion at Laurent. cap. 32.) Whence it follows, that nothing is left for the will to arrogate as its own. This Paul has expressly stated. For, after saying, ‘It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do,’ he immediately adds, ‘of his good pleasure’ (Phil. 2:13); indicating by this expression that the blessing is gratuitous. As to the common saying, that after we have given admission to the first grace, our efforts cooperate with subsequent grace, this is my answer: – If it is meant that after we are once subdued by the power of the Lord to the obedience of righteousness, we proceed voluntarily, and are inclined to follow the movement of grace, I have nothing to object. For it is most certain, that where the grace of God reigns, there is also this readiness to obey. And whence this readiness, but just that the Spirit of God being everywhere consistent with himself, after first begetting a principle of obedience, cherishes and strengthens it for perseverance? If, again, it is meant that man is able of himself to be a fellow labourer with the grace of God, I hold it to be a most pestilential delusion.

“In support of this view, some make an ignorant and false application of the Apostle’s words: ‘I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me’ (1 Cor. 15:10). The meaning they give them is that as Paul might have seemed to speak somewhat presumptuously in preferring himself to all the other apostles, he corrects the expression so far by referring the praise to the grace of God, but he, at the same time, calls himself a cooperator with grace. It is strange that this should have proved a stumbling block to so many writers, otherwise respectable. The Apostle says not that the grace of God laboured with him so as to make him a co-partner in the labour. He rather transfers the whole merit of the labour to grace alone, by thus modifying his first expression. ‘It was not I,’ said he, ‘that laboured, but the grace of God that was present with me.’ Those who have adopted the erroneous interpretation have been misled by an ambiguity in the expression, or rather by a preposterous translation, in which the force of the Greek article is overlooked. For to take the words literally, the Apostle does not say that grace was a fellow worker with him, but that the grace which was with him was sole worker. And this is taught not obscurely, though briefly, by Augustine, when he says, ‘Good will in man precedes many gifts from God, but not all gifts, seeing that the will which precedes is itself among the number.’ He adds the reason, ‘for it

is written, “The God of my mercy shall prevent me” (Psa. 59:10), and “Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me” (Psa. 23:6); it prevents him that is unwilling, and makes him willing; it follows him that is willing, that he may not will in vain.’ To this Bernard assents, introducing the Church as praying thus, ‘Draw me, who am in some measure unwilling, and make me willing; draw me, who am sluggishly lagging, and make me run’ (Serm. 2 in Cantic.).

“Let us now hear Augustine in his own words, lest the Pelagians of our age, I mean the sophists of the Sorbonne, charge us after their wont with being opposed to all antiquity. In this, indeed, they imitate their father Pelagius, by whom of old a similar charge was brought against Augustine. In the second chapter of his treatise ‘De Correptione et Gratia,’ addressed to Valentinus, Augustine explains at length what I will state briefly, but in his own words, that to Adam was given the grace of persevering in goodness if he had the will; to us it is given to will, and by will overcome concupiscence: that Adam, therefore, had the power if he had the will, but did not will to have the power, whereas to us is given both the will and the power; that the original freedom of man was to be able not to will, but that we have a much greater freedom – viz., not to be able to sin. And lest it should be supposed, as Lombard erroneously does (Lib. 2, Dist. 25), that he is speaking of the perfection of the future state, he shortly after removes all doubt when he says, ‘For so much is the will of the saints inflamed by the Holy Spirit, that they are able, because they are willing, and willing, because God worketh in them so to will.’ For if, in such weakness (in which, however, to suppress pride, ‘strength’ must be made ‘perfect’), their own will is left to them, in such sense that, by the help of God, they are able, if they will, while at the same time, God does not work in them so as to make them will, among so many temptations and infirmities the will itself would give way, and, consequently, they would not be able to persevere. Therefore to meet the infirmity of the human will, and prevent it from failing, how weak soever it might be, divine grace was made to act on it inseparably and uninterruptedly. Augustine (ibid. cap. 14), next entering fully into the question, how our hearts follow the movement when God affects them, necessarily says, indeed, that the Lord draws men by their own wills; wills, however, which he himself has produced. We have now an attestation by Augustine to the truth which we are specially desirous to maintain – viz., that the grace offered by the Lord is not merely one which

every individual has full liberty of choosing to receive or reject, but a grace which produces in the heart both choice and will: so that all the good works which follow after are its fruit and effect; the only will which yields obedience being the will which grace itself has made. In another place Augustine uses these words, ‘Every good work in us is performed only by grace’ (August. Ep. 105).

“In saying elsewhere that the will is not taken away by grace, but out of bad is changed into good, and after it is good is assisted, – he only means that man is not drawn as if by an extraneous impulse [“French, ‘Comme une pierre’; – like a stone.”] without the movement of the heart, but is inwardly affected so as to obey from the heart. Declaring that grace is given specially and gratuitously to the elect, he writes in this way to Boniface: ‘We know that Divine grace is not given to all men, and that to those to whom it is given, it is not given either according to the merit of works, or according to the merit of the will, but by free grace: in regard to those to whom it is not given, we know that the not giving of it is a just judgment from God’ (August. ad Boniface. Ep. 106). In the same epistle, he argues strongly against the opinion of those who hold that subsequent grace is given to human merit as a reward for not rejecting the first grace. For he presses Pelagius to confess that gratuitous grace is necessary to us for every action, and that merely from the fact of its being truly grace, it cannot be the recompense of works. But the matter cannot be more briefly summed up than in the eighth chapter of his treatise “De Correptione et Gratia,” where he shows, First, that human will does not by liberty obtain grace, but by grace obtains liberty. Secondly, that by means of the same grace, the heart being impressed with a feeling of delight, is trained to persevere, and strengthened with invincible fortitude. Thirdly, that while grace governs the will, it never falls; but when grace abandons it, it falls forthwith. Fourthly, that by the free mercy of God, the will is turned to good, and when turned, perseveres. Fifthly, that the direction of the will to good, and its constancy after being so directed, depend entirely on the will of God, and not on any human merit. Thus the will (free will, if you choose to call it so), which is left to man, is, as he in another place (Ep. 46) describes it, a will which can neither be turned to God, nor continue in God, unless by grace; a will which, whatever its ability may be, derives all that ability from grace” (Institut. ii. 3).

Again, but for brevity we must omit some sentences in the passage: “Another confirmation tending to establish our confidence is, that our election is connected with our calling. For those whom Christ enlightens with the knowledge of his name, and admits into the bosom of his Church, he is said to take under his guardianship and protection. All whom he thus receives are said to be committed and entrusted to him by the Father, that they may be kept unto life eternal. What would we have? Christ proclaims aloud that all whom the Father is pleased to save he hath delivered into his protection (John 6:37–39, 17:6, 12). Therefore, if we would know whether God cares for our salvation, let us ask whether he has committed us to Christ, whom he has appointed to be the only Saviour of all his people. Then, if we doubt whether we are received into the protection of Christ, he obviates the doubt when he spontaneously offers himself as our Shepherd, and declares that we are of the number of his sheep if we hear his voice (John 10:3, 16). Let us, therefore, embrace Christ, who is kindly offered to us, and comes forth to meet us: he will number us among his flock, and keep us within his fold. But anxiety arises as to our future state. ... But Christ has freed us from anxiety on this head; for the following promises undoubtedly have respect to the future: ‘All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.’ Again, ‘This is the will of him that sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing; but should raise it up at the last day’ (John 6:37–39). Again, ‘My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me is greater than all: and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand’ (John 10:27–28). Again, when he declares, ‘Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up’ (Matt. 15:13), he intimates conversely that those who have their root in God can never be deprived of their salvation. Agreeable to this are the words of John, ‘If they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us’ (1 John 2:19). Hence, also, the magnificent triumph of Paul over life and death, things present, and things to come (Rom. 8:38). This must be founded on the gift of perseverance. There is no doubt that he employs the sentiment as applicable to all the elect. Paul elsewhere says, ‘Being confident of this very thing, that he who hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ’ (Phil. 1:6). David, also, when his faith threatened to fail, leant on

this support, ‘Forsake not the works of thy hands.’ Moreover, it cannot be doubted, that since Christ prays for all the elect, he asks the same thing for them as he asked for Peter – viz., that their faith fail not (Luke 22:32). Hence we infer, that there is no danger of their falling away, since the Son of God, who asks that their piety may prove constant, never meets with a refusal. ...

“The expression (‘None of them is lost, but the son of perdition,’ John 17:12) is not strictly proper; but it is by no means obscure: for Judas was not numbered among the sheep of Christ because he was one truly, but because he held a place among them. Then, in another passage, where the Lord says, that he was elected with the apostles, reference is made only to the office, ‘Have I not chosen you twelve,’ says he, ‘and one of you is a devil?’ (John 6:70). That is, he had chosen him to the office of apostle. But when he speaks of election to salvation, he altogether excludes him from the number of the elect, ‘I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen’ (John 13:18). Should any one confound the term *election*, in the two passages, he will miserably entangle himself; whereas if he distinguish between them, nothing can be plainer. Gregory, therefore, is most grievously and perniciously in error, when he says that we are conscious only of our calling, but are uncertain of our election; and hence he exhorts all to fear and trembling, giving this as the reason, that though we know what we are today, yet we know not what we are to be (Gregor. Hom. 38). But in that passage he clearly shows how he stumbled on that stone. By suspending election on the merit of works, he had too good a reason for dispiriting the minds of his readers, while, at the same time, as he did not lead them away from themselves to confidence in the divine goodness, he was unable to confirm them. Hence believers may in some measure perceive the truth of what we said at the outset – viz., predestination duly considered does not shake faith, but rather affords the best confirmation of it” (Institut. iii. 24).

We may only add, as elsewhere he writes: “Under the Fourteenth Head (of the Decree of the Sixth Session of the Council of Trent) they (the Tridentine Fathers) prohibit any one from feeling absolutely certain that God will bestow upon him the gift of Final Perseverance, and yet they do not disapprove of entertaining the strongest hope of it in God. But let them first show us by what kind of cement they can glue together things so opposed to each other as the strongest hope and a doubtful expectation. For

certainly, he whose expectation of eternal life is not founded on absolute certainty, must be agitated by various doubts. This is not the kind of hope which Paul describes, when he says that he is certainly persuaded that neither life nor death, nor things present, nor things to come, will dissolve the love with which God embraces him in Christ. He would not speak thus did not the certainty of Christian hope reach beyond the last hour of life. And what languages do the promises speak? The Spirit not only declares that the just lives by faith, but that he shall live (Hab. 2:4). Thus far must hope reach. Paul even shows this when he describes hope as patiently waiting for things which are yet concealed.

“But, it may be said, they do not take away hope, but only absolute certainty. What! is there any expression of doubt or uncertainty when Paul boldly asserts that a crown of righteousness is laid up for him? (1 Tim. 4:8). Is there anything conditional in the words, when he declares that an earnest of our adoption has been given us, so that we can dare with loud voice to call God our Father? They take refuge in the frivolous quibble out of which I have already driven them, viz., that Paul had this by special revelation. But he claims nothing so special for himself as not to share it with all believers, when in their name as much as his own, he boldly exults over death and life, the present and the future. Nor does John claim for himself alone that knowledge in which he glories, when he says, ‘We know that we shall be like God, for we shall see him as he is’ (1 John 3:2). Nor Paul, when he says, ‘We rejoice in hope of the glory of God’; and again, ‘We know that when this earthly tabernacle falls, a mansion is prepared for us in heaven’ (Rom. 5:2; 2 Cor. 5:1).

“They make a gloss of what is said in the tenth chapter of first Corinthians, ‘Let him who standeth take heed lest he fall.’ Of this there is a twofold solution. Paul there only checks carnal arrogance, which has nothing to do with the assurance of hope; nor does he address believers only, but all of the Gentiles who had assumed the name of Christ, among whom there might be many puffed up with vain confidence. For the comparison which is there made between Jews and Gentiles is not confined to the elect only, but comprehends all who belonged to the Church by name. I will be satisfied, however, with this one reply, as it is quite sufficient, viz., that the fear enjoined is not that which in the smallest degree impairs the certainty of faith or hope, but only that which keeps us solicitous in the fear of God.

“The regenerate are not yet in glory, but only in the hope of glory, and much of the contest still remains. Hence did they infer that torpor must be shaken off, and no overweening security indulged, there is no man of sense who would not subscribe to them. But when they employ the passage as a battering ram to shake the firmness of our hope, and drive us headlong, their conduct is on no account to be tolerated. In qualifying Paul’s sentiment, and making it mean that the work of salvation which God has begun will be perfected in us only if we are not wanting to his grace, they act very ignorantly, not observing that one part of grace consists in having God present with us so as to prevent our being wanting to his grace. This doctrine ought not to give occasion to sloth, it ought only to make them recognize what they have received of God, and what they expect from him” (Antidote to the Sixth Session).

The fourteenth Head of the Decree commented on is as follows: –

“The same (as of Predestination, that it cannot be known without special revelation) is true in regard to the gift of Perseverance, of which it is written, ‘He who perseveres unto the end shall be saved’: a thing indeed which cannot be obtained anywhere else than from him who is powerful to make him who stands stand perseveringly, and restore him who falls. Let no man promise himself anything with absolute certainty, although all ought to place and repose the firmest hope in the help of God. For God, if they themselves are not wanting to his grace, will, as he has begun the good work, also finish it, working in them to will and to do. Still let those who think they stand take heed lest they fall, and with fear and trembling, work out their salvation, in labours, in vigils, and alms, in prayers and oblations, in fastings and chastity. For knowing that they have been born again in the hope of glory, but not yet to glory, they ought to be in fear concerning the contest which remains with the devil, the world, and the flesh; in which they cannot be victorious, unless, by the grace of God, they obey the Apostle when he says, ‘We are debtors not to the flesh to live after the flesh; for if ye live after the flesh ye shall die, but if by the Spirit ye mortify the deeds of the flesh, ye shall live’ (Acts of the Council of Trent, Sixth Session, Calvin’s Tracts).

Alas how Rome is ever ready to interfere with Christ in his great work of Redemption; and how far too near the teaching of Bishop Browne and others in the Protestant Church of England approximates to the teaching of Rome.

(5.) Let not the reader mistake us. It is difficult and perhaps not always wise to formulate creeds in the deep things of God. But error must be met by counter-statements of truth. While therefore on the one hand we hold, that though Arminianism is right in its assertion that Christ died for the sins of the whole world, yet firmly do we maintain that it is perniciously wrong in its doctrines of foreseen works, the efficacy of the human will, and falling away from God. So on the other hand we hold, that Calvinism is right in its doctrines of Predestination and Final Perseverance, but firmly maintain that it is wrong in its assertion that Christ died for the elect only, and in its doctrine of Absolute Reprobation.

And such, we believe, is the teaching, expressly or by fair implication, of Holy Scripture and the Thirty-nine Articles. And which, we trust, is fully enough set forth and established in this Exposition.

And thus and happily are we relieved of philosophy so called – the wisdom of man, and brought face to face, to humble and yet to cheer us, with all and what, on these subjects, God has been pleased to reveal to us.

John Calvin was in many respects a champion of the faith – a writer of gigantic powers of mind; who, in his extensive works, with the exceptions we have noted, and some others which will come before us, may be fitly characterized as a Euclid in Theology; whose easy logic rivets and charms equally with the freshness and flow of the poetry of Chalmers. But his great fault is that he sometimes becomes so enamoured of his own abstract deductions, that he really believes them to be scriptural, and thus pushes logic to an extreme. Like Luther too, in the heat of debate, he becomes at times intemperate, and perhaps rather painfully proves himself master of invective. But these latter faults in these two masterminds may be condoned by the circumstances in which they were placed. Coarseness of language we must ever hold as unnecessary. Still we cannot forget that they had coarse and unscrupulous enemies to deal with. And had they been less human, we might have unduly worshipped them. They were the morning stars of the Reformation; and without them, the world might have been still in chains. Take them for all in all, we may not look upon their like again.

(6.) The Scriptural Proof has been already set forth to a considerable extent. And we do not know that we can better sum up our argument than in the words of Fisher and Erskine: –

What is meant by Perseverance in Grace?

A continuing still in the *state* of grace, and the habitual practice of godliness to the end, John 10:28.

Can none who are justified, adopted, and sanctified, *fall totally* and *finally* from grace?

No: they can neither fall totally from *all grace*, nor finally *without recovery*; for *those that thou gavest me*, says Christ, *I have kept, and none of them are lost*, John 17:12.

How is the perseverance of the saints *infallibly secured*?

By the immutability of electing love, Jer. 31:3; by an indissoluble union with Christ, Rom. 8:38–39; by the merit of his purchase, 1 Peter 1:18–19; by the prevalence of his intercession, Luke 22:32; by the inhabitation of the Spirit, John 14:16; and by the power of a *promising* God, 1 Peter 1:5.

What *promise*, among others, have believers for their perseverance in grace to the end?

They have that remarkable *promise*, in Jer. 32:40, *I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me*.

What *security* have believers by this promise?

They are secured on *every side*; both that God will never cast them off, and that they shall never desert from *him*.

What is the *ground, in law*, upon which believers are secured, that God will never cast them off, and that they shall never desert from him?

Christ's perseverance in obedience unto the law for them, till the condition of the covenant was perfectly fulfilled, Phil. 2:8, whereby their perseverance was purchased, and infallibly secured, Titus 2:14.

Do all who make a zealous profession of religion persevere therein?

No: many of them *fall away* afterwards, John 6:66.

What may we conclude about those who fall totally and finally from their profession?

That they were never in *reality* what they professed themselves to be, 1 John 2:19, *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for, if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us*.

What are the *chief branches* of the promise of perseverance?

A promise of the *continued influence* of grace, Isa. 27:2–3; and a promise of *continued pardon* for the sins of the believer's *daily walk*, Jer.

33:8.

Why is a promise of the *continued influences* of grace *necessary*?

Because the stock of inherent grace would soon fail: of itself, it would *wither away*, and *die out*, if it were not fed, John 15:16.

Why is a promise of *continued pardon necessary* to the perseverance of saints already justified?

Not as if there were any need of *new pardons* with respect unto their *state*, because none of their sins can bring them any more under the *guilt of eternal wrath*, Rom. 8:1; but only with respect to the sins of their *daily walk*, which bring them under the *guilt of fatherly anger*, Psa. 89:30–32.

How is the pardon of the sins of the daily walk *granted* unto believers?

Upon their renewed actings of faith in Jesus Christ, and of repentance towards God; yet not *for* their believing and repenting, but *for Christ's sake*, 1 John 2:1–2, even as the *first pardon* is given, chap. 1:7.

Doth repentance then *go before* the pardon of sin?

Although *repentance* doth not go before, but follows after, the *pardon* of sin in *justification*; yet not only *faith*, but *repentance* also, goes before the *pardons* given to those who are *already justified*, 1 John 1:9. *If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.*

How doth the perseverance of the saints flow from their *justification*?

Inasmuch as they who are *once* justified, and *accepted in the Beloved*, are *always* so; *for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance*, Rom. 11:29.

How doth their perseverance flow from *adoption*?

Inasmuch as he who hath adopted them as his children is their *everlasting Father*, Isa. 9:6; and therefore they shall *abide* in his house forever, John 8:35.

How doth it flow from their *sanctification*?

Inasmuch as the *sanctifying Spirit* is given them to *abide with them forever*, John 14:16; and to be in them *a well of water, springing up into everlasting life*, chap. 4:14.

What *improvement* should be made of this *connection* of the benefits and blessings that *accompany and flow from justification, adoption, and sanctification*?

It should excite us to have a desire after the saving knowledge of the truth, *as it is in Jesus*, in whom all the lines of divine truth do meet, as in

their *center*, Eph. 4:21; and to admire the infinite goodness and wisdom of God, who has so linked all the blessings of the covenant into one another, that they who are possessed of one, are possessed of all, 1 Cor. 3:22–23.

III. The Sin against the Holy Ghost.

(1.) All sin is against the Holy Ghost. All sin is against our Heavenly Father, and against the Son of Man, and especially against the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as in the Divine Economy, He is now on earth carrying on the Work of Redemption, in the application thereof. And we desire that we could impress this truth more on the minds of Christians. We seem to forget that we are under the Administration of the Spirit. We seem to be ignorant that we have One of the Blessed Trinity now *in* the Church, *with* our souls, and *over* the world. We seem to live under the dreamy, indefinite impression that there is a God somewhere, but not that there is a God present with each one of us – not that we are subjects under the immediate Reign of the Eternal Spirit, God of all Might, of all Holiness, of all Love.

(2.) We think it clear therefore in some measure that The Sin against the Holy Ghost is the wanton and malicious rejection of His Work and His Love. We cannot see that Christ so awfully warned of a sin which could only be committed on the occasion, or in His lifetime and the course of His ministry. We rather think The Sin against the Holy Ghost could not well have been committed during the period that Christ veiled his glory and Godhead on earth; nor until all the means of grace were exhausted, and the Holy Ghost was poured out from on high upon all flesh, as on the Day of Pentecost; that the sin of the Pharisees was if we may so speak a type and dread foreshadowing of the greater Blasphemy; and that Christ took occasion of the scene for a solemn admonition for all time.

(3.) It may be interesting briefly to refer to the opinions of some writers on the subject: –

Athanasius and Augustine agree in the main as above.

Calvin: “He sins against the Holy Spirit who, while so constrained by the power of divine truth that he cannot plead ignorance, yet deliberately resists, and that merely for the sake of resisting. For Christ, in explanation of what he had said, immediately adds, ‘Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him’ (Matt. 12:31). ... Those who are convinced in conscience that what they repudiate and impugn is the

word of God, and yet cease not to impugn it, are said to blaspheme against the Spirit, inasmuch as they struggle against the illumination which is the work of the Spirit. Such were some of the Jews, who, when they could not resist the Spirit speaking by Stephen, yet were bent on resisting (Acts 6:10). ... Such, too, were the Pharisees, on whom our Lord denounced woe. To depreciate the power of the Holy Spirit, they defamed him by the name of Beelzebub (Matt. 9:3–4, 12:24). ... If ignorance joined with unbelief made Paul obtain pardon, it follows that there is no room for pardon when knowledge is added to unbelief. ... The Apostle speaks not of one particular lapse or two, but of the universal revolt by which the reprobate renounce salvation ... not some particular vice, but universal aversion to God, and (so to speak) the apostasy of the whole man. Therefore, when he speaks of those falling away ‘who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come,’ we must understand him as referring to those who, with deliberate impiety, have quenched the light of the Spirit, tasted of the heavenly word and spurned it, alienated themselves from the sanctification of the Spirit, and trampled underfoot the word of God and the powers of a world to come. ... The promise as to those who call upon God will never fail; but the names of conversion and prayer are improperly given to that blind torment by which the reprobate are distracted when they see that they must seek God if they would find a remedy for their calamities, and yet shun to approach him” (Institut. iii. 3).

Cranmer (most probably), in the Edwardine Articles, No. 16: “Blasphemy against the holy Ghost is, when a man of malice and stubbornness of mind, doeth rail upon the truth of God’s word manifestly perceived, and being enemy thereunto persecuteth the same. And because such be guilty of God’s curse, they entangle themselves with a most grievous, and heinous crime, whereupon this kind of sin is called and affirmed of the Lord, unpardonable.” – “Abandoned (in the Elizabethan), it may be, from a reluctance to define the nature of the irremissible sin, or, as in other cases, from the partial disappearance of the sect at which it had been levelled” – (Hardwick).

Bishop Burnet thinks that the Sin cannot be committed now; but that it was limited to the original occasion.

Bishop Beveridge: “It shall therefore only never be pardoned by God, because never repented of by us. For if it could be repented of by us, it could not but be pardoned by God, the promise of pardon to repentance running in general terms, that if a man do confess his sins to God, God will pardon his sins to him.”

Dr. Boulton: “When we have marshalled and considered the grand array of Gospel promises, and asked ourselves what it is which excludes from a share in them, the answer cannot well be any other than this. It must be a spiritual state incompatible with the conditions of those promises. In other words, it must be a finally impenitent state, since the promises to repentance are so full and free. And since the Holy Ghost is the source of all true spiritual life and feeling, we may well understand why such a desperate condition is described as the result of the sin against the Holy Ghost.”

Fisher and Erskine: –

What is the sin against the Holy Ghost?

It is a willful, malicious, and avowed rejection of Christ and salvation through him, by a blaspheming apostate, after manifest conviction of the truth of the gospel report, and some kind of approbation thereof by the common influence or operation of the Spirit, Heb. 6:4–6 and 10:26–27; 1 John 5:16; Mark 3:29–30.

Why is this sin called blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, Matt. 12:31?

Because it is an opprobrious and reproachful speaking of, and against the testimony of the Holy Ghost, in the word concerning Christ; with a direct intention to disparage his glory, and to disgrace his truth and way; hence called, a *putting him to an open shame*, Heb. 6:6.

What is the object of his sin against which it is directly levelled?

It is Christ, and salvation through him, as held out in the gospel revelation; for, it is a treading underfoot the Son of God, and accounting the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, Heb. 10:29.

What are the acts of this dreadful sin?

A willful rejecting, and obstinate opposing of the truth of the gospel, a spiteful scoffing at Christianity, and the professors of it, joined sometimes with a malicious persecuting of them: and all these as fruits and concomitants of a total and final apostasy from the faith.

What are the aggravations of this sin?

Its being committed after a person hath *received the knowledge of the truth and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come*, Heb. 6:5 and 10:26.

Why is it said, that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men, Matt. 13:31?

Not because it is above the virtue of the blood of Jesus to cleanse from it, but because it despises the only sacrifice for sin, and means of pardon, there being *no other name under heaven, given among men, by which we must be saved*, but that of Jesus, Acts 4:12, who is contemptuously rejected by it, Heb. 2:3.

How may a person be assured that he is not guilty of this sin?

He may be well assured that this sin is not charged upon him, if he is afraid that he is guilty of it; or in the least concerned about his unbelief; or has any desire after salvation through Christ; and is content to be debtor to the riches of his grace.

Articles XVI, XVII, XVIII.

History and Doctrine, With Scriptural Proof.

Article 17 states at length, and in general terms, the views of the Reformers on the subject of Predestination, against the fatalistic notions of the day, and for the comforting of the godly. Articles 16 and 18 might, we think, be more conveniently detached from their present position, and treated as addenda to the present 17th – the 16th taking up the very natural inquiry which follows upon a consideration of Predestination to Life, What of Sin committed after grace given? and the 18th as a corollary, that no man can be saved but by Christ, in antagonism to the rationalistic argument of the Anabaptists that sincerity and the light of Nature alone, without Christ, are sufficient for salvation. A Doctrine, a Question, an Objection. And by treating these Articles in this order and combination, we shall, we feel, gain by having the subjects before us in a more systematic and connective view, without the jar of otherwise unavoidable repetitions. The chapter may be larger, but the exposition will be more compact.

“Seventeenth” Article.

Predestination.

Of Predestination and Election. – Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they which he endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works: and at length by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: and, in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

De Praedestinatione et Electione. – Praedestinatio ad vitam, est aeternum Dei propositum, quo ante jacta mundi fundamenta, suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decrevit, eos quos in Christo elegit ex hominum genere, a maledicto et exitio liberare, atque (ut vasa in honorem efficta) per Christum, ad aeternam salutem addneere. Unde qui tam praeclaro Dei beneficio sunt donati, illi Spiritu ejus, opportuno tempore operante, secundum propositum ejus vocantur, vocationi per gratiam parent, justificantur gratis, adoptantur in filios Dei, Unigeniti ejus Jesu Christi imagini efficiuntur conformes, in bonis operibus sancte ambulant, et demum et Dei misericordia pertinquunt sempiternam felicitatem.

Quem admodum praedestinationis et electionis nostrae in Christo pia consideratio, duleis, suavis, et ineffabilis consolationis plena est vere piis, et his qui sentiunt in se vim Spiritus Christi, facta carnis, et membra, quae adhuc sunt super terram, mortificantem, animumque ad coelestia et superna rapientem; tum quia fidem nostram de aeterna salute

consequenda per Christum plurimum stabilit atque confirmat, tum quia amorem nostrum in Deum vehementer accendit: ita hominibus curiosis, carnalibus, et Spiritu Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuo versari praedestinationis Dei sententiam, perniciosissimum est praecipitium, unde illos diabolus protrudit, vel in desperationem, vel in aequae perniciosam impurissimae vitae securitatem. Deinde promissiones divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis generaliter propositae sunt, et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est, quam in verbo Dei habemus, diserte revelatam.

History.

Predestination is not the special outcome of Christianity; neither does Christianity attempt to solve all the difficulties of the doctrine.

Cicero, in the most valuable of all treatises on Fate that have come down to us, discusses the opinions of the ancient Greek philosophers on the subject, and reduces them to two classes: those who maintained that fate works all in all, and that it exerts a necessary and compulsive force over all agents; and those who asserted that fate had no influence whatever over the voluntary acts of the soul. To these indeed he adds the opinions of Chrysippus, who held an ostensible middle course, but seemingly approaching, nearest to those who believed the soul free from necessity. Cicero however alleges that the expression Chrysippus employed threw him back into the very dilemma he sought to avoid, so that in spite of himself he affirmed the necessity of fate. Cicero's treatise *On Fate* is unfortunately very imperfect and mutilated, many apparently most important chasms occurring. But we may take the following preface by his translator, Francis Barham, Esq., 1841, as fairly indicating the great Roman philosopher's views: "Cicero regards Fate or Destiny as the decree of God, the dictum of Providence. But he supposes that it is essentially conditional, and goes hand in hand with freewill, since freewill is one condition of Fate itself. He therefore agrees with the fathers of the first three centuries in their doctrine of freewill, so Admirably explained by Erasmus and Leibnitz. While on one side he defends the decrees of Deity, on the other he defends the liberty of man in a qualified sense, and rescues his readers at once from impiety and fatalism." Mr. Barham truthfully adds: "In this brief treatise will be found the germs of most of the arguments that have been so elaborately extended by more recent writers, who while they have done much to elucidate the subject, have done yet more to obscure it."

Among the Jews, as Josephus informs us, there were three sects divided on Fate: the Essenes, who declared that Fate ruled all things; the

Sadducees, who took away Fate altogether, and supposed that God is not concerned in our doing or not doing what is evil, and that to act what is good, or what is evil, is at man's own choice, and that the one or the other belongs so to everyone, that they may act as they please; and the Pharisees who held a *via media*, that some things, though not all, are the work of Fate, man possessing a freedom of acting as he thinks fit, since it hath pleased God to make a temperament, whereby what he wills is done, but so that the will of men can act virtuously or viciously.

Then again Mohammedanism, from its rigid stoical idea of the unity of God, as the stern, inflexible, unsympathizing One Motor of the universe, reduces its devotees and all created beings to an unconditional passivity. And thus Gardiner (Against Joyce): "... as the Turks do, once in a week tell the people out of the steeple, ye that are predestinate, shall be of necessity saved, ye that are not predestinate, shall be of necessity damned." Hence, only that nature reasserts herself, it would be difficult, after defeat, to rally the Turk on any field of action.

As to the *fate* of "fixt fate and freewill," in the primitive and later church, we must refer the reader to our historical sketches under Article X. But there is one point there intentionally left out, to which we must here briefly advert – the history and bearings of the Synod of Dort.

Bishop Browne and others have been at some pains to note and classify the "vast variety of sentiment" on the doctrine of predestination and election. And it may be well before passing to follow on the same lines, and enumerate the more important of such varied views, notwithstanding any slight repetitions, inasmuch as they are attempts to reconcile or modify the two rival doctrines which were ultimately brought out into so sharp antagonism at Dort: though disturbing as we have seen the Christian Church almost from its infancy.

(1.) *Calvinism, or Arbitrary Election.* – That God from all eternity predestinated a certain number of individuals, irrespective of anything foreseen in them, to salvation. But that all others are predestinated to Damnation; or at least, so left out of God's decree to life everlasting, that they must inevitably perish. The strong term, *reprobation*, however, is generally omitted by Calvinists, who use instead, *praeterition* – or the passing by of the non-elect, and leaving them to the consequences of their sins. "By predestination we mean the eternal decree of God, by which he determined with himself whatever he wished to happen with regard to every

man. All are not created on equal terms, but some are preordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation; and, accordingly, as each has been created for one or other of these ends, we say that he has been predestinated to life or to death” (Calvin’s *Instit.*, lib. iii. 21. 5).

(2.) *Arminianism, or Contingent and Conditional Election.* – That God hath predestinated a certain number to glory, foreseeing their faith and good use of the grace to be bestowed; but determined from all eternity to inflict everlasting punishment on those who should continue in their unbelief. “God from all eternity decreed the salvation of those whose faith in Christ Jesus he foresaw would endure to the end, and the everlasting punishment of those whose ultimate unbelief he foresaw” (Teaching of First of the Five Points).

(3.) *Nationalism, or Locke’s Election.* – That God ordains nations to saving privileges, but not individuals to salvation. The Elect, and Christian Nations, are convertible terms.

(4.) *Ecclesiastical Election.* – That as circumcision was the pale which enclosed the Jewish Church, so likewise now is baptism that of the Christian Church; and consequently the election spoken of by God in Scripture refers to circumcision or baptism, and not to final glory. The Elect, the Baptized, the Church, are synonymous expressions.

(5.) *Eclectic Election.* – That God selects out of the elected to baptism and church privileges, some to grace efficacious, final perseverance and glory.

(6.) Lastly, *Baxterian Election.* – That God gives to all Christians grace enough to be saved; but to some such a degree of grace, that they must be saved. “All have so much grace as bringeth and leaveth the success to man’s will.” Yet there is “a special decree and grace of God, which with a chosen number shall antecedently infallibly secure his ends in their repentance, faith, perseverance, and salvation” (God’s Goodness Vindicated).

Synod of Dort (1618–19) and Its Results.

It is instructive to glance for a moment at the historical phases of creedal authority as they develop themselves in the Christian Church. First, we have an assembly of Apostles, Elders, and Brethren at Jerusalem, presided over by James the Less, the local head of the Church, to decide whether Circumcision and the observance of the Law of Moses were still

binding. Then, as differences afterwards arose, in churches geographically separated, we have provincial synods to adjudicate upon them. And when heresies affecting the very vitals of Christianity, such as Arianism, had begun to spread throughout the Church Catholic, we have General Councils summoned by Emperors – the only existing and veritable force which could constrain such conventions for deliberation. But when the Pope of Rome impiously claimed divine right to summon councils and preside in them, the boon that had been enjoyed by the Church for centuries became the deadliest curse, not only as stifling any liberty of thought and healthy expression of opinion, but as opening the sluices of soul-destroying error. We shall have an opportunity of fully discussing, under Article XXI, the value and importance, especially in early times, of these ecclesiastical assemblies. Meantime, not only may we see something of the havoc of wholesome discipline by Popish assumptions, but easily gather why Luther, Cranmer, and others sighed for a free and general council of the whole Church; and at the same time find a key to the hereditary convictions of the Reformers – that all spiritual matters should be submitted to the test and decision of ecclesiastical councils.

Clearly it is not our business to decide with Bishop Short that “the differences of doctrine between the Calvinists and Arminians were, in the United Provinces, mixed up with much of political opinion.” It has ever been difficult to keep religion and politics separate and apart, each in its proper sphere. Even in our own day they are, if we mistake not, more intermixed than before: or rather it would seem that the former is altogether being displaced by the latter. Our chapels have become political hotbeds; and our Liberationists who so loudly declaim that it is “all for religion’s sake,” might come nearer the truth by taking for their text, “It is all for the sake of Politics.”

Maurice, Prince of Orange, may have been ambitious, and by aiming at the dignity of Count of Holland, as his father had before, may have wished to subvert the liberties of the Belgic Republic and obtain supreme power; but we can discern no reason in all this, nor yet even in the outrageous cruelties that took place, to brand Calvinism as such with monstrosities. The creed can neither stand nor fall by the man, unless indeed the creed creates him.

But to the history of the Synod. Delegates from various countries. – the United Provinces, Hesse, the Palatinate, Bremen, Switzerland, were

assembled; and especially from England, James I having an itching for theology, and in his earlier years having probably imbibed a bias in favour of Genevan and Calvinistic thought, though now his mind may have been in a state of tentative transition. Thus we have Carleton, Goad *vice* Hall, Davenant, Ward, and Balcanquall (Scotch Episcopal), with John Hales as secret envoy, selected by the King, but without consulting the Church.

Bogermann was elected President, “who possessed the soul of an inquisitor, an avowed enemy of the Arminians, and whose whole behaviour at the Synod showed that he was better qualified to be the papal legate at a council of Trent than the moderator of a Protestant synod. And the assessors of the president and the scribes of the council were known to be zealous Contra-Remonstrants” (Schlegel).

By some strange perversity, the Arminians at the outset, when called upon as the accused party for their defense, instead of as by order bound proceeding to expound and maintain their tenets, commenced by attacking those of their adversaries. This of course it was impossible to permit; and as they could not be induced to submit to the rules of rational debate, they were dismissed from the council. To examine their published writings was therefore in reality the only alternative left to the judges; but this surely need not have involved uncharitableness, inhumanity, and a thirst for blood. The Arminians were condemned (unheard), excommunicated, deprived of their civil and religious liberties, and many of them ignominiously exiled, or subjected to other shameful and unrighteous punishments. The so-called spirit of the age has been pleaded as a palliation for these and like foul blots on the escutcheon of Christianity; but we protest against the sickly philosophy. The Spirit of Christ should prevail in all ages. “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” And the first, and invariable, and universal lesson and law of that Spirit, is Love.

Such was the one great and last public fight of philosophical religionists, notable for its rancor to the bitter end, notable for adding nothing to the creed of the Church universal.

And doubtless even further flagitious and atrocious crimes if possible had been committed, but for the presence of the English, whose temperate and moderate conduct served in some measure to allay the violent and savage spirit of the victors; and who naturally would bring back with them to their own countrymen lessons of higher faith and hope, and a deeper charity.

And this we think it may be safely asserted was one grand outcome of the contest. True, the ball of contention was afterwards tossed once and again in England, with varied complications and results; but schools of thought, pronounced as they may be, are not so *outré* as wild, barbaric battlefields. True also that unscrupulous men, in the after history of the Church of England, played Arminianism or Calvinism, as either seemed best to suit their purpose; but still we must believe, that sober-minded Churchmen saw the play, and felt that Dort, even had Dort been a fair fight, was not the Gospel.

And if we mistake not, a further outcome of Dort, and Laudian, and Whitgift Christianity is, that there are few men in the present day within the pale of the Church of England, bold enough to say, I am of Calvin, or, I am of Arminius. Calvinism and Arminianism we know, the latter perhaps more widely, are still nursed by the clergy of our Church; but few are brave enough publicly to declare their patronage. Not one of us dare say, with any persistency, I am a Dortite with Episcopius, or, much less with Bogermann. A fight like Dort, fought out with madness, is in a way wholesome for civilized minds. Ridicule perhaps is out of place in any religious controversy, but admitting it for a moment, the following verses, quoted by Neal, give a pointed epitome of England's opinion of the Council of Dort: –

“Dordrecht Synodus, Nodus: Chorus integer, AEger:
Conventus, Ventus: Sessio, Stramen: Amen.”

It may be convenient here to place before the reader the Five Points or Articles of the Arminians in juxtaposition with the Five Points of Calvinism as enunciated by the Synod of Dort.

The Five Points of the Arminians.

(1.) God, from all eternity, decreed to bestow eternal salvation on those who, he foresaw, would maintain their faith in Christ Jesus inviolate until death: and on the other hand, to consign over to everlasting punishment the unbelieving who resist the invitations of God unto the end.

(2.) Jesus Christ by his death and sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of the whole world, and of every individual in particular; yet none but believers can become partakers of this divine benefit.

(3.) No one can of himself, or by the powers of his free will, produce or generate faith in his own mind. But man, being by nature corrupt, and incapable of thinking or doing any good thing, it is necessary to his

conversion and salvation, that he should be born again and renewed by God for Christ's sake, through the Holy Ghost. – [This Article was afterwards given a *Pelagian* cast.]

(4.) This divine grace or energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection everything that is truly good in man; and therefore all good works are to be attributed to God alone and the operation of his grace: yet this grace compels no man against his will, though it may be repelled by his perverse will.

(5.) They who are united to Christ by faith, are thereby furnished with abundant strength and help sufficient to overcome the snares of the devil and the allurements of sin. But whether such may fall from faith, and finally forfeit this state of grace, has not yet been resolved with sufficient clearness, and needs therefore to be examined by a more careful and attentive study of Holy Scriptures. – [This Article afterwards explicitly asserted that it is possible for man to fall away *finally* from grace.]

The Five Points of Calvinism.

(1.) Arbitrary Predestination and Reprobation (subsequently Preterition).

(2.) Particular Redemption – that Christ died for the Elect only.

(3.) Original Sin, involving the total depravity of human nature.

(4.) Irresistibility of Grace, or Effectual Calling.

(5.) Indefectibility of Grace, or Final Perseverance.

The former is Stoicism, or the Philosophy of the Grove; the latter is Platonism, or the Philosophy of the Porch; the one is the creed in the main of Cassian, the Semi-Pelagian; the other is the creed in the main, with the exception of absolute Reprobation, of Augustine each an exegesis vainly if not irreverently essaying to reveal the unknown and wisely hidden counsels of him to whom “the secret things belong.” Neither is Christ; nor, thank God, the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles.

Scriptural Proof.

Bishop Browne treats this Article in a strange if not an incomprehensible manner. Full of the doctrine of what is generally known as ecclesiastical or baptismal election, he reads it at large in the Old Testament as well as in the New, and finds passage after passage in the Fathers and the later Church to support his theory. And even some very

plain and strong passages in Scripture he gets rid of by saying, “But if we take them altogether, they explain each other. The whole then seems a connected scheme” (of Ecclesiasticism). We will not follow his lordship in the passages he quotes either from the Bible or the Fathers: time and space are too valuable; and for this simple reason moreover, that other commentators, equally learned as he, read many of his quotations on the opposite side, and find not a few more to the same effect. But we will ask the worthy Bishop, Which is easier for him to comprehend, the election of nations and peoples to Church privileges, or the election of individual souls to sure and certain salvation? Which is easier for God? And, above all, which is more likely to display God’s glory? As to the latter idea, let us hear a directly suicidal argument of the Bishop. Speaking of what he calls the election of the Jews to the blessing of privilege, and this forsooth as any proof against what is commonly understood by the Doctrine of Election, he writes: “And even of those chosen to be brought out of Egypt, and to become God’s people in the wilderness, by abusing their privileges; *all but two* [The italics of course are ours.] perished before they reached the promised land; and those chosen to live in Canaan, as God’s Church and people then on earth, were continually provoking God’s indignation, and bringing down a curse instead of a blessing upon them.” If we may so say with reverence, we are afraid God’s glory in this way was not very materially advanced. *Two* solitary individuals out of thousands upon thousands, brought and only to the “absolute possession” of Canaan! But we must not further press the arithmetical argument upon the Bishop, lest it might seem profane in dealing with Holy Scripture. Yet such and so sad is the historic result, and in his own words, of Bishop Browne’s doctrine of Election as meaning only Election to the blessing of ecclesiastical privileges. But it is really painful here as elsewhere to read the Bishop. His plain paraphrase of the whole Article is as follows:

“Predestination to Life,” is Church Life! – i.e., Church membership! “To deliver from curse and damnation,” means election to baptism! “To bring to everlasting salvation,” is election to a salvable state, or place in the Church where spiritual blessings are bestowed! And therefore the great Scriptural stronghold of the Predestination of the seventeenth Article – “For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he

called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified” (Rom. 8:29–30) – has “no reference to the future glory of Christians in the world to come, but to that present glorification of the elect (out of the world), which consists in their participation in the high honour and privilege bestowed by God upon his Church!” And finally, as the Article concludes, “We must receive God’s promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture”; the word “generally” means “generically, i.e., as concerning classes of persons!”

And this also is the doctrine with which nine-tenths of our candidates for the ministry are inoculated. And therefore, fearlessly and faithfully, as our bounden duty before God, we lift up in these pages our solemn protest against it.

But to proceed. Our Article divides itself into Four main Parts: I. The assertion of the Doctrine of Predestination to Everlasting Life, particular, absolute, and unconditional. II. The Results of that Predestination. III. The Comforts of such a doctrine, with a caution as to the dangers that may beset. IV. The proper Reception of God’s promises.

I. Particular Predestination to Everlasting Life, Absolute and Unconditional.

“Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world” (Acts 15:18).

“According as he selected (εξελέξατο – middle, *chose for Himself*) us in him [Christ] before the foundation of the world” (Eph. 1:4). God’s absolute and particular election of the saved, in Christ as their righteous Head.

“Because God chose (είλατο, *rec είλετο* – middle, *chose for himself*) you [= from the beginning from all eternity] to salvation in (εν – the elements of) sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth” (2 Thess. 2:13).

“For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy” (Rom.

9:11–16). No sober-minded commentator can, we think, read this ninth chapter of Romans, on God’s Sovereignty in dealing with Jews and Gentiles, and especially the verses we have quoted, without being convinced that it also teaches the Doctrine of the Sovereign and Unconditional Saving Election of Individuals.

“And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the Book of Life from the foundation of the world” (Rev. 17:8).

II. The Results of Predestination.

(1.) Effectual Calling.

“Who saved us, and called us with an holy calling (κλήσει αγία – the state or vocation, and its quality), not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and the grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus before the world began” (2 Tim. 1:9).

But rather than cite a number of individual texts, we shall perhaps here better study the interests of the reader – spiritually we hope as well as doctrinally – by placing before him the following excerpts from Fisher and Erskine’s Westminster Assembly’s Shorter Catechism Explained (omitting the marks of quotation, etc., as before).

What is Effectual Calling?

Effectual Calling is the work of God’s Spirit, whereby convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to us in the Gospel.

Why is *effectual calling* termed a [*work*]?

Because it is effected by various operations or workings of the Spirit of God upon the soul, called therefore, *the seven Spirits which are before his throne*, Rev. 1:4.

Why is it called a work of [*God’s Spirit*]?

Because it relates to the application of redemption, which is the *special* work of God’s Spirit, John 16:14. – *He* (says Christ of the Spirit) *shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.*

How manifold is the divine [*calling*]?

Twofold; *outward*, by the Word; and *inward*, by the Spirit.

What is the *outward call* by the Word?

It is the free and unlimited invitation given, in the dispensation of the Gospel, to all the hearers of it, to receive Christ, and salvation with him, Isa.

55:1, Rev. 22:17.

What is the *inward call* by the Spirit?

It is the Spirit's accompanying the outward call with power and efficacy upon the soul, John 6:45.

Which of these is [*effectual*] in bringing sinners to Christ?

The inward call, by the Spirit; *for it is the Spirit that quickeneth*, John 6:63; the outward call, by the Word, is of itself ineffectual; *for many are called but few are chosen*, Matt. 22:14. ["In verse 14 our Lord shows us that this guest, thus single in the parable, is, alas, to be the representative of a numerous class in the visible Church, who, although sitting down as guests before His coming, have not on the ἐνδομά γαμου – the imputed and inherent righteousness of the Lord Jesus " (Alford).]

What do you mean by *few are chosen*?

That few are determined effectually to embrace the call, and therefore termed a *little flock*, Luke 12:32.

What is the *main* or *leading* work of the Spirit in effectual calling?

It is that whereby [*He doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to us in the Gospel*], Phil. 2:13.

What is it to [*embrace*] Christ?

It is to *clasp* him in the arms of faith, with complacency and delight, as Simeon did, Luke 2:28.

Where is it that faith embraces him?

In the promises of the Gospel, Heb. 11:13.

What warrant has faith to embrace him in the promise of the Gospel?

His Father's *gift*, John 3:16; and his own *offer* of himself therein, Isa. 45:22.

Can there be an embracing or receiving without a previous *giving*?

A man can receive (marg. *take unto himself*) *nothing except it be given him from heaven*, John 3:27.

What is the *faith* of the Gospel offer?

It is a *believing* that Jesus Christ, with his righteousness, and all his salvation, is, by *himself*, offered to sinners, and to each of them in particular, Prov. 8:4, John 7:37.

By what *means* doth the Spirit persuade and enable us to embrace Christ?

By [*convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills*].

How doth the Spirit convince of sin and misery?

By the *law*, Rom. 3:20. *By the law is the knowledge of sin.*

What *measure* of conviction by the law is requisite for such as are come to full ripeness of age?

Such a measure as to let them see that they are sinners by nature, both in heart and life; that they are lost and undone under the curse of the law, and wrath of God; and that they are utterly incapable to recover themselves, as being legally and spiritually dead, Rom. 7:9.

Is not the [*enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ*] a mean of persuading and enabling us to embrace him?

Yes: for, *how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* Rom. 10:14.

What is the subject of the Spirit's [*enlightening*]?

[*Our minds*] or understandings, which are the eyes of the soul, Eph. 1:18. *The eyes of your understanding being enlightened*, etc.

What is the *object* of this *enlightening*, or that wherein we are enlightened?

It is [*in the knowledge of Christ*], Phil. 3:8.

By what *means* doth the Spirit enlighten the mind in the knowledge of Christ?

By the means of the Gospel, Rom. 10:17.

What is it *in Christ* that the Spirit enlightens the mind in the knowledge of?

In the knowledge of his person, righteousness, offices, fullness, etc., John 15:26, says Christ of the Spirit, *He shall testify of me.*

What are the *distinguishing properties* of saving illumination?

It is of an humbling, Job 42:5–6; sanctifying, John 17:17; transforming, 2 Cor. 3:18; and growing nature, Hosea 6:3.

Doth not the [*renewing of our wills*] accompany the illumination of our minds?

Yes: when *the Lord shall send the rod of his strength out of Zion*, there shall be a *willing people in the day of his power*, Psa. 110:2–3.

Wherein *consists* the renovation of the will?

In working a new inclination or propensity therein to good, and a fixed aversion to that which is evil, Ezek. 36:26.

Doth the Spirit use any *violence*, or *compulsion*, upon the *will*, in the renovation thereof?

No: He makes us *willing* in the day of his power, Psa. 110:3.

What is the *natural disposition* of the *will* before it be renewed?

It is wicked and rebellious, full of enmity against Christ, and the way of salvation through him, John 5:40.

Can any man *change*, or *renew*, his own *will*?

No more than the *Ethiopian* can *change his skin*, or the *leopard his spots*, Jer. 13:23.

What *necessity* is there for renewing the *will*, in order to the embracing of Christ?

Because, till this be done, the natural *ill will* that is in sinners against Christ, *in all his offices*, will be retained, 2 Cor. 5:17.

Wherein appears the *ill will* which sinners bear unto Christ as a *Prophet*?

In the conceit of their own wisdom, Prov. 1:22; and slighting the means of instruction, chap. 26:12.

How do they manifest their aversion to him as a *Priest*?

In *going about to establish their own righteousness*, and refusing to submit *themselves unto the righteousness of God*, Rom. 10:3.

How do they manifest their opposition to him as a *King*?

In their hatred of holiness, love to sin, and saying upon the matter, concerning him, *We will not have this man to reign over us*, Luke 19:14.

Who are the only persons that are effectually called?

All the elect, and they only, Acts 13:48. – *As many as were ordained to eternal life, believed.*

What may we learn from the doctrine of effectual calling?

That *the gifts and calling of God are without repentance*, Rom. 11:29; that *all things work together for good – to them that are called according to His purpose*, Rom. 13:28; and that it is our duty to walk *worthy of God, who hath called us unto His kingdom and glory*, Thess. 2:12.

(2.) Justification.

“And as many as were ordained (ἦσαν τεταγμένοι) to eternal life believed” (Acts 13:48). We rather agree here with Augustine, Calvin, and the Vulgate, in the rendering of this passage as above, than with Alford, Wordsworth, and others, who follow Bengel, and read, for the “ordained” of the text, *disposed*.

τάσσω is an official or military word, and bears in it the idea of order or arrangement – to settle, draw up in army, ordain, determine, destine; and carries this idea of *appointment* strictly throughout. Hence unless Paul’s

hearers *appointed themselves* to eternal life (as Grotius has it, *se ordinarant*, but which would require the *middle*) there is really no meaning in the gloss of Alford and Wordsworth, except indeed they would read, *were disposed by God to eternal life*: which is just giving up the whole point they contend for.

“Whom he called, them he also justified” (Rom. 8:30). “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?” (Rom. 8:33.)

But see the whole subject of Justification drawn out under the eleventh Article.

(3.) Adoption.

“For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the Firstborn among many brethren” (Rom. 8:29). God’s foreknowledge, and preordination of his children, coincident from all eternity.

“But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons” (Gal. 4:4–5). “The children of God by faith in Christ Jesus” (Gal. 3:26).

We turn again for a moment to Fisher and Erskine’s Catechism.

What is Adoption?

Adoption is an act of God’s free grace, whereby we are received into the number, and have a right to all the privileges of the sons of God.

What doth the word [*adoption*] signify among men?

It signifies the taking of a *stranger* into a family and dealing with him as if he were a *child or heir*.

What is the difference between adoption, as it is an *act of God*, and as it is a *deed of men*?

Men generally adopt but *one* into their family, and they do it on account of some amiable properties, or qualifications, they discern in the adopted; but God adopts *many* into his family, and that, not upon the account of anything commendable in them, but merely out of his own free and unmerited love, Eph. 1:5.

How many *kinds* of adoption doth the *scripture* speak of?

Two kinds; namely, *general* and *special*.

What is meant by *general* adoption?

It is the erecting of a certain indefinite number of mankind, into a *visible church*, and entitling them to all the privileges thereof, Rom. 9:4.

What is the outward *seal*, or *badge* of this general adoption?

It is *baptism*: which comes in the room of *circumcision* under the Old Testament, Eph. 4:5.

What is to be understood by *special* adoption?

It is a sovereign and free translation of a sinner of mankind, from the family of *hell* or *Satan*, into the family of *heaven*, or *household of God*, Eph. 2:19; with an investiture into all the privileges of the sons of God, 1 John 3:1.

By whose *act* and *authority* is this *translation* accomplished?

By the act and authority of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

What is the act of the *Father* in this matter?

He hath *predestinated us unto the adoption of children – to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will*, Eph. 1:5.

What is the act of the *Son* in this special adoption?

In consequence of his purchasing the sinner by the price of his blood, he actually gives the power, right, or privilege to become a child of God, in the day of believing, John 1:12.

What is the act of the *Holy Ghost*?

He comes in Christ's name, takes possession of the person, and dwells in him, as a *Spirit of adoption*, teaching him to cry, *Abba, Father*, Rom. 8:15.

What are the [*privileges*] which the sons of God are invested with?

Among others, they are invested with great dignity, glorious liberty, a title to the whole inheritance, boldness of access to God as a Father, and His fatherly chastisement, or correction.

What is the great dignity or honour to which they are advanced?

To the dignity of being kings and priests unto God, Rev. 1:6, or a royal priesthood, 1 Peter 2:9; to feast on Christ their Passover sacrificed for them, 1 Cor. 5:7.

Wherein consists *the glorious liberty of the children of God* mentioned, Rom. 8:21?

Not only in a freedom from the guilt and dominion of sin, the curse of the law, the tyranny of Satan, and sting of death, John 8:36; but in a filial and reverential obedience, flowing from a principle of faith and love inlaid in the soul, Gal. 5:6.

What is the inheritance which the adopted children of God are heirs of, according to the promise?

They are heirs of the righteousness which is by faith, Heb. 11:7; heirs of the grace of life, 1 Peter 3:7; heirs of salvation, Heb. 1:14; and, which comprehends all, they are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, Rom. 8:17.

What doth their boldness of access to God, as their Father, include in it?

A firm persuasion of the power, love, and faithfulness of a promising God, Rom. 4:20–21; and an assured expectation of success at His hand, 1 John 5:14.

What are the grounds of this boldness?

The righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith, Psa. 84:9; and his prevalent intercession within the veil, 1 John 2:1.

Whence is it that God *chastises* adopted children?

Because he loves them, Heb. 12:6; Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth.

Wherewith does he chastise them?

Sometimes with the rod of outward affliction, of various kinds, Psa. 34:19; and sometimes with the rod of desertion, Psa. 30:7.

For what end doth he thus chastise them?

For their *profit*, that they may be *partakers of his holiness*, Heb. 12:10.

What are the *marks or evidences* of the adopted children of God?

They will resemble their Father, 1 John 3:2; they know their Father's voice, John 10:4; affect their Father's company, Rom. 8:15; are deeply concerned for his absence, Job 23:3; and out of love to him that *begat*, they have great love to all them that are *begotten of him*, 1 John 5:1.

(4.) Conformity to the image of Christ.

“Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son” (Rom. 8:29). “For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth” (John 17:19). “But we all, with open face (*ανακεκαλυμμένω* – *unveiled*, at our conversion) beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord [Christ], are changed into the same image from glory to glory (probably, from one degree of glory to another), even as by the Lord the Spirit” (2 Cor. 3:18).

So Fisher and Erskine: –

Whose work is it to sanctify?

It is the special work of the Spirit of God, 2 Thess. 2:13.

What *moves* God to sanctify a sinner?

His own free grace and good pleasure, Phil. 2:13.

Are not justification, adoption, and sanctification linked inseparably together?

Yes: they that are justified and adopted; and they that are justified and adopted, are sanctified and glorified, Rom. 8:30.

In what respects are justification and sanctification inseparably joined and linked together?

In the decree of God, Rom. 8:30; in the promise of God, Psa. 110:3; in the end of Christ's death, Titus 2:14; in the offices of Christ, 1 Cor. 1:30; in the gospel call and offer, 2 Tim. 1:9, 1 Thess. 4:7; and in the experience of all believers, Phil. 3:8–12.

What are the marks of sanctification?

A heart respect to all God's commandments, and loving them because they are holy; a hatred of sin, and avoiding of all appearance of evil; a spirit of watchfulness and warfare against sin; a delight in doing good; a conversation becoming the Gospel; and an habitual improvement of the blood of Christ, by faith and prayer, for cleansing from the filth of sin, and of the precious promises for that end, 2 Cor. 7:1; 2 Peter 1:4.

What are the chief motives and inducements to sanctification?

The will of God commanding, 1 Peter 1:15; the love of Christ constraining, 2 Cor. 5:14; the dignity of resembling God thereby, Lev. 19:2; and the indignity of resembling the devil by the want thereof, John 8:44.

What should we do to be sanctified?

We should fly to Christ by faith, touching the hem of his garment for healing and purification, for *we are sanctified in Christ Jesus*, 1 Cor. 1:2; we should pray for the Spirit of sanctification, through whom only the deeds of the body can be mortified, Rom. 8:13: we should associate with saints, for *he that walketh with the wise, shall be wise*, Prov. 13:20; association begets assimilation: we should make a right use of God's Word. and rod, sabbaths and sacraments.

(5.) Fruitfulness in Good Works.

“For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for (*επί – the purpose of*) good works, which God before prepared that we should walk in them” (Eph. 2:10). “That ye might walk worthily (*αξίως*) of the Lord unto

all pleasing, bringing forth fruit in every good work, and increasing by (*as the instrument*) the knowledge of God” (Col. 1:10). “Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain” (John 15:16).

(6.) Everlasting glory and felicity through God in Christ Jesus.

“The gifts and calling of God are without repentance” (Rom. 9:29). “Whom he justified, them he also glorified” (Rom. 8:30). “And on this account [Christ’s blood-shedding and meritorious work, verses 1–14], he is the Mediator of a new covenant, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressors that were under the first covenant, they which are called might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance” (Heb. 9:19). “Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world” (Matt. 25:34). “And so shall we ever be with the Lord” (1 Thess. 4:17).

Thus Fisher and Erskine: –

Why will the saints in heaven have an *undoubted certainty* of their full enjoying of God to all eternity?

Because the *everlasting* GOD himself will be their *eternal life and happiness*; 1 John 5:20, *This is the true God and eternal life*; Isa. 60:19, *The Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory*. Hence it is said of heaven that *the glory of God doth lighten it; and that the Lamb is the light thereof*, Rev. 21:23.

III. The Comfort of the Doctrine of Predestination, with a needed Caution.

Hence St. Paul could boast and glory.

“Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom. 8:33–39).

And St. Peter –

“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time” (1 Peter 1:3–5).

And even Christ himself could exultingly say –

“My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand” (John 10:27–28).

But here especially is an opening for the Serpent. “If you are not one of the Predestinated to Eternal Life, why not ‘eat and drink, for tomorrow you die?’” There are two answers: (1) It is written, “The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law” (Deut. 29:29). (2) It is written again, “Go ye unto all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned” (Mark 16:15–16).

“Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price” (Isa. 55:1). “And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And Whosoever Will, Let Him Take The Water Of Life Freely” (Rev. 22:27).

IV. The Proper Reception of God’s Promises.

“Furthermore, we must receive God’s promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture.” “Generally set forth to us,” in the Latin, “nobis generaliter propositae,” may, as has been read, refer either to the whole *genus* of the promises, as against unprofitable selection of passages, and not “comparing spiritual things with spiritual”; or, as the Articles are drawn up in much of technical language, the phrase may be interpreted as asserting that the promises apply to the *genus* Man.

But while both these views are legitimate and orthodox, we think we come still nearer the truth of the Gospel, if we hold that the promises of God are to be received by us in their full scope and universality – and simply so.

“Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth” (Isa. 45:22). “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16). “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon “ (Isa. 55:7).

The words of Bishop Beveridge are admirably to the point: – “It is here very opportunely added, that we must receive God’s promises as they be generally set forth in the Holy Scripture. Though they are but some that God hath elected, yet his promises are made to all: ‘Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest’ (Matt. 11:22): and ‘Whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life’ (John 3:16). In the application of which and the like promises, we must not have respect to the eternity of God’s purpose, but to the universality of his promise. His promises are made to all, and therefore are all bound to lay hold upon his promises; and as we are to receive his promises, so are we also to obey his precepts as made to all. So that in all our doings the will of God is to be followed as we have it expressly declared to us in his word: not considering whether God elected me from eternity, but whether I obey him in time: if I obey him in time, I may certainly conclude that he elected me from eternity.”

Article XVIII.

History and Doctrine, With Scriptural Proof.

Of obtaining Eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ. – They also are to be had accursed that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of Nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

De speranda aeterna salute tantum in nomine Christi. – Sunt et illi anathematizandi, qui dicere audent unumquemque in lege aut secta quam profitetur esse servandum, modo juxta illam et lumen naturae accurate vixerit, cum sacrae literae tantum Jesu Christi nomen praedicent, in quo salvos fieri homines oporteat.

History.

Our Article is a clear corollary from the propositions demonstrated. A fit winding up of the Doctrines of Faith of the Church of England.

Thus we have had assertion and proof of the Being, Nature, and Attributes of God – a Trinity in Unity; have maintained that the Revelation of God’s Will – the Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is and should be the religion of Protestants; that the Incarnation, vicarious Death, glorious Resurrection, and triumphant Ascension of Christ, is the imperishable basis of the believer’s hope; that faith working by love is the connecting link between the soul and God; that human works, and the human will, unsanctified, are dead and powerless unto salvation; that even when sanctified, they are but the fruits and evidences of grace, not the cause *per se* of Divine mercy; that our Predestination to Eternal Life is full and sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort; and lastly, as our Article concludes upon the whole subject, we are committed to the declaration, that salvation is not of any law, sect, or profession, for Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby we must be saved.

And yet, strange to say, not one of the thirty-nine Articles has been more misunderstood in its scope than this eighteenth. Some consider it as introductory to the remaining twenty-one – the Second grand Division of the Articles which treats of the Church, or Christians as members of a religious body. Others, that it is not inserted in its proper place, but should stand at the head of that Second Division. While Bishop Browne devotes the whole of his Historical, and part of his Scriptural Section, to prove that the Article treats – not so much of salvation through Christ, though of course that is conceded, as of salvation *by* Baptism and *in* the Church. Thus we have detached passages from Ignatius down to Noel’s Catechism, culled to show that “out of the Church, there is nothing but damnation and death.” And even the spurious Recognitions of Clement is quoted, which argues, that “if a person is not baptized, not only will he be deprived of Heaven, but will not be without danger in the resurrection, however good his life may have been.”

Now Baptism is an ordinance of God, and the Church is of Divine institution; but all this has nothing whatever to do with our Article. Rather, the above sort of special pleading is just a maintenance of the very proposition which the Article condemns. For the plain text and tenor of it declare, that no profession, however sincere, strict, and unblameable – no religious society, how observant soever a man may be of its ceremonies and laws, availeth, but only “the Blood of Jesus Christ his Son, cleanseth us from all sin.”

Had the Bishop brought forward his quotations, full and fairly expanded, under the Articles of Baptism and the Sacraments, we should not have complained. But to interpolate them here cramps, and indeed nullifies the force of the Article – which is, to bring Christ ALONE, not *ordinances*, into view. Under these Articles, however, we shall duly recur to his excerpts and authorities, but must not at present be led away to follow the learned Doctor in his plainly devious and mistaken course. We would only stop now simply to refer the Bishop to the following passage from Ignatius: “Christ is the Door of the Father, by which Abraham, and Isaac, and the Prophets, and the Apostles, and the Church, all enter” (ad Philadelph.).

Here, however, we must apologize to the reader. Nothing is or could be more painful to us than to have to oppose the dignitaries of our Church. But at the same time, we believe that an unflinching testimony, in the present day especially, is demanded of all who would stand in the breaches of our beloved Zion. Calmness of tone is desirable, and unseemly expression is to be avoided; but faithfulness to the principles of the Reformation must never be *toned down*.

Partisan is a misleading and an unhappy term. It brands you at best with taking a one-sided view of truth. And yet alas it is a word which cannot well be dispensed with. I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas, should all merge in, I am of Christ. But they don't. Satan would then have no strifes to foment, no schisms to lead. Nevertheless, we believe, that explicitness of statement, and certain sound, should characterize all who would enlist as soldiers of Christ.

We have had of late a digest of the theology of the Church of England, if we may be allowed the phrase, which has called forth praises from opposing camps, inasmuch as the author is not so much an advocate as a judge. And yet we are told in the same breath that though the book is honest and often fair, and takes truth *all round* to see what it comes to, it is above all things a *partisan* book! So that, whether you are lukewarm, or cold, or hot, you save nothing, gain nothing – you may be alike a partisan.

Our Article is levelled against the Rationalists among the Anabaptists at the period of the Reformation, who held that sincerity of profession, and following the light of nature are the essentials to salvation; in fact, that man's virtuous actions alone, without Christ, justify him before God. But enough has been said in previous pages of these deadly errors.

We are sorry to find the excellent Dr. Boulton write as follows: "This Article is not in debate between ourselves and any section of the Christian Church. Latitudinarians may call it in question; but no sect can deny it which believes in the efficacy of the death of Christ." Very true. But Dr. Boulton must know that the spirit of unbelief at which the Article strikes, is one that largely pervades society, and every section of the Christian Church. It is a leaven which is corrupting not only the more independent classes, ostensibly, and no longer silently as some two or three decades ago, but is beginning also to extend its bane and poison even amongst the lower classes. The Latitudinarianism and Rationalism of the Anabaptists repeats itself, nor shall we be wrong in saying in a still more alarming and extended form. It abounds in the pulpit, the college, the press, and should not be ignored.

Take the following as a graphic picture of our age: –

"The most careless eye cannot fail to perceive the fearful desecration of the Lord's Day, which many give up to diversion or business, and which, if unchecked, will speedily leave very small audiences to whom the Gospel can be preached. Christians themselves are carried away by the wave that will surely dash the Church like a broken wreck upon the rocks. Twenty-five years ago a Christian could scarcely be found who would read the Sunday papers; today they are not only taken and read by a large majority of Church members in our cities, but by many evangelical ministers. Twenty-five years ago a Christian received discipline if he traveled on the Lord's Day except under the pressure of necessity; now it is a rule for professed Christians to start upon a considerable journey on Saturday, so as to save time.

"It is in the pulpit, indeed, the work of disintegration and ruin most rapidly progresses. There are still many true and faithful witnesses for Christ and His Word, for whom God be praised, but that there has been in general a sad change from the plain, and pointed, and scriptural preaching of the former times is evident to all. The more boldly a preacher denies the inspiration of God's Word, the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and the future punishment of the wicked, the more adroitly he leaves out all flavour of the Gospel in his sermons, and substitutes the greatness of man. The more impudently he advertises sensational topics and claptrap performances, worthy of a clown, the more certainly he draws a crowd, and is lauded to

the skies by the secular press, that is conducted almost wholly in the interests of infidelity.

“All of this may be ridiculed as the croaking of a bird of ill-omen, and it will be asserted again and again that the world is growing better every day. But if it is really growing better, it has a poor way of showing it, while the daily papers are loaded to disgust with the record of crimes, and immorality is rolling away the very foundations of society, and the Church is obviously losing its hold upon the masses of the people. When will God’s children awake from among the dead, and lift even with piercing accents the warning, that judgments are gathering thick and fast around the close of this Christ-rejecting age? ‘Return, O Lord, how long? and let it repent thee concerning thy servants. O satisfy us early with thy mercy; that we may rejoice and be glad all our days. Make us glad according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us, and the years wherein we have seen evil’ (Psa. 90:13–15). The apostasy of the last days which is predicted to precede the Second Advent of Christ is surely coining on apace (2 Thess. 2:2).” – *American Paper*.

The Article is illustrated by the following contemporary parallels from Hardwick: –

Reformatio Legum: “Horrible and monstrous is the audacity of those, who contend that in every religion and sect, which men profess, salvation is to be hoped for (*sperandam*, cf. the title of the *Latin Article*), if only in innocence and integrity of life, they endeavour, as far as they are able, to follow the light of nature. But by the authority of the Holy Scriptures, such pestilential heresies are demolished. For the Name only and alone of Jesus Christ is there set forth to us, from whom all salvation comes.”

Melancthon (quoted by Laurence): “There is a usual and false distinction of three Laws, the Natural, the Mosaic, and the Evangelical. And it is more impious, still, since they feign that every one, by the observance of his own law, obtains remission of sins, and eternal life.”

Scotch Confession (1560) in Knox’s Works: “And therefore we utterly abhor the blasphemy of those that affirm that men quick live according to equity and justice, shall be saved, what religion soever they have professed.”

The question of the solvability of the heathen, which is commonly imported under this Article, has been sufficiently considered by us. We may however subjoin the following paragraphs – one from Bishop Browne, with

whom we are happy in any instance to agree, the other from Dr. Boulton, the respected Principal of the London College of Divinity.

Browne: “Passages, such as Psalm 9:17, ‘The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God,’ are brought forward as proving that all heathen nations shall be damned. Yet *hell* in this case is *Hades*, not *Gehenna*; and on the other hand, Rom. 2:11–16, Acts 17:26–27, 30, appear to prove that it is not impossible heathens may be capable of salvation. No doubt the reason why so little is said about them is, that it is impossible that what is said can reach them. ‘I hold it to be a most certain rule of interpreting Scripture that it never speaks of persons, when there is a physical impossibility of its speaking to them. ... So the heathen, who died before the word was spoken, and in whose land it was never preached, are dead to the word; it concerns them not at all; but, the moment it can reach them, it is theirs, and for them.’ – Dr. Arnold’s Life and Correspondence, Letter 65.”

Boulton: “The subject of the possibility of salvation for a heathen is generally noticed under this Article. Most of the commentators seem to agree that the Article does not absolutely pronounce upon that point. It asserts that none can be saved but by Christ. But it is silent on the question which was touched upon with some degree of hope by some of the early Fathers, how far it may be conceivable that some who have never heard of Christ may be saved *by* him. The first two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans will naturally be referred to on this subject. The ‘Judge of all the earth’ has himself assured us that there will be discrimination at the last between the ignorant and the enlightened sinner. He tells us that eternal justice will not involve all in one indiscriminate ruin. ‘That servant *which knew his Lord’s will*, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But *he that knew not*, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes.’ Consistently with that absence of detail and circumstantiality which it has been the will of God should characterize all revelations of the course of his final justice, what more distinct utterance could we have? We may add, what further revelation are we entitled even to desire?”

Little remains to be added. It will be noticed that the Anathema, with which the Article begins, is the ancient form of ecclesiastical condemnation, and exclusion from the communion of the Church. And the particle “also” in the opening sentence is perhaps in some measure a proof

of the correctness of our division, inserting the present seventeenth in place of the sixteenth, and so transferring the latter immediately to precede this eighteenth, with which it seems to be connected by the copulate in question, as well as in doctrinal sequence. “They are to be condemned” of the one, is more naturally followed by “They also are to be had accursed” of the other.

Scriptural Proof.

If we are right in viewing our Article as a “corollary,” there is logically little or nothing to prove. Its two clauses rest upon the previous demonstrations. And indeed, as matter of fact, there is nothing further to detain us, save a brief reassertion of what precedes. And therefore we shall only add or recall some of the more conclusive texts upon the subject.

(1.) The Light of Nature not sufficient for Salvation, nor any Law of man’s devising.

“O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps” (Jer. 10:23).

We cannot agree with the author of “Texts Misquoted and Misapplied,” that this verse refers to Nebuchadnezzar; nor with Durell, whom he quotes from Dlayney, that “the way” and “the steps” are those of Jehovah. We cannot wrest the words from their ordinarily adopted interpretation – viz., that man is devoid of wisdom and strength in and of himself. And in this view we are confirmed by the context throughout.

True, if indeed we may scan the language of the Holy Ghost, by any process of human analysis, the chancre and sin of the “brutish pastors,” and the turning of the ungodly Nebuchadnezzar from his purposed war with the Moabites and Ammonites, to march against Jerusalem, may have suggested the idea to Jeremiah. But still, from these and such like details and surroundings, we cannot but hold, that he arrives at a universal law – the utter impotency of man to think or to do that which is right, “to direct his steps” before Jehovah.

“But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags” (Isa. 64:6). “There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death” (Prov. 4:12). “Every way of a man is right in his own eyes; but the Lord pondereth the hearts” (Prov. 21:2).

“What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followeth after the law of righteousness, hath

not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumbling stone. As it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a stumbling stone and rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.” And all this in proof of – “It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy” (Rom. 9:30–33, 16).

“For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law” (Rom. 2:12).

“Because that which is known of God is manifest in them (the phenomena of nature witnessing it to their conscience): for God manifested it unto them. For his invisible attributes from the creation of the world are perceived by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and Divinity (θειότης – not θεότης); so that they are without excuse: because that, though they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools” (Rom. 1:19–22). What a Picture of the Insufficiency of the Light of Nature!

“Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness would have been by the law (of Moses). But on the contrary (ἀλλά) the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before this faith (of Jesus Christ) came, we were kept in ward, shut up under the law unto the faith which was afterwards to be revealed. So that the law hath become our schoolmaster (to guide us) unto Christ, that we may be justified by faith” (Gal. 3:21–24). Even the Light or Law of Nature, drawn out, perfected, and enshrined as a covenant by God Himself in the Law of Moses, is insufficient for salvation: except so far as it brings us to Jesus Christ – its great and ultimate rationale and office.

(2.) Salvation is of God alone.

“The Lord is my strength and song, and he is become my salvation” (Exod. 15:2). “Salvation belongeth unto the Lord” (Psa. 3:8). “The salvation of the righteous is of the Lord” (Psa. 37:39). “He that is our God is the God of salvation” (Ps. 68:20). “I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no Saviour” (Isa. 43:2). “Truly in vain is salvation hoped for from the hills, and from the multitude of mountains; truly in the Lord our God is

the salvation of Israel” (Jer. 3:23). “And when I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood, I said unto thee, when thou wast in thy blood, Live; yea, I said unto thee, when thou wast in thy blood, Live” (Ez. 16:6). “I am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt, and thou shalt know no god but me; for there is no Saviour beside me” (Hosea 13:4). “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David” (Luke 1:68–69). “For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God” (Eph. 2:8).

(3.) Christ, the Saviour.

“Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.” “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.” “Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all” (Isa. 7:14, 9:6, 53:4–6). “In his day Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness” (Jer. 23:6). “And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus (Heb. *Saviour*): for he alone (αὐτός – emphatic) shall save his people (all who believe on him – Gentiles as well as Jews) from their sins” (Matt. 1:21). “And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all the people (παντι τω λαω). For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ Jehovah (χριστος κύριος)” (Luke 2:10–11).

παντι τω λαω. “Not (ε. ν.) to all people, here: but to all the people, – the Jewish people. To them was the first message of joy, before the bursting in of the Gentiles – just as here the one angel gives the prefatory commencement, before the multitude of the heavenly host burst in with their proclamation of ‘peace on earth’.” – Alford.

χριστος κύριος. – “This is the only place where these words come together. In chap. 23:2 we have χρ. βασιλέα, and in Acts 2:36 κύριον και χρ. (In Col. 3:24 we have, in a somewhat different meaning [said to servants],

τω κυρίω χριστῷ δουλεύετε.) And I see no way of understanding this κύριος, but as corresponding to the Hebrew JEHOVAH.” – *Idem*.

“Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29). “Jesus saith unto him, I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me” (John 14:6). “Neither is the salvation (ἡ σωτηρία – for which we all look) in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). “Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses” (Acts 13:38–39). “Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and (the same of) thy household” (Acts 16:30–31). “For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God (what the Law is never called) unto salvation to everyone that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek (the Jewish expression for all mankind). For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:16–17). “But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who was made wisdom unto us from God (απο θεου), both righteousness and sanctification (the Christian life in its completeness – the negative as well as the positive side in Christ’s justifying work) and redemption: that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord” 1 Cor. 1:30–31). “Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. 3:11). “Yea doubtless, and I count all things but lost for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them as refuse, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith” (Phil. 3:8–9). “The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin” (1 John 1:7). “And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (1 John 2:2). “After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb” (Rev. 7:9–10).

Plan of Exposition of the Second Part of the Articles.

We have always thought that this Division of our Articles is less systematically arranged than the First, and than it might be. We propose therefore to consider the Church, and all that pertains to it, as here drawn out, in one connected view, reserving for discussion afterwards those interjectional Articles which interrupt that view. Our order will be the following: –

The Church (Art. 19).

The Church – Its Ministers (Arts. 23, 36, 24, 26, 32).

The Church – Its Authority (Arts. 20, 34, 21, 33).

The Church – Its Sacraments (Arts. 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31).

Article XIX.

The Church – What It Is.

Of the Church. – The Visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, have erred; so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.

De Ecclesia. – Ecclesia Christi visibilis est coetus fidelium, in quo verbum Dei purum praedicatur, et Sacramenta, quoad ea quae necessario exigantur, juxta Christi institutum recte administrantur. Sicut erravit Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Alexandrina, et Antiochena; ita et erravit Ecclesia Romana, non solum quoad agenda, et caeremoniarum ritus, verum in his etiam quae credenda sunt.

History.

What is the Church? is, perhaps, the question of the hour. The pretensions and anathemas of the Papal See have long agitated the world with it; but the late Romeward tendencies of Oxford have brought it to our very doors. [When we settled a few years ago in a northern town, in temporary charge of a district, two out of every three clergymen who called upon us had the charity and consistency to remark to the effect, The town is full of Wesleyans, they are doing a good work, but, as of course you are aware, they are outside the covenanted mercies of God! What a pity! What a pity 'tis, if true!]

The Pope solemnly declares that they and they only who are within the pale of the Romish communion, constitute the Church. The Ritualist affirms that they and they only who are within the pale of a communion whose clergy have received Episcopal Ordination, constitute the Church. While the Evangelical Protestant believes and maintains that the Church is composed of all those who profess true faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, together with their children.

These, verily, are discordant voices; but history, and above all, thank God, the Divine Record, enable us to judge between them.

It must here, at the outset, once for all be noted, that the phrase “visible Church” implies also a Church which is invisible. And this gives us an opportunity of remarking that in the corrupted communions, there may be some of the members of the invisible Church of God. So that, when we cut off any community from the visible Church of Christ, in following up the plain sense and meaning of our Article, we must not be understood as declaring that no members of that community can be God’s children. The invisible Church is composed of the elect, whether militant on earth or triumphant in glory. But it is not expressly brought before us.

Our old English word Church or Kirk (A. S. *Cyrice*, Gr. *κυριακη*, sc. *οικία*) means the Lord’s House. Hence an assembly of worshipers; the collection body of Christians, etc.

Now names in the history of things and peoples are for the most part of important value. And here the very fact that our Anglo-Saxon and English word *Grice*, *Kirk*, or *Church*, is derived from the Greek *Kuriake*, and not from the Roman *Ecclesia* (the only one term known to that tongue for Church), amounts almost to a demonstrative proof that the British Church does not owe its origin in any way whatever to Rome, but that it is traceable directly to a Greek or Asiatic source – most probably the “Mother Church” of Jerusalem.

Κυριακη, or Church, is if we may so say the more homely term. Its root idea being that of a family under one head – the household of the Lord.

Εκκλησία, on the other hand, has reference rather to the origination of the family of believers – their being called out of the family of mankind. Thus in Grecian Antiquities, *εκκλησία* was the public legislative assembly of the Athenians – citizens called out by the crier.

These two reciprocally complementary words then give us the full idea of the Visible Church – a professed family of believers, called out from the

world, and presided over by one Invisible Head, even Christ.

The following remarks of Archbishop French on ἐκκλησία, etc., are most interesting, and well worthy the attention of the student: –

“Ἐκκλησία, συναγωγή, πανήγυρις. – There are words whose history it is peculiarly interesting to watch, as they obtain a deeper meaning, and receive a new consecration, in the Christian Church; words which the Church did not invent, but has assumed into its service, and employed in a far loftier sense than any to which the world had ever put them before. The very word by which the Church is named is itself an example – a more illustrious one could scarcely be found – of this progressive ennobling of a word. For we have ἐκκλησία in three distinct stages of meaning – the heathen, the Jewish, and the Christian. In respect of the first ἡ ἐκκλησία (= Euripides, *Orestes*, 930) was the lawful assembly in a free Greek city of all those possessed of the rights of citizenship, for the transaction of public affairs. That they were *summoned* is expressed in the latter part of the word; that they were summoned *out of* the whole population, a select portion of it, including neither the populace, nor strangers, nor yet those who had forfeited their civic rights, this is expressed in the first. Both the *calling* (the κλησις, Phil. 3:14; 2 Tim. 1:9), and the calling *out* (the εκλογη, Rom. 11:7; 2 Peter 1:10), are moments to be remembered, when the word is assumed into a higher Christian sense, for in them the chief part of its peculiar adaptation to its more august uses lies. It is interesting to observe how, on one occasion in the New Testament, the word returns to this earlier significance (Acts 19:32, 39, 41).

“Ἐκκλησία did not, like some other words, pass immediately and at a single step from the heathen world to the Christian Church; but here, as so often, the Septuagint supplies the link of connection, the point of transition, the word being there prepared for its highest meaning of all. When the Alexandrian translators undertook the rendering of the Hebrew Scriptures, they found in them two constantly recurring words, namely, עֲרָה and קָהָל. For these they employed generally, and as their most adequate Greek equivalents, συναγωγή and ἐκκλησία. The rule which they seem to have prescribed to themselves is as follows – to render עֲרָה for the most part by συναγωγή (Exod. 12:3, Lev. 4:13, Num. 1:2, and altogether more than a hundred times), and, whatever other renderings of the word they may adopt, in no single case to render it by ἐκκλησία. It were to be wished that they had shown the same consistency in respect of קָהָל; but they have not; for

while ἐκκλησία is their standing word for it (Deut. 18:16, Judg. 20:2; 1 Kings 8:14, and in all some seventy times), they too often render this also by συναγωγή (Lev. 4:13, Num. 10:3, Deut. 5:22, and in all some five and twenty times), thus breaking down for the Greek reader the distinction which undoubtedly exists between the words. Our English Version has the same lack of a consistent rendering. Its two words are ‘congregation’ and ‘assembly’; but instead of constantly assigning one to one, and one to the other, it renders עֵרָה now by ‘congregation’ (Lev. 10:17, Num. 1:16, Josh. 9:27), and now by ‘assembly’ (Lev. 4:13); and on the other hand, קָהָל sometimes by ‘assembly’ (Judg. 21:8; 2 Chron. 30:23), but much oftener by ‘congregation’ (Judg. 21:5, Josh. 8:35).

“There is an interesting discussion by Vitranga (*De Synag. Vet.*, pp. 77–89) on the distinction between these two Hebrew synonyms, the result of which is summed up in the following statements: ‘Notat proprie קָהָל universam alicujus populi multitudinem, vinculis societatis unitam et rempublicam sive civitatem quandam constituentem, cum vocabulum עֵרָה ex indole et vi significationis suae tantum dicat quemcunque hominum coetum et conventum, sive minorem sive majorem’ (p. 80). And again: ‘Συναγωγή, semper significat coetum conjunctum et congregatum, etiamsi nullo forte vinculo ligatum, sed ἐκκλησία [= קָהָל] designat multitudinem aliquam, quae populum constituit, per leges et vincula inter se junctam, etsi saepe fiat non sit coacta vel cogi possit’ (p. 88). Accepting this as a true distinction, we shall see that it was not without due reason that our Lord (Matt. 16:18, 18:17) and His apostles claimed this as the nobler word, to designate the new society of which He was the Founder, being, as it was, a society knit together by the closest spiritual bonds, and altogether independent of space.

“Yet for all this we do not find the title ἐκκλησία wholly withdrawn from the Jewish congregation; that too was ‘the church in the wilderness’ (Acts 7:38), for Christian and Jewish differed only in degree and not in kind. Nor yet do we find συναγωγή wholly renounced by the Church; the latest honourable use of it in the New Testament, indeed the only Christian use of it there, is by that apostle to whom it was especially given to maintain unbroken to the latest possible moment the outward bonds connecting the Synagogue and the Church, namely, by St. James (2:2); επισυναγωγή, I may add, on two occasions is honourably used, but in a more general sense (2 Thess. 2:1, Heb. 10:25). Occasionally also in the

early Fathers, in Ignatius, for instance, (*Ep. ad Polyc.* 4; for other examples see Suicer, s.v.), we find συναγωγή still employed as an honourable designation of the Church, or of her places of assembly. Still there were causes at work which led the faithful to have less and less pleasure in the appropriation of this name to themselves, and in the end to leave it altogether to those whom, in the latest book of the canon, the Lord had characterized for their fierce opposition to the truth even as the ‘synagogue of Satan’ (Rev. 3:9). Thus the greater fitness and nobleness of the title εκκλησία has been already noted. Add to this that the Church was ever rooting itself more predominantly in the soil of the heathen world, breaking off more entirely from its Jewish stock and stem. This of itself would have led the faithful to the letting fall of συναγωγή, a word of at once of infrequent use in classical Greek, and permanently associated with Jewish worship, and to the ever more exclusive appropriation to themselves of εκκλησία, so familiar already, and of so honourable a significance in Greek ears. ...

“The πανήγυρις differs from the εκκλησία in this, that in the εκκλησία, as has been noted already, there lay ever the sense of an assembly coming together for the transaction of business. The πανήγυρις, on the other hand, was a solemn assembly for purposes of festal rejoicing, and on this account it is found joined continually with εορτή, as by Philo, *Vit. Mos.* ii. 7; Ezek. 46:11; cf. Hos. 2:11, 9:5; and Isa. 66:10, where πανηγυρίζειν = εορτάζειν. ... Keeping this festal character of the πανήγυρις in mind, we shall find a peculiar fitness in the word’s employment at Heb. 12:23, where only in the New Testament it occurs. The apostle is there setting forth the communion of the Church militant on earth with the Church triumphant in heaven – of the Church toiling and suffering here with that Church from which all weariness and toil have forever passed away (Rev. 21:4); and how could he better describe this last than as a πανήγυσις, than as the glad and festal assembly of heaven?” – (*Synonyms of the New Testament.*)

Notes of the Church.

The early Christian Fathers dwell rather upon the Kuriaké and Ecclesia aspects of the Church than distinct definitions, since in their days there was little, if indeed any, controversy on the subject. Heresies and schisms and synagogues of Satan there were, but opposing churches as such there were not. That curse we owe to apostolic Rome, her unsanctified

ambition, and thirst for the blood of the saints of God. And therefore, in describing the Church, the Fathers use such language as the following: –

The Multitude in God. – *Ignatius*.

The Synagogue of God. The Paradise of God planted in the world. – *Irenaeus*.

The congregation of those dedicated to prayer. – *Clement of Alexandria*.

The Body of Christ, animated by the Son of God. – *Origen*.

Christ, the Foundation. – *Athanasius*.

Christ, the Head. – *Jerome*.

The City of God. The City of the Great King. – *Augustine*.

Or they dwell upon the Church's *Unity* –

“We are one body by our agreement in religion, our unity of discipline, and our being in the same covenant of hope” (Tertullian, *Apol.*, 39).

Sanctity –

“The temple therefore of God, that is, of the whole supreme Trinity, is the Holy Church [the Church], that is, universal in heaven and on earth” (Augustine, *Euchirid*). But in the Visible Church there is the mingling of the good and the evil: “The Lord Himself ... even among His twelve apostles still endured a devil until His passion; and said, *Suffer both to grow until the harvest, lest haply, whilst ye would root up the tares, ye root out the wheat also*; and foretold that these nets, which were a figure of the Church, should have good and evil fishes, even unto the shore, that is, even unto the end of the world” (Idem, *De Fide et Op.*).

Universality –

“The Church spread abroad throughout all the world ... in Germany, in Spain, among the Celts, in the East, in Egypt, in the middle of the world. As the sun, God's creature, is one and the same in all the world, so too the preaching of the truth shines everywhere, and enlightens all men who wish to come to the knowledge of the truth” (Irenaeus, *Contr. Haer.*).

Apostolicity –

“The apostles having obtained the power of the Holy Ghost, which was promised them, in order to work miracles, and to speak boldly in all utterance, and having first borne their testimony to the faith in Jesus Christ throughout Judea, and planted Churches there, went afterwards into other parts of the world, and published the same doctrine of the same faith to the

Gentiles; and so proceeded to found Churches in every city; from which afterwards other Churches borrowed, and still continue to borrow, the offshoots of their faith and the seeds of their doctrine, that so they might become Churches. And by this means they are also reputed apostolical, as being the offspring of the Apostolical Churches, every kind of which must be accounted of according to its original. And therefore so many and great Churches are nothing else but that primitive one, from which all the rest proceed. Thus they are all primitive and all apostolic as long as they maintain one and the same truth, whilst there is amongst them a communion of peace, and an appellation of brotherhood, and a league of hospitality; which rights are no otherwise to be preserved inviolable, than by the uniform delivery of the same doctrine [the Rule of Faith delivered by the Apostles]” (Tertullian, *de Praescript. Haeret.*).

“I will not that the Holy Church be demonstrated from human reasonings, but from the Divine Oracles” (Augustine, *de Unit.*).

Still, not a few of the Fathers speak of the Priesthood, or a Succession of Ministers from the Apostles, as a distinct mark of the Church. Thus Ignatius says that without the three orders of clergy, there is no Church (χωρις τουτων Ἐκκλησία ου καλειται – ad *Trall.*). A discussion here, however, is involved; but it belongs more properly to the Twenty-third Article, as limited and interpreted by the Thirty-sixth.

We are thus prepared to see that the Creeds give us no logical definitions of the Church beyond assigning it the titles of One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolical.

The first at least of these characters of the Visible Church, it remained for Rome to destroy – its Unity. Nothing perhaps is more wonderful in history than the audacity of the Bishops of Rome in setting up their claim to supremacy, and the tenacity with which throughout centuries they clung to it. But time is God’s avenger. The blasphemous claims of the Roman Pontiff, as Judge in the place of God as Vicegerent of the Most High, first kindled the flame of jealousy between the East and West, in the sixth century; which was fanned by Rome’s lineage worship and other encroachments in the eighth century; until at last, in the eleventh century, Leo IX, in his vain endeavours to impose his absolute authority, lost, we can only hope forever, the Eastern Church to the Papal See. But the nemesis of Divine vengeance still went on, nor sheathed its righteous sword, until in the end the Papal Supremacy was struck down in Germany, and, thank God,

in our own England. And if Germans and Britons will only be true to themselves, their fatherlands, their common Bible, and their common God, the foul grave of the Supremacy of Rome is sealed forever.

There is indeed one thing yet more wonderful in history than the audacity and tenacity of purpose of the Bishops of Rome; and that is, how any intelligent mind can bow to the Papal system, when its pretensions are displayed. And therefore we ask the reader's deliberate study of—

The Romanist's Notes of the Church.

1. Catholicity.
2. Antiquity.
3. Extent.
4. Duration.
5. Succession of Bishops.
6. Union among themselves, and with their head.
7. Conformity of Doctrine with former times.
8. Miracles.
9. Prophecy.
10. Sanctity of Doctrine.
11. Holiness of Life.
12. Temporal Felicity.
13. Curses upon their enemies.
14. A Constant Progress, or Efficacy of Doctrine.
15. The confession of adversaries. (Bellarmine.)
16. Infallibility.
17. The Pope the Vicar of Christ upon earth. To these we must add the cruel exactions of Rome, for they are amongst her most prominent “marks” – implicit obedience and the non-use of private judgment.

The blasphemy and naked absurdity of these claims we must consider further on. But would here ask, in all sincerity, are the above monstrous features of the Romish imposture known to nine-tenths of its adherents? or do they, in blind simplicity and ignorance, and in sheer illiterateness, “all bow down to the slaughter?”

We must also remark, that we are somewhat puzzled to explain how Bishop Browne writes: “The definition of the Church by the Roman Catholic divines does not materially differ from those of the Reformers, except in one important point. Bellarmine gives it as follows: ‘Nostra

sententia est ecclesiam unam tantum esse, non duas, et illam unam et veram esse coetum hominum ejusdem Christianae fidei professione et eorundem sacramentorum communionem colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum, ac praecipue unius Christi in terris Vicarii Romani pontificis.” His Lordship must be aware that the Protestant Church, of which he is a member, does not count amongst her notes – miracles, nor prophecy, nor curses upon her enemies, nor infallibility; nor does she exact blindly implicit obedience, nor denounce the use of private judgment.

Now let us contrast with the above Notes of Rome, the Notes of the Church adopted by Protestants; and mark how they all tend to glorify God, and not to exalt man, except indeed where the taint of Rome still remains.

Standard or Official Documents.

The Augsburg Confession, A.D. 1530.

“The Church is the congregation of saints [the assembly of all believers – *Versammlung aller Gläubigen*], in which the Gospel is rightly taught [purely preached] and the Sacrament rightly administered [according to the Gospel].

“And unto the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies instituted by men, should be alike everywhere, as St. Paul saith: There is one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.”

The First Helvetic Confession, A.D. 1536.

[This confession had a much wider range than any preceding, being embraced by all the Reformed Cantons of Switzerland.]

“We hold that the Church is built upon Christ the living Rock of stones cemented in by Faith, and is a holy collection of all saints, and the immaculate spouse of Christ, which he washes and purifies with his own Blood, and at length will assign and deliver up to his Father without spot or wrinkle.

“Which indeed, although it be known to the eyes of God alone, is nevertheless not only discerned and recognized by certain external rites, instituted by Christ himself, and a public and legitimate discipline even as of the word of God, but is so constituted, that no one, without [the

observance of] these (unless by the singular privilege of God), is reckoned to be within the Church.”

The Second Helvetic Confession, A.D. 1566.

[The most elaborate of the Swiss Confessions. It was adopted or approved by nearly all the Reformed Continental and English Churches.]

“As there is always one God, and one Mediator between God and men, Jesus the Messiah, who is also one Shepherd of a universal flock, the one Head of the body, in fine one Spirit, one Salvation, one faith, one Testament or Covenant; it necessarily follows that there is only one Church: which we therefore call Catholic, because it is universal, and diffused through all parts of the world, and extends to all time, nor is it included in any places or times. We condemn therefore the Donatists, who confine the Church to parts of Africa. Nor do we approve of the Romish Clergy, who boast of the Roman Church as alone Catholic.” It then goes on to speak of particular Churches in different countries, their unity, and characteristics; and of Christ as the sole living Head of the universal Church. That only is the true Church, in which the marks or notes of the true Church are found: in the first place, the legitimate and sincere preaching of the Word of God, according as it is delivered to us in the books of the Prophets and the Apostles; then the members thereof have one faith; worship one God in spirit and truth; call upon one Mediator and Intercessor, Christ; seek justification and eternal life through Christ alone and by faith in him; acknowledge Christ as the sole Head and Foundation of the Church; upon him firmly relying, by repentance renew their strength from day to day; patiently bear his Cross; have fellowship with all his members, in love unfeigned, by which they declare that they are his disciples, persevering in the bonds of peace and holy unity; and together partake of the Sacraments instituted by Christ, not using them otherwise than as they have received of the Lord. And it condemns, with much strength and clearness of argument, the assumptions of the Roman Pontiff as universal pastor and chief head of the Church on earth, and so vicar of Christ – inasmuch as Christ remains forever the one universal Pastor and Great High Priest before God the Father, and therefore requireth not a Vicar, which implies an absent Lord.”

The French Confession of Faith, A.D. 1559.

“We believe that it is important to discern with care and prudence which is the true Church, for this title has been much abused. We say, then,

according to the Word of God, that it is the company of the faithful who agree to follow his Word, and the pure religion which it teaches; who grow in grace all their lives, believing and becoming more confirmed in the fear of God according as they feel the want of growing and pressing onward. Even though they strive continually, they can have no hope save in the remission of their sins. Nevertheless we do not deny that among the faithful there may be hypocrites and reprobates, but their wickedness cannot destroy the title of the Church.

“In this belief we declare that, properly speaking, there can be no Church where the Word of God is not received, nor profession made of subjection to it, nor use of the Sacraments. Therefore we condemn the papal assemblies, as the pure Word of God is banished from them, their sacraments are corrupted, or falsified, or destroyed, and all superstitions and idolatries are in them. We hold, then, that all who take part in these acts, and commune in that Church, separate and cut themselves off from the body of Christ.”

The Belgic Confession, A.D. 1561. Revised 1619.

“We believe and profess one catholic or universal Church, which is a holy congregation and assembly of true Christian believers, expecting all their salvation in Jesus Christ, being washed by his blood, sanctified and sealed by the Holy Ghost.

“This Church hath been from the beginning of the world, and will be to the end thereof; which is evident from this, that Christ is an eternal King, which, without subjects, he cannot be. ...

“Furthermore, this holy Church is not confined, bound, or limited to a certain place or to certain persons, but is spread and dispersed over the whole world; and yet is joined and united with heart and will, by the power of faith, in one and the same spirit. ...

“We believe that we ought diligently and circumspectly to discern from the Word of God which is the true Church, since all sects which are in the world assume to themselves the name of the Church.

“But we speak here not of the company of hypocrites, who are mixed in the Church with the good, yet are not of the Church, though externally in it; but we say that the body and communion of the true Church must be distinguished from all sects who call themselves the Church.

“The marks by which the true Church is known are these: If the pure doctrine of the gospel is preached therein; if she maintains the pure administration of the sacraments as instituted by Christ; if Church discipline is exercised in punishing of sin; in short, if all things are managed according to the pure Word of God, all things contrary thereto rejected, and Jesus Christ acknowledged as the only Head of the Church. Hereby the true Church may certainly be known, from which no man has a right to separate himself. With respect to those who are members of the Church, they may be known by the marks of Christians, namely, by faith; and when they have received Jesus Christ the only Saviour, they avoid sin, follow after righteousness, love the true God and their neighbour, neither turn aside to the right or left, and crucify the flesh with the works thereof. But this is not to be understood as if there did not remain in them great infirmities; but they fight against them through the Spirit all the days of their life, continually taking their refuge in the blood, death, passion, and obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ, *in whom they have remission of sins through faith in him.*

“As for the false Church, she ascribes more power and authority to herself and her ordinances than to the Word of God, and will not submit herself to the yoke of Christ. Neither does she administer the Sacraments, as appointed by Christ in his Word, but adds to and takes from them as she thinks proper; she relieth more upon men than upon Christ; and persecutes those who live holily according to the Word of God, and rebuke her for her errors, covetousness, and idolatry. These two Churches are easily known and distinguished from each other.”

The Scotch Confession of Faith. A.D. 1560.

“Because that Satan from the beginning has laboured to deck his pestilent Synagogue with the title of the Kirk of God, and has inflamed the hearts of cruel murderers to persecute, trouble, and molest the true Kirk and members thereof, as Cain did Abell, Ismael Isaac, Esau Jacob, and the whole Priesthood of the Jews, Christ Jesus himself, and his Apostles after him. It is one thing waist requisite, that the true Kirk be discerned from the filthy Synagogues, by clear and perfect notes, least we being deceived, receive and embrace, to our own condemnation, the one for the other. The notes, signs, and assured tokens whereby the immaculate Spouse of Christ Jesus is known from the horrible harlot, the Kirk malignant, we affirm, are

neither Antiquity, Title usurped, lineal Descent, Place appointed, nor multitude of men approving any error. For Cain, in age and title, was preferred to Abel and Seth: Jerusalem had prerogative above all places of the world, where also were the Priests lineally descended from Aaron, and greater number followed the Scribes, Pharisees, and Priests, then unfeignedly believed and approved Christ Jesus and his doctrine: And yet, as we suppose, no man of sound judgment will grant, that any of the forenamed were the Kirk of God. The notes therefore of the true Kirk of God we believe, confess, and avow to be, first, the true preaching of the Worde of God, into the which God has revealed himself unto us, as the writings of the Prophets and Apostles does declare. Secondly, the right administration of the Sacraments of Christ Jesus, which may be annexed unto the word and promise of God, to seal and confirm the same in our hearts. Last, Ecclesiastical discipline uprightly ministered, as God's Word prescribes, whereby vice is repressed, and virtue nourished."

The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. A.D. 1562 [1563].

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

"As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith."

The Irish Articles of Religion. A.D. 1615.

"There is but one Catholic Church (out of which there is no salvation), containing the universal company of all the saints that ever were, are, or shall be, gathered together in one body, under one head, Christ Jesus: part whereof is already in heaven *triumphant*, part as yet *militant* here upon earth. And because this Church consisteth of all those, and those alone, which are elected by God unto salvation, and regenerated by the power of his Spirit, the number of whom is known only unto God himself; therefore it is called the Catholic or universal, and the Invisible Church.

"But particular and visible Churches (consisting of those who make profession of the faith of Christ, and live under the outward means of salvation) the many in number: wherein the more or less sincerely,

according to Christ's institution, the Word of God is taught, the Sacraments are administered, and. the authority of the Keys is used, the more or less pure are such Churches to be accounted.

“The power which the Bishop of Rome now challengeth to be supreme head of the universal Church of Christ, and to be above all emperors, kings, and princes, is a usurped power, contrary to the Scriptures and Word of God, and contrary to the example of the Primitive Church; and therefore is for most causes just taken away and abolished within the King's Majesty's realms and dominions.

“The Bishop of Rome is so far from being the supreme head of the universal Church of Christ, that his works and doctrine do plainly discover him to be *that man of sin*, foretold in the holy Scriptures, *whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his coming.*”

The Westminster Confession of Faith, A.D. 1647.

“The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.

“The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those, throughout the world, that profess the true religion, and of their children [al. *together with*, instead of *and of*]; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation. ...

“This catholic Church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less visible. And particular churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them.

“The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless, there shall be always a Church on earth to worship God according to his will.

“There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof; but is that Antichrist

[Lat. *insignis ille Antichristus*], that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God.”

The Confession of the Waldenses. A.D. 1655.

“We believe that God has chosen one Church in the world for the salvation of men, and that this Church has one only head and foundation, which is Jesus Christ.

“That this Church is the company of the faithful, who, having been elected by God before the foundation of the world, and called with a holy calling, unite themselves to follow the Word of God, believing whatsoever he teaches them therein, and living in his fear.

“That this Church cannot fail, nor be annihilated, but must endure forever.”

“Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold.”

To these authoritative norms we shall only further add the strong testimony of our semi-authoritative Homilies.

Homily for Whitsunday.

“The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God’s faithful and elect people, *built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head cornerstone* (Eph. 2:20). And hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to Christ’s holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. This description of the church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God, and also to the doctrine of the ancient fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith.

“Now if you will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd, you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true church, that nothing can be more. For neither are they *built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets*, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesus; neither yet do they order the sacraments, or else the ecclesiastical keys, in such sort as he did first institute and ordain them: but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away,

that now they may seem to be converted into a new guise. Christ commended to his church a sacrament of his body and blood: they have changed it into a sacrifice for the quick and the dead. Christ did minister to his apostles, and the apostles to other men indifferently under both kinds; they have robbed the lay people of the cup, saying, that for them one kind is sufficient. Christ ordained no other element to be used in baptism, but only water, whereunto ‘when the word is joined, it is made (as St. Augustine saith) a full and perfect sacrament.’ They, being wiser in their own conceit than Christ, think it is well nor orderly done, unless they use conjuration, unless they hallow the water, unless there be oil, salt, spittle, tapers, and such other dumb ceremonies, serving to no use, contrary to the plain rule of St. Paul, *who willet all things to be done in the church to edification* (1 Cor. 14:26). Christ ordained the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners, and to absolve them which are truly penitent: they abuse this power at their own pleasure, as well in cursing the godly with bell, book, and candle, as also in absolving the reprobate, which are known to be unworthy of any Christian society: whereof they that lust to see examples, let them search their lives. To be short, look what our Saviour Christ pronounced of the scribes and Pharisees in the Gospel; the same may be, boldly and with safe conscience, pronounced of the Bishops of Rome; namely, that they have forsaken, and daily do forsake, the commandments of God, to erect and set up their own constitutions. Which thing being true, as all they which have any light of God’s word must needs confess, we may well conclude, according to the rule of Augustine, that the bishops of Rome and their adherents are not the true Church of Christ, much less then to be taken as chief heads and rulers of the same. ‘Whosoever (saith he) do dissent from the Scriptures concerning the head, although they be found in all places where the Church is appointed, yet are they not in the Church’: a plain place, concluding directly against the Church of Rome.”

Representative Men.

Luther: – “Church, or *Ecclesia*, means properly the congregation or communion of Christians – gathered together of holy men under one Head, Christ; collected by the Holy Spirit, in one faith and one sentiment, adorned with various gifts, but united in love, and accordant in all things, without sects or schisms.”

Calvin: – “The Scriptures speak of the Church in two ways. Sometimes when they speak of the Church they mean the Church as it really is before God – the Church into which none are admitted but those who by the gift of adoption are sons of God, and by the sanctification of the Spirit true members of Christ. In this case it not only comprehends the saints who dwell on the earth, but all the elect who have existed from the beginning of the world. Often, too, by the name of Church is designated the whole body of mankind scattered throughout the world, who profess to worship one God and Christ, who by baptism are initiated into the faith; by partaking of the Lord’s Supper profess unity in true doctrine and charity, agree in holding the Word of the Lord, and observe the ministry which Christ has appointed for the preaching of it. In this Church there is a very large mixture of hypocrites, who have nothing of Christ but the name and outward appearance: of ambitious, avaricious, envious, and evil-speaking men, some also of impurer lives, who are tolerated for a time, either because their guilt cannot be legally established, or because due strictness of discipline is not always observed. Hence, as it is necessary to believe the invisible Church, which is manifest to the eye of God only, so we are also enjoined to regard this Church which is so called with reference to man, and to cultivate its communion.

“Accordingly, inasmuch as it was of importance to us to recognize it, the Lord has distinguished it by certain marks, and, as it were, symbols. It is, indeed, the special prerogative of God to know those who are his, as Paul declares in 2 Tim. 2:19. And doubtless it has been so provided as a check on human rashness, the experience of every day reminding us how far his secret judgments surpass our apprehension. For even those who seemed most abandoned, and who had been completely despaired of, are by his goodness recalled to life, while those who seemed most stable often fall. Hence, as Augustine says, ‘In regard to the secret predestination of God, there are very many sheep without, and very many wolves within’ (August. Hom. In Joan. 45). For he knows, and has his mark on those who know neither him nor themselves. Of those again who openly bear his badge, his eyes alone see who of them are unfeignedly holy, and will persevere even to the end, which alone is the completion of salvation. On the other hand, foreseeing that it was in some degree expedient for us to know who are to be regarded by us as his sons, he has in this matter accommodated himself to our capacity. But as here full certainty was not necessary, he has in its

place substituted the judgment of charity, by which we acknowledge all as members of the Church who by confession of faith, regularity of conduct, and participation in the sacraments, unite with us in acknowledging the same God and Christ. The knowledge of his body, inasmuch as he knew it to be more necessary for our salvation, he has made known to us by surer marks.

“Hence the form of the Church appears and stands forth conspicuous to our view. Wherever we see the Word of God sincerely preached and heard, wherever we see the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ, there we cannot have any doubt that the Church of God has some existence, since his promise cannot fail, ‘Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them’ (Matt. 18:20). But that we may have a clear summary of this subject, we must proceed by the following steps: – The Church universal is the multitude collected out of all nations, who, though dispersed and far distant from each other, agree in one truth of divine doctrine, and are bound together by the tie of a common religion. In this way it comprehends single churches, which exist in different towns and villages, according to the wants of human society, – so that each of them justly obtains the name and authority of the Church; and also comprehends single individuals, who by a religious profession are accounted to belong to such churches, although they are in fact aliens from the Church, but have not been cut off by a public decision. There is, however, a slight difference in the mode of judging of individuals and of churches. For it may happen in practice that those whom we deem not altogether worthy of the fellowship of believers, we yet ought to treat as brethren, and regard as believers, on account of the common consent of the Church in tolerating and bearing with them in the body of Christ. Such persons we do not approve by our suffrage as members of the Church, but we leave them the place which they hold among the people of God, until they are legitimately deprived of it. With regard to the general body we must feel differently; if they have the ministry of the Word, and honour the administration of the sacraments, they are undoubtedly entitled to be ranked with the Church, because it is certain that these things are not without a beneficial result. Thus we both maintain the Church universal in its unity, which malignant minds have always been eager to dissever, and deny not due authority to lawful assemblies distributed as circumstances require.”

Ridley: – “The holy Catholic or universal Church, which is the communion of saints, the house of God, the city of God, the spouse of God, the body of Christ, the pillar and stay of the truth this Church I believe, according to the Creed: this Church I do reverence and honour in the Lord. The marks whereby this Church is known unto me in this dark world, and in the midst of this crooked and froward generation, are these: the sincere preaching of God’s Word; the due administration of the sacraments; charity; and faithful observance of ecclesiastical discipline, according to the Word of God.”

Hooker: – “A visible Society, signed with this mark, One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism: having communion in instruction, breaking of bread, and prayers: but not necessarily under one Form of Ecclesiastical Polity.

“In whomsoever these things are, the Church doth acknowledge them for her children; them only she holdeth for aliens and strangers, in whom these things are not found. For want of these it is, that Saracens, Jews, and Infidels are excluded out of the bounds of the Church. ... For preservation of Christianity there is not anything more needful, than that such as are of the visible Church have mutual fellowship and society one with another. In which consideration, as the main body of the sea being one, yet within divers precincts hath divers names; so the Catholic Church is in like sort divided into a number of distinct Societies, every one of which is termed a Church within itself. In this sense the Church is always a visible Society of men; not an assembly, but a Society. For although the name of the Church be given unto Christian assemblies, although any number of Christian men congregated may be termed by the name of a Church, yet assemblies properly are rather things that belong to a Church. Men are assembled for performance of public actions; which actions being ended, the assembly dissolveth itself, and is no longer in being; whereas the Church which was assembled doth no less continue afterwards than before. ‘Where but three are, and they of the Laity also (saith Tertullian), yet there is a Church’; that is to say, a Christian assembly. But a Church, as now we are to understand it, is a Society; that is, a number of men belonging unto some Christian fellowship, the place and limits whereof are certain. That wherein they have communion, is the public exercise of such duties as those mentioned in the Apostles’ Acts, ‘instruction, breaking of bread, and prayer.’ ... But we must note, that he which affirmeth speech to be necessary among all men

throughout the world, doth not thereby import that all men must necessarily speak one kind of language; even so the necessity of Polity and Regiment in all Churches may be held without holding any one certain Form to be necessary in them all, nor is it possible that any Form of Polity, much less of Polity Ecclesiastical, should be good, unless God himself be the author of it. ... We teach, that whatsoever is unto salvation termed necessary by way of excellency; whatsoever it standeth all men upon to know or to do that they may be saved; whatsoever there is whereof it may truly be said, ‘This not to believe, is eternal death and damnation’; or, ‘This every soul that will live, must duly observe’: of which sort the Articles of Christian Faith, and the Sacraments of the Church of Christ, are: all such things if Scripture did not comprehend, the Church of God should not be able to measure out the length and the breadth of that way wherein forever she is to walk; Heretics and Schismatics never ceasing, some to abridge, some to enlarge, all to pervert and obscure, the same. But as for those things that are accessory hereunto, those things that so belong to the way of salvation as to alter them, is no otherwise to change that way, than a path is changed by altering only the uppermost face thereof; which be it laid with gravel, or set with grass, or paved with stones, remaineth still the same path; in such things, because discretion may teach the Church what is convenient, we hold not the Church further tied herein unto Scripture, than that against Scripture nothing be admitted in the Church, lest that path which ought always to be kept even, do thereby come to be overgrown with brambles and thorns. If this be unsound, wherein doth the point of unsoundness lie?”

Field: – “First, the entire profession of those supernatural verities, which God hath revealed in Christ his Son.

“Secondly, the use of such holy ceremonies and sacraments as he hath instituted and appointed to serve as provocations to godliness, preservations from sin, memorials of the benefits of Christ, warrants for the greater security of our belief, and marks of distinction, to separate his own from strangers.

“Thirdly, an union or connection of men in this profession and use of these sacraments, under lawful pastors and guides, appointed, authorized, and sanctified, to direct and lead them in the happy ways of eternal salvation.”

Not “Antiquity, Succession, Unity, Universality, and the very name and title of Catholic, expressing the Universality” (the five *Notes of the Church* as propounded by Bellarmine).

Pearson: –

1. One origination – Christ.
2. One faith – that “once delivered to the saints”.
3. The same sacraments – Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.
4. One hope – that “of righteousness by faith,” even “the hope of eternal life.”
5. The bond of charity.
6. One discipline and government – Episcopacy (see Footnotes).

Barrow: –

1. “Consent in faith and opinion concerning all principal matters of doctrine.”

Delivered into one form of doctrine (Rom. 6:17).

Confederated in the society of a sacrament, or of one profession (Tertullian).

2. “Mutual charity and good will.”

This is my commandment, That ye love one another (John 15:12).

*They that are enemies to brotherly charity, whether they are openly out of the Church, or seem to be within, they are Pseudo-Christians and Anti-Christ*s (Augustine).

3. “Spiritual cognation and alliance.”

The sons of God – born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God (John 1:12–13).

All Christians, as *the sons of God and brethren of Christ*, become brethren one to another; so that it is a peculiar title or appellation of Christians, *the brethren* signifying all Christian people; and *a brother* being the same with a Christian professor.

4. “Incorporation into the mystical body of Christ – that spiritual heavenly kingdom, whereof Christ is the sovereign head and governor.

Called in one hope of your calling (Eph. 4:4).

Though the place disjoin them, yet the Lord joins them together, being their common Lord, etc. (Chrysostom).

5. “Peaceable concord and confederacy.”

Have peace one with another (Mark 9:50).

With us there is both one Church, and one mind, and individual concord (Cyprian).

6. “Concurrence of pastors to preserve truth and charity.”

Which that, with, the rest of our colleagues, we may steadfastly and firmly administer; and that we may keep the peace of the Church, in the unanimity of concord, the divine favour will vouchsafe to accomplish (Cyprian).

7. “Specific unity of discipline.”

The same sacraments, according to the forms appointed by our Lord, not admitting any substantial alteration. That sort of order, government, and ministry in all its substantial parts, which God did appoint in the Church. In lesser matters of ceremony or discipline (instituted by human prudence) Churches may differ, and it is expedient they should do so, in regard to the various circumstances of things, and qualities of persons to which discipline should be accomplished.

8. “Conformity in great matters of prudential discipline, although not instituted or prescribed by God, for this is a means of preserving peace, and is a beauty or harmony; for difference of practice doth alienate affections, especially in common people.”

But it is no mark of the universal Church of Christ, nor is it necessary, by the design and appointment of God, that there should be, in way of external policy, one singular government or jurisdiction of any kind. That the Church is capable of such a union, or that it is possible it should be so united, is not the question; but that such a union of all Christians is necessary, or that it was ever instituted by Christ, cannot be granted. St. Paul doth not imply any such unity then extant, or designed to be. He doth mention and urge the unity of spirit, of faith, of charity, of peace, of relation to our Lord, of communion in devotions and offices of piety; but concerning any union under one singular visible government or policy he is silent. He saith, *One Lord, one faith, one baptism*: not one monarch, or one senate, or one sanhedrim. The Fathers, in their set treatises and in their incidental discourses about the unity of the Church (which was *de facto*, which should be *de jure* in the Church), do make it to consist only in those unions of faith, charity, peace, which we have described, not in this political union. There hath never to this day been any place but one (namely, Rome) which hath pretended to be the seat of such an authority. But before the

Roman Church was founded there were Churches elsewhere. There was a great Church at Jerusalem (which indeed was the *mother of all Churches*, and was by the Fathers so styled. However, Rome now arrogates to herself that title.) There were issuing from that mother a fair offspring of Churches (those of Judea, of Galilea, of Samaria, of Syria and Cilicia, of divers other places) before there was any Church at Rome, or that St. Peter did come thither, which was at least divers years after our Lord's ascension. St. Paul was converted – after five years he went to Jerusalem, then St. Peter was there; after fourteen years thence he went to Jerusalem again, and then St. Peter was there: after that he met with St. Peter at Antioch. Where then was this authority seated? How then did the political unity of the Church subsist? Was the seat of the sovereign authority first resident at Jerusalem when St. Peter preached there? Did it walk thence to Antioch, fixing itself there for seven years? Was it thence translated to Rome, and settled there ever since? Did this roving and inconstancy become it?

The union of the whole Church in one body, under one government or sovereign authority, would be inconvenient and hurtful, prejudiced to the main designs of Christianity, destructive to the welfare and peace of mankind in many respects. Yet it is convenient that the subjects of each temporal sovereignty should live, as in a civil, so in a spiritual uniformity; for neighbours differing in opinion and fashions of practice, will be apt to contend each for his way, and thence to disaffect one another. But that all the world should be so joined is needless, and will be apt to produce more mischief than benefit.

It may be objected that this doctrine doth favour the conceits of the Independents concerning ecclesiastical discipline. I answer, No. For we do assert, that every Church is bound to observe the institutions of Christ, and that sort of government which the apostles did ordain, consisting of bishops, priests, and people. And we avow it expedient for several particular Churches or parishes to be combined in political corporations. Yet we hold that all Churches which have a fair settlement in several countries are coordinate, neither can one challenge a jurisdiction over the other.

It is therefore the duty and interest of all Churches to disclaim the pretenses of the Roman court, maintaining their liberties and rights against its usurpations; for compliance therewith, as it doth greatly prejudice truth and piety (leaving them to be corrupted by the ambitious, covetous, and voluptuous designs of those men), so it doth remove the genuine unity of

the Church and peace of Christians, unless to be tied by compulsory chains (as slaves) be deemed unity or peace.

[The above abstract contains some of the more salient points of Dr. Barrow's Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church. But we would strongly recommend the student to peruse the treatise throughout.]

Burnet: – 1. True Baptism as a federal admission into Christianity. There can, therefore, be no baptism where the essence of Christianity is not preserved.

2. Association together in the use of the Sacraments. But if any part of the institution is cut off, there we do not own the Sacrament to be true. Upon this account it is, that since Christ appointed bread and wine for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that He not only blessed both, but distributed both with words appropriated to each kind, we do not esteem that to be a true sacrament, in which either the one or the other of these kinds is withdrawn.

3. In short, the retention of the fundamentals of Christianity – the covenant of grace, the terms of salvation, and the grounds on which we expect it.

Beveridge: –

1. Visibility.
2. Profession of true faith in Christ.
3. Preaching of the pure Word of God.
4. Administration of Baptism, in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost. And of the Lord's Supper, according to Christ's institution, left on record for our imitation, Matt. 16:26–27, 1 Cor. 11:23–25.
5. A Priesthood – the three orders of clergy.

“They certainly hazard their salvation at a strange rate, who separate themselves from such a Church as ours, wherein the Apostolical succession, the root of all Christian communion, hath been so entirely preserved, and the Word and Sacraments are so effectually administered; and all to go into such assemblies and meetings as can have no pretense to the great promise in my text. For it is manifest that this promise was made only to the Apostles, and their successors, to the end of the world. Whereas in the private meetings, where their teachers have no Apostolical or Episcopal

imposition of hands, they have no ground to pretend to succeed the Apostles, nor, by consequence, any right to the Spirit which her Lord here promiseth” (Sermon on Matt. 28:20).

Potter: – A Christian Society, having the following chief characters and properties –

(a) Not voluntary, but obligatory, being of God’s appointment, and appointed with an enforcement of rewards and punishments.

(b) Spiritual, being founded in opposition to the kingdom of darkness; and as a consequence, to be distinct from all earthly kingdoms.

(c) Always Outward and Visible (necessity of denied by Socinus). Evident from the use of the word Church in Scripture as our Saviour: “Tell it unto the Church”; from the passages where it is compared to a marriage feast, etc.; from the descriptions of it to its first constitution – public rulers, public confession, public worship, visible sacraments; and state of in the first ages after its foundation.

(d) Universal – with regard to place or country, and in respect of time, or continuance to the end of the world; and so to be governed by a succession of the same officers as in the first age, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, for the maintenance of order and discipline, and due administration of the sacraments.

Palmer: –

1. Visibility. Collected from Scripture; confirmed by the Fathers; evident from Reason; acknowledged by Reformers; admitted by Dissenters; maintained by the Church of England and her theologians.

2. Unity. The Church of Christ is one in its origin; possesses one ministry derived from the apostles; is actually or virtually one in communion, its true members being always in communion with all their brethren, either in act or in intention and desire; one in faith, none of its true members obstinately doubting or rejecting any articles of the faith.

Yet, actual unity of external communion, not a necessary characteristic of the Church; but all parts of the Church must necessarily desire such a unity, and tend towards it, and must possess principles and means calculated to produce unity in each particular church, and in the Church Universal.

Nor is actual unity in all matters of faith, a note of the Church; neither promised in Scripture, nor can it be pretended to by any society of professing Christians. For –

(1) An apparent difference in doctrine, does not furnish alone any proof that there is a real difference in faith.

(2) The whole Catholic Church has been frequently disturbed for a long time by differences concerning faith – e.g., Arianism was not expelled for half a century, the disputes concerning Origen's doctrines continued for three centuries, the Eutychian doctrines disturbed the Church for more than two centuries, the controversies on Images for nearly the same time. Witness also the differences between the Lutherans and Calvinists; the disputes in the Eastern Churches; and in the Roman Obedience, besides Jansenism, the Controversies of Jesuits, Dominicans, and Augustinians, of Scotists and Thomists, of Ultramontanes and Cisalpines. And although Milner and Raines assert that no difference on any single article of faith is to be found amongst Romanists – still on the other hand a large number of their own theologians, Bossuet, Bellarmine, Stapleton, N. Dubois, etc., etc., affirm that their disputes do concern faith, and that one or other party are *heretical*.

(3) The apparent existence of unity in faith, is not a proof of such unity as Christ requires, because there may be a unity of error – e.g., the Nestorians or Eutychians are not less apparently united in their faith than the Eastern or the Roman Churches.

But as Christ has enjoined unity in the belief of the truth, there must be some means in his Church for preserving or restoring it. Therefore, all societies prevented by their fundamental principles from sustaining unity in the truth, cannot be Churches of Christ. Yet societies which by their principles tend to unity of faith, and provide means for accomplishing it, are properly parts of the Church. But any society which separates itself from, or was cut off by the great body of the Church of Christ in any one question of faith, after due examination and without any manifest irregularity of proceeding, is not to be accounted a portion of Christ's Church.

7. (*sic*) Sanctity. The Church is holy in its Divine Head and Founder (Titus 2:14) – the source of all holiness; and in its doctrine (2 Tim. 1:9). But its means of sanctity in the sacraments cannot with propriety be reckoned among the signs of the Church; for before we determine whether a society is in possession of all these means, we must enter on the whole subject of

the sacraments, which would lead to a discussion much too lengthened, and beyond the capacity of the majority of men. Romanists argue that the true and valid administration of the sacraments is not a note of the Church, therefore they cannot consistently enter on the discussion of those sacraments as a means of holiness.

Nor is the actual sanctity of its members a note of the Church – against the Novatians and Donatists, who considered all guilty of great sins as forming no part of the Church; the Pelagians, who held the Church to consist only of those free from sin; the Wickliffites, who taught that the Church includes only the predestinate; and the Anabaptists and English Dissenters, in their error that the Church consists only of those who are visibly holy in their lives – the latter founding their separation from the Church on the principle that she comprised sinners in her communion. All which fictions of purity have been exploded long ago by *experience*.

Neither are miracles, as Romanists contend, to be reckoned divine attestations of sanctity – Matt. 24:24, Mark 13:22, Matt. 7:22; 1 Cor. 13:1–2. And even some Roman theologians deny that signs and wonders alone are a sufficient proof of sanctity. Thus Espencaeus says, that “miracles are common to God and to the devil, to Christ and to antichrist.”

4. Catholicity. A moral universality (to be propagated in all nations) taught by the Old Testament and Christ himself; held by the Fathers; expressly admitted by the Reformers; acknowledged by Dissenters; and always recognized by the Anglo-Catholic Churches. But universality of communion not always essential, nor of itself a sufficient Note of the Church.

5. Apostolicity. Especially the Apostolical Succession of Ministers: so that no community which is without this succession can be a Church of Christ. But if it can be proved that a community is deprived of the apostolic ministry without fault of its own, or by difficulties which it cannot overcome, but that it is *desirous of obtaining such a ministry, and is in communion with the successors of the apostles in other Churches*, the actual want of this ministry does not exclude such a community from the Church of Christ. The Oriental Churches form a portion of the Catholic Church of Christ; so do the British Churches (the catholic and apostolic Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland) and their branches; so the Roman Churches, which have not been founded within the jurisdiction of other Churches, both before and since the Reformation; and also the Swedish

Church: *inter alia*, they all possess a ministry derived by regular succession from the Apostles: but not the English and Irish Papists, because they separated themselves from the communion of the Catholic Church of their country, and established rival altars, and a rival priesthood in the reign of Elizabeth; nor the American Papists, for schismatics do not cease to be so by a mere change of country. The Churches of the Foreign or Lutheran Reformation are also a portion of the Catholic Church, though deficient in Apostolical succession, which was a matter of necessity. The Dissenters of Britain, the United States, and English Colonies – e.g., Quakers, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Swedenborgians, Socinians, Huntingdonians, Independents, Irvingites – form no part of the Church of Christ, because Dissent is founded in schism and in heresy, is a mere human institution, man makes and unmakes, and has no apostolic succession of ministers. The Quakers have no ministry. The Wesleyans have or had no ordinations by imposition of hands. And the Independents and others pretend that no ordination whatever is requisite. The Dissenting minister is commissioned to preach the Gospel, not by God, but by man; and therefore the Dissenting communities are destitute of a true ministry; are but clubs, and not Churches of Christ. Finally, neither do the Nestorians and Monophysites, or Jacobites, constitute any part of the visible Church of Christ, though we should be lenient towards them, for it appears that their errors are generally held in ignorance, and that many of them are disposed to hear the truth.

Wordsworth: – A Visible Society, distinguished from all others, such as Pagans, Jews, Mahomedans, Infidels, and Apostates, by the profession of the True Religion, the essential characteristic whereof is Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; and appointed by God to be the dispenser of the means of pardon, grace, and salvation to men; and through which its members derive the following Privileges: –

(a) The Word of God, pure and entire, or the Canonical Scriptures.

(b) The right interpretation of the Word of God, as ascertained from the Church's Creed, Confessions of Faith, Liturgies, and the Practice of the Church; and expounded by her authorized Pastors and Teachers, for whose supply Christ made a permanent, hereditary, and successive provision.

(c) The due administration of the Sacraments by a Lawful Ministry, ordained by the hands of the Successors of the Apostles.

(d) Discipline, or the Power of the Keys, given by Christ to St. Peter, and in him to all Presbyters, to admit to the Kingdom of Heaven (the Visible Church, and that to which it leads the faithful, the Invisible), and exclude from it.

(e) Absolution – or the mode by which Christ’s Ministers re-admit offenders into the Church or Kingdom of Heaven, both Visible and Invisible; the visible effects, restoration to the Church and Holy Communion, leading to invisible results. The penitent must resort to the Priest, and the Priest must examine, exhort, and make trial of his sincerity. Christ’s power is here αυτοκρατορικη, or imperial; the Priest’s is διακονικη, or ministerial. It is Christ who raises the sinner from the death of sin; but when he has raised him by his Spirit, his Word, and his ministry, Christ then says to his Ministers, “Loose him, and let him go.”

(f) Sacerdotal Intercession and Benediction. Priestly Intercession is not superseded and taken away by the intercession of Christ. For although there is indeed to us but One Mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus; and no intercessions are available except only by and through him; yet the intercession of his Ministers, acting in his name, and by his authority and appointment, is to be considered, in a certain sense, his act and his intercession. Sacerdotal Benediction, or the communication of spiritual grace and blessing to single individuals, hath been always accompanied in the Church by the laying on of hands upon the head of the recipient; and is thus imparted in Confirmation, in the readmission of penitent sinners, and in the making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. And there is also the Sacerdotal Benediction of things – as at the Holy Communion, when the Priest lays his hand on the Sacramental Elements.

Rome, notwithstanding her novel, unscriptural, and anti-scriptural dogmas and practices, and her schism, is nevertheless, in a certain sense, a true Church. She has the essentials of a Church, though greatly marred and obscured. She has the Christian Sacraments, the Holy Scriptures, an Apostolic succession of Ministers, the Lord’s Prayer, the three Creeds, and the Ten Commandments. She is therefore a Church.

Dissenters (willful and obstinate Heretics and Schismatics), though we may not say they are in the *Invisible* Church, yet by virtue of the Sacraments which they may have received, and of such articles of the Christian Faith as they may still continue to hold, are so *far* in the *Visible*

Church. They are in the *field*, but they are tares in the *field*. Being *Heretics* or *Schismatics*, but *not* being *Jews*, *Saracens*, *Infidels*, *Atheists*, or *Apostates*, they are still members of the *Visible Church*, though *peccant* and *unsound* members; they are a part, though a *maimed* and *corrupt* part, of the *Visible Church*. “Sunt in Ecclesia, quamvis non salubriter in Ecclesia.” They are in the Visible Church, but as long as they are *willful* Heretics or Schismatics they do not receive benefit *from* it. They are subjects of Christ, but rebellious ones. By breaking the Unity of the Faith and of Worship they forsake *Charity*, without which other things do not profit, but rather, it is to be feared, may increase their condemnation. [The italics are the Bishop’s.]

(Dr. Charles) Elliott: –

1. The true Church receives and retains the doctrine or faith of the inspired Apostles. Eph. 2:20; 1 Cor. 3:2. Faith is the medium which unites us to Christ; and his doctrine, which is the object of faith, is the foundation of the Church.

It is not the sentiments of Fathers, Pontiffs, or Bishops, but of Prophets and Apostles, which constitute the foundation of the faith of the Church. As St. Augustine, when refuting the Donatists, says: “Let them show me their Church; not in the councils of their Bishops, not in the writings of disputers, not in the miracles and prodigies of which they boast; but let them show it me in the ordinances of the Law, in the predictions of the Prophets, in the songs of the Psalms, in the preaching of the Evangelists, and in the canonical authorities of the sacred books. This is our foundation, to which we inviolably attach ourselves, reposing only upon this Scripture, which is come from the Prophets and Apostles.” If Apostolic doctrine be wanting, no other quality, not even that of Apostolical Succession, can avail. As Gregory Nazianzen, in his eulogy upon Athanasius, says: “This is the law of the family of God, that it is neither flesh nor blood, nor the transmission of pulpits and benefices, which constitutes the succession, but the Spirit of Jesus Christ.” And quoting from Tertullian, observes, “ ... to this test then (Apostolic Doctrine), heresies will be challenged by those Churches, which, although they can bring forward as their founder no one of the Apostles or of apostolic men, as being of much later date, and indeed being founded daily, nevertheless, since they agree in the same faith, are, by reason of their consanguinity in doctrine, counted not the less Apostolical.”

2. An Apostolical Ministry.

What is the Vocation to the Ministry of which the Scriptures speak? To understand this, some have distinguished two sorts of vocation, which they denominate an internal and an external calling. That disposition of mind which a person feels who is powerfully influenced by the grace of God to consecrate himself to the work of the Christian ministry; and the public recognition and investiture of a person with this office and charge. But in order to constitute a legitimate call to the ministry, both should be united. The mind ought to be disposed by the Holy Spirit to desire the office; and there must of necessity be some credentials duly sealed and certified by which the mission may be attested to the world. Ordination is requisite to constitute a legitimate ministry; but it cannot be admitted that there are no Ministers but those who have received Episcopal Ordination. Every Church has power in itself to ordain Ministers in such order and after such manner as are consistent with the Word of God.

3. Apostolic Sacraments – Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

4. The Exercise of a pure Discipline.

Thus then we have a fair, and perhaps sufficient history of opinion in the Reformed Churches, as to what constitutes the Visible Church of Christ. All the documents and writers agree in holding Christ the Head; all agree in holding the Canonical Scriptures alone as the pure Word of God; all agree in the fundamental doctrine of the Atonement, or Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, expressly or by direct implication; and all agree in the use of the Sacraments, according to Christ’s institution and appointment; to which we may add a gospel Ministry, and godly Discipline. And such, we conceive, are the True Notes of the Visible Church of Christ.

The one, and thank God, the only disturbing element is Episcopacy, or Apostolical Succession. But as this will come before us elsewhere, we need not enter upon the discussion here. We may only simply observe, that since the Apostolical Succession School has once again revived, now flanked by the Neo-Evangelicals, and is making or essaying rapid strides in our midst, we have thought it well to give extended analysis, ad valorem, of Palmer and Wordsworth – the pronounced exponents of that school. What a bulwark of Protestant and Evangelical, and Saving Truth, might not our present Bishop of Lincoln be, if he could cease to love so-called “Antiquity” less, and the newborn Brotherhood of nineteenth century Christianity more! A giant in mind, and learning, and lore, prostrate in the windings of the dry, frail, feeble, withes of Apostolical Succession.

Oh! that the Men and the Churches of Christ, would strive for a purer, higher, holier atmosphere than caste, and prepare in heart, and soul, and *tongue*, for the Second Coming of our Lord. Gal. 5:14–15.

Dissent is not to be won back by banning it, either from the Visible Church of Christ, with Palmer, or from the Invisible, with Bishop Wordsworth.

Much less are the idols of Popery to be broken, or the system toned down, or stripped of one iota of its blasphemy, by assigning the Man of Sin and false and flattering scat in the temple of God. The Holy Scriptures, the Christian Sacraments, the Three Creeds, the Ten Commandments, Rome has not, save with corruptions, additions, mutilations.

We do grieve for the good Bishop of Lincoln in these his failings. And we do earnestly pray that his eyes may be opened; and that God may raise up faithful men to counteract the evil of his teaching.

We give both these illustrious writers, Palmer (who has passed away), and Wordsworth (who is yet with us), all credit for their earnestness and zeal and outspoken faith; but we cannot *endorse their Notes*. We cannot exclude men and women whom we know to be the children of God, albeit they are Dissenters, either from the Visible or the Invisible Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Churchmen, if we may; but Christians we must.

We come now directly to examine the remaining chief point of our Article – the Credenda and Agenda of the Papacy. And this leads to the important question, in these solemn days of demanded witness, and notwithstanding the lapses or dereliction of any – Is Rome a part of the Visible Church of Christ, or a Synagogue of Satan?

A preliminary remark may tend considerably to clear our way. Stress less or more is not infrequently laid on the fact, that writers of nearly all classes apply the term *Church* to Rome, and continually speak of “the Church of Rome”. Even our Article has been pressed into this service. But there is really no force in the argument, save what is utterly weak and childish. It is simply an example of the looseness of popular language; and the great majority even of Protestants who use the phrase, do so just as we are wont to adopt any other lingual fallacy. Add, that Rome was once and for ages a veritable Church of Christ, distinguished for the purity of her faith, and commanding worldwide respect; and we shall see how, and how easily she has succeeded in retaining her ancient designation. Nor may we

omit to note, that the Apostolical Succession party in the Church of England has done much to habituate us to the same.

Some Heads of Evidence Against Rome.

First. Rome does not worship the one, living, and true God alone. She holds the doctrine of the Trinity in words, and professes to worship a Triune God; but in practice she divides that worship which is due exclusively to God, amongst Jehovah, the Virgin, the Angels, and the Saints. Yea, the very Attributes of God are ascribed to Mary and all the Saints. See express proof under the twenty-second Article.

Second. Rome rejects the Bible as a sufficient rule of faith and practice; and places Tradition, written and unwritten, on an equality with the Word of God. Yea, the original Scriptures, Hebrew and Greek, of the Old and New Testament, are not acknowledged by her. But the old Latin Vulgate, or the Douay and Rhemish Translations, containing also the Apocrypha, constitute, together with Tradition, Rome's Bible; which she blasphemously calls the Revealed or Inspired Word of God.

Decree of the Council of Trent (4th Session) concerning the Canonical Scriptures: – “This sacred, holy, ecumenical, and General Council of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, the three legates of the Apostolical See presiding therein ... and perceiving that this truth and discipline are contained both in written books, and in unwritten traditions, which have come down to us, either received by the Apostles from the lips of Christ himself, or transmitted by the hands of the same Apostles, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit, following the example of the orthodox Fathers, doth receive and reverence, with equal piety and veneration, all the books as well of the Old as of the New Testament, the same God being the author of both, and also the aforesaid Traditions, pertaining both to faith and manners, whether received from Christ himself, or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession. Moreover, lest any doubt should arise respecting the sacred books which are received by the council, it has been judged proper to insert a list of them in the present Decree.” – [Here follow the Books of the Apocrypha and the Old and New Testaments.] – And the Decree concludes: – “Whosoever shall not receive, as sacred and canonical, all these books, and every part of them, as they are commonly read in the Catholic Church, and are contained

in the old Vulgate Latin edition, or shall knowingly and deliberately despise the aforesaid Traditions, let him be accursed.”

Bishop Hay: –

“Q. What is meant by Tradition?

“A. The handing down, from one generation to another, whether by word of mouth or by writings, those truths revealed by Jesus Christ to his Apostles, which either are not at all contained in the Holy Scriptures, or at least are not clearly contained in them.

“Q. What is the principle upon which Tradition proceeds?

“A. It is the laying down, as an invariable rule, to be observed in every generation, firmly to adhere to the doctrine received from the preceding generation, and carefully to commit the same to the succeeding generation, without addition or diminution” (*The Sincere Christian.*)

Dr. Milner: –

“The Catholic Rule of Faith, is not merely the Written Word of God, but the whole Word of God both written and unwritten; in other words, Scripture and Tradition, and these propounded and explained by the Catholic Church. This implies that we have a twofold Rule or Law, and that we have an interpreter or Judge to explain it, and to decide upon it in all doubtful points.” And again: “The Catholic Rule is *the whole Word of God*, together with her (the Church’s) *Living Authority* in explaining it. For while this rule and this authority are acknowledged, there can be no heresy or schism among Christians; as whatever points of religion are not clear from Scripture, are supplied and illustrated by Tradition: and as the Pastors of the Church, who possess this authority, are always living and ready to declare what is the sense of Scripture and what the Traditions, on each contested point, which they have received in succession from the Apostles” (End of Controversy).

Peter Dens: –

“Q. How is Tradition divided?

“A. 1. By reason of *origin*, or of its author, it is divided into Divine, Apostolic, and Ecclesiastical Tradition.

“2. By reason of *matter*, into Dogmatic, Ritual, and Moral Tradition.

“3. By reason of *duration*, into perpetual and temporary.

“4. By reason of *place*, into universal and particular.

“Q. What Tradition is called Divine?

“A. It is the unwritten Word of God, or it is *truth divinely revealed to the Church*, and by our elders transfused to their posterity without writing of canonical authority. Examples of Divine Tradition are: – That there are Seven Sacraments, neither more nor fewer; that there are Four Gospels; that the God-bearer remained ever Virgin; that infants are to be baptized, and various things relating to the matters and the forms of sacraments. [To which we may add, The Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, as propounded by Pope Pius IX, in 1854; and that of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, 1870.]

Q. What authority has Divine Tradition?

“A. Divine Tradition ‘has equal authority with Holy Scripture, for both are truly the Word of God. This only is the difference – that the sentence of the Church (*propositio ecclesiae*) may be more clearly manifested to us, it fixed the catalogue of canonical books, and approved the (*Latin*) Vulgate to be authentic: but the Church has not made a catalogue of Divine Traditions, but on occasion puts forth one now, and then another.

“*Apostolic* Tradition has the same authority as decrees of Apostolic institution.

“*Ecclesiastical* Tradition is of the same authority as laws and constitutions ecclesiastical; consequently the Pontiff can change both.

“Q. Then what Tradition is a Rule of Faith?

“A. A merely Apostolic or Ecclesiastical Tradition is not a Rule of Faith, because *neither the one nor the other is divinely revealed; but a Divine Tradition is truly a Rule of Faith, for it is a Word of God, no less than Holy Scripture. This Tradition, since heretics impugn it to their utmost, we shall establish*” (*Tractatus de Virtutibus*).

Third. Rome prevents and prohibits the presence of God’s Holy Word.

Index Expurgatorum, et Prohibitorum: –

“Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to everyone, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the Bishops or Inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the Priest or Confessor, permit the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety they apprehend will be augmented, and not injured,

by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any shall have the presumption to read or possess it without any such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the Ordinary Booksellers, however, who shall sell or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the Bishops to some pious use; and be subjected by the Bishop to such other penalties as the Bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors.”

Adopting the words of the Rev. Dr. Charles Elliott, – “We charge the Church of Rome with *opposition* to the pure Word of God, and from this imputation it is impossible to exculpate them. They have constantly opposed the circulation of the Scriptures in the vernacular language of the people. When Wickliffe published his Translation, Pope Gregory sent a Bill to the University of Oxford, in 1378, condemning the translator as having run into a detestable kind of wickedness. When Tindal published his Translation, it was condemned in 1546. When Luther was translating the Scriptures into the German language, Pope Leo X published a Bull against him, couched in the most vile and opprobrious language. After the Reformation the Church of Rome was compelled to *permit* (not *authorize*, *command*, or *provide for*) the translations of the Scripture into modern languages, but always accompanied with notes. Yet this was viewed as a dangerous expedient; and it was judged best not to give the Bible to the people, except where they were in danger of receiving Protestant versions. The Rhemish divines avow this to have been the motive which produced their translation.

“We have ample proof that they are afraid to trust the people with the Scriptures. When the British Bible Society proposed to publish the Douay Bible without note or comment, for the use of the English Papists, the Roman Catholic Clergy would not allow it. When the proposal was first made to them, Mr. Gaudolphy, a Priest of London, said, ‘If any of the Bible Societies feel disposed to try our esteem for the Bible by presenting us some copies of a Catholic version, *with* or *without notes*, we will gratefully accept and faithfully distribute them.’ Yet when the Society was about to fulfill its engagement, the Roman Catholic Clergy objected, and then Mr. Gaudolphy said, ‘The English Catholic Board did not now intend to

disperse *gratuitously* even their own stereotype edition *with notes*; for they could not go about to desire people to receive Testaments, *because the Catholics did not in any wise consider the Scriptures necessary*"; and added, 'they learned and taught *their* religion by means of Catechisms and elementary tracts.'

Fourth. Rome undermines the fundamental doctrine of Justification through Faith, by introducing "works of satisfaction"; and so tramples upon the atonement of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Council of Trent: "Whoever shall affirm that the entire punishment is always remitted by God, together with the fault, and therefore that penitents need no other satisfaction than faith, whereby they apprehend Christ, who has made satisfaction for them; let him be accursed."

Fifth. Rome, as she has gods many, so also has she mediators many; and this on the awful assumption that "Christ is too exalted to be affected by our miseries; but that we may flee to the saints, who are more ready to hear, because they have been our fellow-sufferers, and are experienced in our sorrows!"

Sixth. Rome, even in many of her Pontiffs, has been a sink of immorality. Take the following picture, drawn by Edgar, not from Protestant, but Catholic historians, and the warmest friends of the Papacy: –

"The Roman hierarchs of the middle and succeeding ages exhibited a melancholy change. Their lives displayed all the variations of impiety, malevolence, inhumanity, ambition, debauchery, gluttony, sensuality, deism, and atheism. Gregory the Great seems to have led the way in the career of villainy. This celebrated Pontiff has been characterized as worse than his predecessors, and better than his successors, or, in other terms, as the last good and the first bad Pope. The floodgates of moral pollution appear, in the tenth century, to have been set wide open, and inundations of all impurity poured on the Christian world through the channel of the Roman Hierarchy. Awful and melancholy indeed is the picture of the Popedom at this era, drawn, as it has been, by its warmest friends; such as Platina, Petavius, Luitprand, Genebrard, Baronius, Hermann, Barclay, Binius, Giannone, Viginer, Labbe, and Du Pin. Platina calls these Pontiffs 'monsters'. 'Fifty Popes,' says Genebrard, 'in one hundred and fifty years, from John VIII to Leo IX, entirely degenerated from the sanctity of their ancestors, and were apostatic rather than apostolic. Thirty Pontiffs reigned in the tenth century; and the successor, in each instance, seemed

demoralized even beyond his predecessor. Baronius, in his Annals of the Tenth Century, seems to labour for language to express the base degeneracy of the Popes, and the frightful deformity of the Popedom. Many shocking monsters, says the annalist, intruded into the pontifical chair, who were guilty of robbery, assassination, simony, dissipation, tyranny, sacrilege, perjury, and all kinds of miscreancy. Candidates, destitute of every requisite qualification, were promoted to the Papal chair; while all the canons and traditions of antiquity were contemned and outraged. The Church, says Giannone, was then in a shocking disorder, in a chaos of iniquity. Some, says Barclay, crept into the Popedom; while others broke in by violence, and defiled the holy chair with the filthiest immorality.

“The electors and the elected, during this period, appear, as might be expected, to have been kindred spirits. The electors were neither the clergy nor people, but two courtesans, Theodora and Marozia, mother and daughter, women distinguished by their beauty, and at the same time, though of senatorial family, notorious for their prostitution. These polluted patrons of licentiousness, according to their pleasure, passion, whim, or caprice, elected Popes, collated Bishops, disposed of dioceses, and indeed assumed, in a great measure, the whole administration of the Church. The Roman See, become the prey of avarice and ambition, was given to the highest bidder.

“These vile harlots, according to folly or fancy, obtruded their filthy gallants or spurious offspring on the pontifical throne. Theodora, having conceived a violent but base passion for John X, raised her gallant to the Papacy. The Pontiff, like his patron, was an example of sensuality; and was afterwards, in 924, at the instigation of Marozia, deposed, and, in all probability, strangled by Wido, Marquis of Tuscany. Marozia was mistress to Sergius III, who treated the dead body of Formosus with such indignity. She brought her pontifical paramour a son; and this hopeful scion of illegitimacy and the Popedom was, by his precious mother, promoted to the Vice-regency of Heaven. His conduct was worthy of genealogy. He was thrown, however, into prison by Alberic, Marozia’s son by Adelbert, where he died of grief, or, some say, by assassination. The person who can believe in the validity of such elections, and the authority of such Pontiffs, must possess an extraordinary supply of faith, or rather of credulity.

“A person, desirous of painting scenes of atrocity and filth, might, in the history of the Popedom, find ample materials of gratification. A mass of

moral impurity might be collected from the Roman hierarchy, sufficient to crowd the pages of folios, and glut all the demons of pollution and malevolence. But delineations of this kind afford no pleasing task. The facts, therefore, on this topic shall be supplied with a sparing hand. A few specimens, however, are necessary, and shall be selected from the biography of John, Boniface, Gregory, Sixtus, Alexander, Julius, and Leo.

“John XII ascended the Papal throne in 955, in the eighteenth year of his age. His youthful days were characterized by barbarity and pollution. He surpassed all his predecessors, says Platina, in debauchery. His Holiness, in a Roman Synod before Otho the Great, was found guilty of blasphemy, perjury, profanation, impiety, simony, sacrilege, adultery, incest, constupration, and murder. He swore allegiance to Otho, and afterwards revolted to his enemy. Ordination, which he often bartered for money, he conferred on a Deacon in a stable, and on a boy ten years old, by constituting him a Bishop. He killed John, a Sub-Deacon, by emasculation; Benedict, by putting out his eyes; and, in the wantonness of cruelty, amputated the nose of one Cardinal, and the hand of another. He drank a health to the Devil, invoked Jupiter and Venus, lived in public adultery with the Roman matrons, and committed incest with Stephania, his father’s concubine. ... ‘John,’ says Bellarmine, ‘was nearly the wickedest of the Popes.’ Some of the Vice-gods, therefore, the Cardinal suggests, surpassed His Holiness in miscreancy.

“Boniface VII, who seized the Papal chair in 974, murdered his predecessor and successor. Historians represent him as the basest and wickedest of mankind. Baronius calls him a thief, and miscreant, and a murderer, who is to be reckoned, not among the Roman Pontiffs, but among the notorious robbers of the age. Gerbert and Viginer characterise this Vice-God as a monster, who surpassed all mankind in crime. ...

“Gregory VII, who obtained the Papacy in 1073, was another pontifical patron of iniquity. He was elected on the day of his predecessor’s funeral, by the populace and soldiery, through force and bribery, without the concurrence of the Emperor or the Clergy. ...

“The Council of Brescia in 1078 portrayed His Supremacy with freedom. This assembly, composed of thirty Bishops, and many princes from Italy, France, and Germany, called Gregory a fornicator, an impostor, an assassin, a violator of the canons, a disseminator of discord, a disturber of the Christian Commonwealth, and a pestilential patron of all madness,

who had sown scandal among friends, dissension among the peaceful, and separation among the married. ...

“Sixtus IV, who was elected in 1471, walked in the footsteps of his predecessors, Gregory, Boniface, and John. ...

“Sixtus patronized debauchery as well as murder. His Holiness, for this worthy purpose, established brothels extraordinary in Rome. His Infallibility, in consequence, became Head, not only of the Church, but also of the Stews. He presided with ability and applause in two important departments, and was the Vicar-General of God and of Venus. These seminaries of pollution, it seems, brought a great accession to the ecclesiastical revenue. The goddesses who were worshiped in these temples paid a weekly tax from the wages of iniquity to the Viceroy of Heaven! The sacred treasury, by this means, received from this shameful tribute an annual augmentation of twenty thousand ducats. His Supremacy himself was, it seems, a regular and steady customer in his new commercial establishments. He nightly worshipped, with great zeal and devotion, in these pontifical fanes, which he had erected to the Cytherean goddess. ...

“Alexander VI, in the common opinion, surpassed all his predecessors in atrocity. This monster, whom humanity disowns, seems to have excelled all his rivals in the arena of villainy, and outstripped every competitor on the stadium of wickedness. Sannazarius compared Alexander to Nero, Caligula, and Heliogabalus; and Pope, in his celebrated Essay on Man, likened Borgia, which was the family name, to Cataline. This Pontiff, according to contemporary historians, was actuated to measureless excess, with vanity, ambition, cruelty, covetousness, rapacity, and sensuality, and void of all faith, honour, sincerity, truth, fidelity, decency, religion, shame, modesty, and compunction. ‘His debauchery, perfidy, ambition, malice, inhumanity, and irreligion,’ says Daniel, ‘made him the execration of all Europe.’ Rome under his administration, and by his example, became the sink of filthiness, the headquarters of atrocity, and the hotbed of prostitution, murder, and robbery.

“Depravity lurked under many specious displays, and broke out in secret, in sensuality and incest. He formed an illicit connection with a widow who resided at Rome, and with her two daughters. His passions, irregular and brutal, could find gratification only in enormity. His licentiousness, after the widow’s death, drove him to the incestuous enjoyment of her daughter, the notorious and infamous Vannoza. She

became his mistress after her mother's decease. His Holiness, in the pursuit of variety, and the perpetration of atrocity, afterward formed a criminal connection with his own daughter, the witty, the learned, the gay, and the abandoned Lucretia. She was mistress to her own father and brother. Pontanus, in consequence, represented Lucretia as Alexander's daughter, wife, and daughter-in-law. Peter's palace, in this manner, became a scene of debauchery and abomination.

"Simony and assassination were as prominent in Alexander's character as incest and debauchery. He purchased the Papacy, and afterward for remuneration, and to glut his rapacity, he sold its offices and preferments. He first bought, it has been said, and then sold the Keys, the Altar, and the Saviour. He murdered the majority of the Cardinals who raised him to the popedom, and seized their estates. He had a family of spurious sons and daughters; and for the aggrandizement of these children of illegitimacy, he exposed to sale all things sacred and profane, and violated and outraged all the laws of God and man.

"His death was the consequence of an attempt to poison the rich Cardinals for the sake of their possessions. Alexander and Borgia, father and son, actuated with this design, invited the Sacred College to a sumptuous banquet, near the fountain in the delightful garden of Belvidera. Poisoned wine was prepared for the unsuspecting guests. But the fatal cup was, by mistake, handed to the father and son, who drank without knowing their danger. Borgia's constitution, for a time, overcame the virulence of the poison. But Alexander soon died by the stratagem he had prepared for the murder of his friends.

"Julius II succeeded Alexander in the Papacy and in iniquity. His Holiness was guilty of simony, chicanery, perjury, thievery, poisoning, assassination, drunkenness, impudicity, and sodomy. ...

"His Infallibility's drunkenness was proverbial. He was 'mighty to drink wine.' He practiced incontinency as well as inebriation, and the effects of this crime shattered his constitution. One of his historians represents His Holiness as all corroded with the disease which, in the judgment of God, often attends this kind of pollution. The atrocity for which Sodom was consumed with fire from heaven is also reckoned among his deeds of pollution and excess.

"His ingratitude and enmity to the French nation formed one dark feature in his character. The French king protected him against Alexander,

who sought his ruin. The French nation was his asylum in the time of danger, and in the day of distress. This friendship he afterwards repaid with detestation, because Louis patronized the convocation of a General Council. Julius offered rewards to any person who would kill a Frenchman. One of these rewards was of an extraordinary, or rather among the Popes of an ordinary, kind. He granted a pardon of all sins to any person who would murder only an individual of the French nation. The Vicegerent of Heaven conferred the forgiveness of all sin, as a compensation for perpetrating the shocking crime of assassination.

“Leo X, in 1513, succeeded Julius in the Popedom and in enormity. This Pontiff has been accused of Atheism, and of calling the Gospel, in the presence of Cardinal Bembo, a fable. Mirandula, who mentions a Pope that denied God, is by some supposed to have referred to Leo. His Holiness, says Jovius, was reckoned guilty of sodomy with his Chamberlains. These reports, however, are uncertain. But Leo, beyond all question, was addicted to pleasure, luxury, idleness, ambition, unchastity, and sensuality, and spent whole days in the company of musicians and buffoons” (*Edgar’s Variations of Popery*).

Sixth (a). Rome *may vary*; but does Rome *change*?

We answer: –

(1) A widespread opinion prevails, that if all her monasteries and convents were opened, we should behold Chambers of Horrors equal in pollution to anything that has ever blotted the page of history.

(2) The age we live in tends, in a great measure, to abate open profligacy.

Another Council of Constance could not now be held of a thousand *holy* Divines, publicly importing one thousand five hundred courtesans for its supply. “The sacerdotal fornicators, it seems, were very liberal to these professional ladies. One courtesan, it is said, gained eight hundred florins; an immense sum in those days. She was treated very differently from John Huss. The reverend debauchees enriched the prostitute, and burned the Reformer. These fair companions evinced the holy men’s relish for spiritual enjoyments, and refreshed the Infallible Doctors at night, after being exhausted during the day, by making speeches in the Council, and burning the heretics Huss and Jerome” (*Edgar*).

(3) The foulest immorality and most monstrous crime are taught in the writings of the Jesuits; and these, the most unscrupulous of men, long

have been, and at the present moment are, the favoured leaders of doctrine and opinion in the Church of Rome.

Blasphemy No Sin. *Casuedi*: “Do what your conscience tells you to be good and commanded: if through invincible error you believe blasphemy to be commanded by God – *Blaspheme*” (*Crisis Theologica*).

Tolet: “If a man be in a great passion, and so transported that he considers not what he says; if, in that case, he does blaspheme, he does not always sin” (*Instructio Sacerdotum ac de Septem Peccatis Mortalibus*).

Lying No Sin. *Casuedi*: “There is an implied law, which is this: Obey an invincibly erroneous dictate of conscience. As often as you believe invincibly that a lie is commanded – *Lie*.”

Homicide No Sin. *Henriguez*: “If an adulterer, even though he should be an Ecclesiastic, reflecting upon the danger, has entered the house of an adulteress, and being attacked by her husband, kills his aggressor in the necessary defense of his life or limbs, he is not considered irregular” (*Summae Theolog. Moral.*)

Murder No Sin. *Vide Reginald*: “If you are preparing to give false evidence against me, by which I should receive sentence of death, and I have no other means of escape, *it is lawful for me to kill you, since I should otherwise be killed myself*: for it would be immaterial in such a case whether you killed me with you own or by another man’s sword; as for instance, by that of the executioner” (*Praxis Fari Poemtentialis*).

Airault: “If you endeavour to ruin my reputation, by false impeachment before a Prince, a Judge, or men of distinguished rank, and I cannot by any means avert this injury of character, unless I kill you secretly; may I lawfully do it? *Baunez* asserts that I may ... The right of defense extends itself to everything which is necessary for insuring protection from every injury. Still the calumniator should first be warned that he desist from his slander; *and if he will not, he should be killed, not openly, on account of the scandal, but secretly*” (*Propositions dictées au Collège de Clermont à Paris*).

Parricide No Sin. *Father Fagundez*: “It is lawful for a son to rejoice at the murder of his parent, committed by himself in a state of drunkenness, on account of the great riches thence acquired by inheritance” (*Oper. Moralium – in Praecepta Decalogi*).

High Treason And Regicide No Sin. “The rebellion of an Ecclesiastic against a King is not a crime of high treason, because he is not subject to

the King” (*Aphorismi Confessariorum. Verb. Clericus*).

Cresswell (alias Andrew Philopater): “The whole school of theologians and ecclesiastical lawyers maintain (and it is a thing both certain and matter of faith), that every Christian Prince, if he has manifestly departed from the Catholic religion, and has wished to turn others from it, is immediately divested of all power and dignity, whether of divine or human right, and that, too, even before the sentence pronounced against him by the Supreme Pastor and Judge; and that all his subjects are free from every obligation of the oath of allegiance which they had sworn to him as their lawful Prince, and that they may and must (if they have the power) drive such a man from the sovereignty of Christian men, as an apostate, a heretic, and a deserter of Christ the Lord, and as an alien and an enemy to his country, lest he corrupt others, and turn them from the faith by his example or his command” (*Responsio ud Edictum*).

“Elizabeth wrote with her own hand to Henry III. of France, after the conspiracy against her life, informing him that the Jesuits had contrived it, *who*, says she, *hold it meritorious to kill a Sovereign whom the Pope has deposed*” (*Brief Account – M’Gavin’s Protestant*).

Fornication No Sin. *Tolet*: “If a man desires carnal pollution, that he may be eased of his carnal temptations, or for his health, it were no sin.”

Emmanuel Sa: “If a man lie with his intended wife before marriage, it is no sin, or a light one; nay, *quin etiam expedit, in multum illa differatur*, it is good to do so, if the benediction or publication of marriage be much deferred.”

(And of course) Fraud And Theft No Sin. *Tolet*: “A man cannot sell his wine at a fair price, either on account of the injustice of the judge, or through fraud of the purchasers, who have agreed among themselves to be few in number in order to lower the price: then he may diminish his measure, or mix a little water with his wine, and sell it for pure wine of full measure, demanding the full price, provided only that he does not tell a lie; which if he does, it will neither be a dangerous nor a mortal sin, neither will it oblige him to make restitution.”

Reginald: “Servants are excused both from sin and restitution, if they only take (steal) in equitable compensation.”

Value of Ghostly Advice. *Laiman*: “When a Doctor is consulted, he may give his advice not only as probable, according to his opinion, but contrary to his opinion, if it should be deemed probable by others, when the

advice which is opposed to our own is more favourable and agreeable to those who consult him; *si forte et illi favorabilior seu exceptatior sit*: but I say further, that he will not act without reason if he should give those who consult him an opinion held probable by some learned individual, though he felt confident at the same time it was absolutely false!” (Blaise Pascal’s *Provincial Letters*.)

Such then is something of the Gospel of Jesuitism – of the Papacy – and at the present moment. For, as Dr. Elliot well observes, although the Church of Rome has not incorporated into her system the (full-blown) doctrines of the Jesuits, by formal articles of religion, yet has she indeed done so, by the more effectual way of permitting the followers of Loyola to teach what they judge proper.

Mockery of the burdened conscience – fraud – theft – fornication – high treason – regicide – parricide – homicide – murder – lying – blasphemy. What must be the Fruits!! What an easy and respectable society, for men and women, must true Roman Catholicism be!

Seventh. Rome sets at naught the Commandments of God.

It were supererogation to attempt formal proof after the foregoing. But we may quote, as supplementary or summary, the words of Dr. Elliott:

“Against the first commandment, secret atheism, idolatry, apostasy from the faith, and heresies reign in that community to an alarming extent.

“The second commandment is vitiated by the use of images.

“The third is contemned by the abuses of the Divine Name in various exercises and adjurations; in perjuries, both by precept and example; and in transferring the honour which is due to the Deity to a fallible creature.

“The fourth is violated by the habitual and systematic profanation of the Sabbath, the multitude of holy days and other observances, by which the divinely appointed day of rest and worship is either abrogated or rendered of none effect.

“The fifth commandment is encroached upon by the contempt of parents, which is encouraged by children set apart to celibacy or to certain monastic orders, either without, or contrary to, the consent of their natural guardians; contempt of the Magistrate, by exempting Clergy from their jurisdiction, who claim certain religious privileges to the prejudice of the civil authorities; sedition against the Magistrate, by depriving Kings of their territories, absolving subjects, etc.

“The sixth commandment is broken by the persecutions of the Church of Rome, the warlike character of that hierarchy, and the utter disregard of the principles and spirit of peace.

“The seventh commandment is transgressed by the encouragement which the Popes have given to houses of public prostitution. The concubinage of the Clergy is known to all, and has not been denied by any. Marriage contracts have often been violated and dissolved, without Scripture authority.

“The eighth commandment is practically disregarded by their encouragement of frauds and thefts.

“The ninth commandment is broken (1) By public and notorious falsehoods, such as the grant of Constantine, and the legends of saints. (2) The introduction of spurious writings in place of the genuine. (3) The corruption of the ancient records. (4) Slandering those whom they call heretics, as Luther and others.

“The sin of concupiscence, which is an offence against the tenth commandment, is considered but venial” (*Delineation of Roman Catholicism*).

Eighth. Rome not only traffics in the souls of men by her Purgatory and Masses for the Dead; but she also condones, and sells licenses for, the foulest sins. She fills her coffers by *creating the sinner*, and replenishes them for ages by taxing posterity to abate or shorten the torments of his soul in the world to come.

We need not burden our pen with Rome’s Dispensations of Vows or of Oaths; but take a few examples of her Dispensations of Crimes: –

“For Absolution to keep a Concubine at bed and board, with a Dispensation to hold a Benefice – £4, 5s. 6d.”

“For Simony or for Fornication of Priests, Friars, or Nuns, £86, 9s. 6d.

“For Incest in a Layman – £4, 6s. 0d.”

“For Adultery in the same – £4, 0s. 0d.”

“For Adultery and Incest together – £6, 2s. 0d.”

“For the Adulterer and Adulteress jointly – £6, 6s. 0d.”

“For the murder of a father, mother, brother, sister, or wife, each – £4, 1s. 8d.”

“For marrying another wife after murdering the former – £8, 2s. 9d.”

See Hale’s *Analysis of Chronology*, and *The Protestant*, January 1881.

Ninth. Rome is drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and ever thirsts for the same.

As to the first charge, let only the butcheries of the Albigenses and of the Huguenots tell! let only the centuries of the infernal Inquisition speak! let only the fires and atrocious murders of the Bloody Mary testify!

As to the second charge: –

“Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord, or his foresail successors, I will, to my power, persecute and oppose.” Clause of original Oath imposed on all Archbishops and Bishops, as well as on all receiving any dignity from the Pope. And although this clause is now struck out for political reasons, and a conciliatory addition made to the end of the Oath, *in reference to the subjects of the British Government*; yet the words of the devoted Father Schrader hold true, that *Political Oaths of Bishops rank: far below the solemn Oath of Ceremony*. And Rome takes care to bind her slaves to intrepid daring, even unto bloodshed, in defense of the “Holy” Faith!

Tenth. Rome sets her face against the God of Nature and the Bible, in the enforced celibacy of her Clergy; while, at the same time, she fosters and licenses them, unblushingly, in concubinal sin and uncleanness. See foregoing.

Eleventh. And, as a climax, Rome claims Infallibility, in Doctrine, and in Morality!

Enough. Though a tithe of the evidence is not told, for it would fill volumes; nor the blackest details here unfolded, for they are too appalling and disgusting in thousands of instances for our pages, yet, we ask, in all honesty and all sincerity, who can at all dip into the awful history of Papal Rome – her credenda as well as her agenda – and lay his hand on his heart, and say, This is a part of the Visible Church of the Lord Jesus Christ?

And yet we find, in the past and present, not a few professedly Protestant writers who, it would seem, shut their eyes for the moment to Rome’s blasphemous and naked impostures, and persist in calling her a Church of God!

Even Martin Luther and John Calvin could not utterly divest themselves of the idea (though their “better conscience” rebelled), as might indeed be expected in their age and circumstances.

But for men now, whose vision has not been disturbed with the gaunt specter so universally before them, who have been born under purer skies,

and whose understandings should not be overclouded, to fall into the fatal error of calling Antichrist, Christ, is inexcusable. We need not record their feeble arguments, save that we may say, were it not for what they call Rome's "Apostolic Succession of Ministers," they would, we believe, rightly term her what she is, and has so overwhelmingly demonstrated herself to be – The Synagogue of Satan. In the words of the Holy Ghost: "Mystery, Babylon The Great, The Mother Of Harlots And Abominations Of The Earth" (Rev. 17:5).

Whatever may have been the errors of the three other ancient Patriarchal Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, referred to in our Article – a moot point – whether the favouring of Arianism and condemning Origen, or on the doctrine of the Procession; the errors of the fourth Patriarchal and for ages faithful Church of Rome, are no longer a question, but stand out clearly dated against her before God and man.

The following short synopsis of Darby's invaluable little work, *Facts and Dates*, [Miller, 20 Berners Street, Oxford Street.] may be useful to the student:

–

1. *Prayers for the Dead.*

Introduced by Ambrose, 397. Sanctioned by Pope Gregory I, 590. Authorized by the Council of Florence, 1439. Finally decreed by the Council of Trent, Sess. XX., 1563.

2. *Invocation of Saints and Angels.*

Condemned, when first broached, by the Council of Laodicea, 372. First introduced into the public Litanies of the Latin Church by Pope Boniface V, 617. First received the sanction of Council, Florence, 1439. Formally decreed and established by the Council of Trent, Sess. xxv, 1563. Embodied in the Creed of Pope Pius IV, and in the Catechism of Trent, 1564. "May the Most Holy Queen of Heaven – the Seat of Wisdom and Mother of good counsel, may our great Saints, Patrick, Malachy, and Laurence O'Toole, bless, direct, and strengthen all our understandings, and make them beneficial to our country and our religion" (*Benediction* by Archbishop Cullen, at a public meeting of Romanists in Dublin, 1850).

3. *The Canonization of Saints.*

First instituted by Alexander III, 1160. "The institution originated in the ancient custom of deifying men who had done any benefit to the Commonwealth" (*Polydore Vergil*, Collection of Peter's Pence-in England, 1470–1503).

4. *Purgatory.*

Generally believed by the Pagans (amongst whom Prayers for the Dead were a common practice). In the Christian Church, first introduced by Origen, 230. Condemned by the Council of Constantinople, 553. Affirmed by Gregory I, 590. Maintained by the Council of Florence, 1439. Established by the Council of Trent, 1563. But neither Florence nor Trent defines what Purgatory really is. Bishop Hall shows what a complete chaos of opinion there is on the subject – whether Purgatory be a *state or place*. There are no less than eight opinions as to the locality of the place, and many more as to the nature of the sufferings, the duration of the imprisonment, and the means of deliverance.

5. *Indulgences.*

Originated in the remission of Church censures on transgressors, by the Bishops; who in process of time took money for their dispensations. And so, under Calixtus II, 1124, Eugenius III, 1153, and Clement III, 1191, the sale of Indulgences was gradually made an Institution of the Church. Boniface VIII proclaimed the first Jubilee of Indulgences, 1300. Leo X issued Bulls of Indulgences for vast periods, 1513. And the preaching and public sale of those indulgences by Tetzel, 1515, roused the spirit of Luther, and brought about the German Reformation.

6. *Justification by Works.*

First propounded by Thomas Aquinas. Established by the Council of Trent, 1546. “Let our fasts, we beseech thee, O Lord, be acceptable to thee, that by *atonement for our sins*, they may make us *worthy of thy grace, and bring us to the everlasting effects of thy promise*” (*The Missal*).

7. *Celibacy of Clergy, Monks, and Nuns.*

First maintained by Authority in Egypt, 305; condemned by the first Council of Nice, 325; observed by the Bishops, 692; enjoined by Benedict VII, 975; enforced under severe penalties by Gregory VII, 1073–85. Decreed by the Council of Lateran, 1123. Introduced into the English Church by Anselm, 1102. The Irish Church had a married clergy in succession from St. Patrick, 432, down to Malachy, 1127–1150, Primate of Armagh in the twelfth century.

8. *Worship of Images and Pictures.*

Images and Pictures in Churches, as “the books of the unlearned,” authorized by Gregory I, 590. “Salutation” and “honorary worship” of (not the true *latría*, or divine worship), first ordered by the Second Council of

Nice, 787. Thomas Aquinas, 1140, first affirmed: “Since, therefore, Christ is to be adored with *latria*, it follows that his image is to be adored with the worship of *latria*.” Veneration of them decreed by the Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, 1563; and Decree embodied in Article VIII of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

9. *Worship of Relics.*

Began as early as the fourth century; and in the mediaeval age, was carried to such an extent as to displace, if not extinguish, the worship of God. Three altars were erected at Canterbury, 1177. Votive offerings – at Christ’s, £3, 2s 6d; at the Virgin’s, £93, 5s. 6d; at Becket’s, £832, 12s. 6d. The following year – at Christ’s altar, £0, 0s. 0d; at the Virgin’s, £4, 18s. 0d; at Becket’s, £954, 6s. 3d. (Burnet, Hume, Fuller). The Worship of Relics was established by the Council of Trent, Sess. XXV., 1563; embodied in the Creed of Pius IV, 1564, and authorized by Clement VIII, 1592.

10. *The Decalogue.*

The exclusion of the Second Commandment, Gregory I, 600, and the Second Council of Nice, 787, took advantage of the order of the Decalogue originated by Augustine, 412 – who to illustrate the doctrine of the Trinity, placed three commandments on the first table and seven upon the second, but preserved all in their integrity – for the omission of the second commandment altogether. Hence the mutilated Decalogue can be traced in the Roman Church historically from the eighth century until the Council of Trent. Pius IV, 1564, had the commandment restored, in the Catechism of the Council, to silence the reproaches of the Reformers, but attached to the first. Nearly all the Catechisms published in Italy and other Roman Catholic countries, exclude the second commandment altogether. The three Catechisms in general use in Ireland, under the express sanction of the Romish Archbishops, have no trace of the Second Commandment.

11. *Unwritten Tradition.*

First maintained by the Council of Trent, Sess. IV, 1546. Not one word, line, or sentence of this mysterious tradition has ever been produced by any Doctor, Pope, or Council of the Roman Church, through her whole history, in all the controversies she has waged.

12. *The Creed of Pope Pius IV.*

The Tridentine Fathers, Sess. III, 1546, recited the Nicene Creed (325), and declared it to be “the firm and only foundation of the faith”. The Creed of Pius IV, published eighteen years after, was appended by him to

the Nicene Creed, and added twelve Articles of Faith to the old faith of the Primitive Church, and declared these novel Articles to be “the true Catholic Faith, *out of which no one could be saved.*” Consequently, the whole Roman Church, including the Trent divines, were excluded from salvation, as they never saw or professed this true Catholic faith of Pius IV!

13. “*I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church,*” – Article X, Creed of Pius IV, 1564.

Rome “with a Pope, many Cardinals, 29 Bishops, 1280 Priests, 2092 Monks, 1698 Nuns, and 537 Ecclesiastical Pupils,” in the year 1852, was still the most immoral city in Christendom. The total number of births in the city in 1836 was 4373, while the total number of foundlings was 3160!! (See Seymour’s *Evenings with the Romanists.*)

14. “*I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church.*”

No Pope, or Council, perpetrated the blunder of designating the Roman Church the Catholic, or universal Church, until Pius IV in the Catechism of Trent, 1564, and in the Creed published by his authority.

15. “*I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church.*”

A Church that has apostatized from the faith of the Apostles cannot be called an Apostolic Church – that has corrupted the Canon of Holy Scripture, and degraded the Word of God to a level with tradition – that has mutilated the Commandments of God, and sold indulgences for the violation of them – that has invented five new Sacraments, and placed them on an equality with the two Sacraments Divinely instituted – that has empowered the Pope to make new Doctrines, unknown to the Apostles, the Primitive Christian Church, or the Church Catholic, throughout the world – that ignores the Atonement and Mediatorship of Christ, by penances, mortifications, purgatory, and the intercession of Saints and Angels – that has introduced and established the worship of the Virgin, to the almost exclusion of the worship of God – that has made wicked men saints, and saints gods – that has persecuted good Christians more than ever did Jews or Pagans – that has revived ancient paganism and promulgated its dogmas and ceremonies as Christianity – that has degraded and demoralized every country in the world where she has become dominant, *on the testimony of her own historians* – that has ever opposed science, progress, and reformation – that has crushed out liberty of thought, action, and the rights of conscience throughout the world – a Church whose character and doom are foretold by the Prophet Daniel (7); by St. Paul (2 Thess. 2 and 1 Tim.

4); and by St. John (Rev. 13 and 18) – cannot be *Apostolic*, but is, *The Apostasy Of The Latter Day*.

But we must refer our readers to Mr. Darby's truly wonderful little work itself for further facts and dates, assuring them that they will find it an overwhelming and unanswerable historical argument against the *Imposture and Romance of the Papacy*.

Scriptural Proof.

As this has perhaps been sufficiently indicated in the preceding pages, we need not do no more than present a very brief and formal outline.

(1) There is a new and abiding visible Church, which was promised by the Saviour, and which is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone.

“When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of man (Bar-Enosh), am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God (Bar-Elohim). And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock [this revelation of the Father to thee – *Christ the Son of the living God* – as a fact, doctrine, and power] I will build my Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. 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; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (Matt. 16:13–19).

The Church therefore is Christ's Church, and the builders under Christ are His servants and ministers, unto whom the Father reveals Himself, and whose salutary and godly discipline Christ endorses. And the central doctrine is The Rock, Christ. The Bar-Elohim and the Bar-Enosh, the God-Man, the Saviour.

“Built upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief (or head) corner-stone” (Eph. 2:20).

(2) This Christian Church was first and expressly founded by the Holy Ghost, through the instrumentality of Peter, on the Day of Pentecost,

and afterwards extended, not only by the Apostles, but by the converted at large.

See Acts 2:8–9, etc.

If any words of the Bible have a plain meaning, then the following sanction Lay Preaching: –

“And at that time there was a great persecution against the Church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Juda and Samaria, *except the Apostles*. ... Therefore *they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the Word*” (Acts 8:1, 4). See also Acts 11:19–21.

(3) This Church is One. And Christ the One Head.

“One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism” (Eph. 4:5).

“My Church” (Matt. 16:18).

“And he is the Head of the Body, the Church” (Col. 1:18).

(4) Yet it consists of several or particular churches dispersed throughout the world.

“We being many, are one Body in Christ” (Rom. 12:5).

“The general assembly and Church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven” (Heb. 12:23).

“When the Scripture speaketh of any country where the Gospel had been preached, it nameth always, by way of plurality, ‘the churches’ of that country; as, the churches of Judea, of Samaria, and Galilee, the churches of Syria and of Cilicia, the churches of Galatia, the churches of Asia, the churches of Macedonia (Gal. 1:22, Acts 9:31; 1 Cor. 16:1, 19; Rev. 1:11; 1 Thess. 2:14; 2 Cor. 8:1; Gal. 1:2). But notwithstanding there were several such churches or congregations of believers in great and populous cities, yet the Scriptures always speak of such congregations in the notion of One Church: as when St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, ‘Let your women keep silence in the churches’ (1 Cor. 14:34). Yet the dedication of his Epistle is, ‘Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth’ (1 Cor. 1:2). So we read not of ‘the churches,’ but ‘the church’ at Jerusalem, the church at Antioch, the church at Caesarea, the church at Ephesus, the church of the Thessalonians, the church of Laodicea, the church of Smyrna, the church of Pergamus, the church of Thyatira, the church of Sardis, the church of Philadelphia (Acts 8:1, 11:22, 13:1, 15:3, 18:22, 20:17; 2 Thess. 1:1; Col. 4:16, Rev. 2:8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14).” – *Pearson on the Creed*.

(5) All are bound together by the Spirit.

“For in (εν – by and through) one Spirit also we all were baptized into one Body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether slaves or freemen: and were all made to drink of one Spirit” (1 Cor. 12:13).

(6) The true Church has the pure Word of God preached.

“Faith cometh by hearing [the publication of the Gospel], and the report [of the Gospel] is by means of the “Word of Christ (χριστου)” (Rom. 10:17).

“If any man speak, let him speak as it were oracles of God” (1 Peter 4:11).

“I came – declaring unto you the testimony of God” (1 Cor. 2:1).

“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them” (Isa. 8:20).

(7) And the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ’s ordinance.

“When they believed Philip preaching the good tidings (ευαγγελιζομένα) concerning the kingdom of God, and of the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women” (Acts 8:12). “And they continued steadfastly in the doctrine and the fellowship of the Apostles, and in the breaking of the bread [the celebration of the Lord’s Supper], and in the appointed times of prayer (ταις προσευχαις)” (Acts 2:42). “For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread. And having given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my Body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner the cup also, after they had supped, saying, This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye declare the Lord’s Death, till he come” (1 Cor. 11:23–26).

(8) Particular Churches have erred, both in doctrine and ceremonies.

“For the time will come, when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but after their own lusts they shall heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears. And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall turn aside unto fables” (2 Tim. 4:3–4). “Unto the angel of the Church in Ephesus write – Nevertheless, I have against thee, that thou hast left thy first love” (Rev. 2:1, 4). “And to the angel of the Church in Pergamus write – I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before

the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication. So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, in like manner” (Rev. 2:12, 14–15). “And to the angel of the Church in Thyatira write – I have this against thee, that thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess; and she teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols” (Rev. 2:18, 20). “And to the angel of the Church in Laodicea write – I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither hot nor cold, I shall soon spew thee out of my mouth” (Rev. 3:14–16).

(9) The Romish Apostasy Foreshown.

“And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him” (Dan. 7:25–27). “The Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their own conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and [commanding] to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and have full knowledge of the truth” (1 Tim. 4:1–3). “But we beseech you, brethren, touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as by us, to the effect that the day of the Lord is come (εἰέστηκεν). Let no man deceive you in any way: for [that day shall not come] unless there shall have come the Apostasy first, and the Man of Sin shall have been revealed, the son of perdition: he that opposeth, and exalteth himself against all that is called God, or an object of worship; so that he sitteth down in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God. Remember ye not that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what hindereth, that he might be revealed in his own time. For the mystery already of lawlessness is working, only until he that now hinders be taken out of the way. And then

shall the Lawless One be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus shall destroy by the breath of his mouth, and annihilate by the appearance of his coming; whose coming is after the working of Satan, in all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, and in all deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause doth God send them the working of delusion, that they should believe the falsehood: that they all of them may be judged who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness” (2 Thess. 2:1–12). See also Rev. 17, 18.

Articles XXIII, XXXVI, and the Ordinal.

The Church: Its Ministers – Apostolical Succession.

ARTICLE XXIII.

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

De Ministrando in Ecclesia. – Non licet cuiquam sumere sibi munus publice praedicandi, aut administrandi Sacramenta in Ecclesia, nisi prius fuerit ad haec obeunda legitime vocatus et missus. Atque illos legitime vocatos et missus existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas vocandi ministros, atque mittendi in vineam Domini, publice concessa est in Ecclesia, cooptati fuerint, et adsciti in hoc opus.

ARTICLE XXXVI.

Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers. – 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 or ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the aforementioned 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.

De Episcoporum et Ministrorum Consecratione. – Libellus de Consecratione Archiepiscoporum, et Episcoporum, et de Ordinatione Presbyterorum et Diaconorum, editus nuper temporibus *Edvardi VI*, et auctoritate Parliamenti illis ipsis temporibus confirmatus, omnia ad ejusmodi consecrationem et ordinationem necessaria continet, et nihil habet, quod ex se sit, aut superstitiosum, aut unpium; itaque quicumque juxta ritus illius libri consecrati aut ordinati sunt, ab anno secundo prwdicti regis *Edvardi*, usque ad hoc tempus, aut in posterum juxta eosdem ritus consecrabunter, aut ordinabuntur, rite atque ordine, atque legitime statuimus esse et fore consecratos et ordinatos.

The Ordinal.

Preface. – It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination. ...

History and Scriptural Proof.

We are thus at last fairly launched on what has so long proved the troubled sea of Apostolical Succession. But we think, if the reader will only accompany us, calmly and without any unreasonable prejudice, we may be able to some extent to pour oil on the surging waves.

1. When God first instituted a Church on earth, *he adapted himself to circumstances*. The family was the congregation. The house the temple. And the father and firstborn, or one elected in his stead, the priest. But when men began to multiply in the profession of the true God, this order would seem to have been changed, and heads of sections were appointed their representatives to “draw near” to the Lord. Yet the while there is no Caste Priesthood. But when Jehovah was obliged to centralize His people, in order to preserve His revelations in the past, and make way for those of

the future, He gradually abolishes the older ritual, and establishes a new and necessarily hereditary Priesthood. We do not say that He took His people down into Egypt expressly to teach them and familiarize their minds with the sacerdotalism of the land of the Pharaohs, nor can we assert with some that the *cultus* of Israel was the outcome of the *cultus* of Egypt; but it is plain that they are intimately connected. Both priesthods were hereditary; both had one High Priest; both had a public maintenance; with both we find multiplied ablutions and tokens of symbolical purity in number. Nor is it difficult to understand how the Aaronic priesthood was just that fitted for the Israelitish settlement. Its law of succession prevented ever-recurring internecine contentions. Its spiritual typicalness was perhaps all that the infant Church could bear. And even its cosmic display was needed for semi-tutored, semi-rude minds. And here again we see the Divine Head of the Church in the wilderness and Canaan, skillfully guiding His people for a change in their outward religious life, and utilizing their surroundings in Egypt, and the carnality of its worship, for a totally fresh point of departure.

And yet, though the Lord came down from heaven, and laid all the lines of the Jewish Church, in all the exquisite and wondrous detail thereof, and in all its exceeding great glory – it too was to pass away! But it took another captivity to loosen the stones, and demolish the Temple of Solomon – to build the Synagogue as a type of freedom and the wide brotherhood of Christianity.

2. When we arrive at New Testament times, one nation no longer, but the whole earth is to know the Lord, and the Christian Church is built on the lines of the Jewish Synagogue – and not of the Temple, with what we may truthfully call, by a sort of anachronism, its *Apostolic Succession*. No hereditary priest is wanted; no sacrifices, save those of the heart and will, are to be offered. It is a higher worship, a more glorious Temple. And thus, when the wreck of Judaism came, God still yet again teaches His people to adapt themselves to circumstances; and the Synagogue in its turn, when it had served its purpose as a working model, was displaced by the abiding Ecclesia.

3. All this then teaches us one great, fundamental principle, namely, that the framework of God's Church may be molded and modeled according to the exigencies of the time. A factor plainly lying on the surface; and which, if duly weighed and worked, must go far to solve and to prove the problem of the lawfulness of seemingly divergent forms of Church

Government, so far and so long as urgency and necessity, and the fuller display of God's glory, demand. A factor and a fact, which has never yet been fully grasped in Christendom. *And hence our bickerings.* Our mutual Anathemas. Our High Church and Low Church, and Broad Church, and Dissenting Churches – all at “tug of war”. Until, at last, we may have no Church at all, save in the wilderness, but only so many Synagogues of Satan.

4. It may be well for a moment to glance at the Construction of the Jewish Synagogue: –

(a) A Council of Elders – πρεσβύτεροι, Luke 7:3; who were called by a variety of names indicative of their duties: ποιμένες, shepherds, as watching over and providing for the welfare of the flock, Eph. 1:11; ηγούμενοι, leaders, “chief men” with authoritative influence and power, Acts 15:22; προεστωτες, rulers, 1 Tim. 5:17.

Note. It is generally admitted that these Elders were appointed by the Congregation.

(b) The Presiding Elder ο αρχισυνάγωγος, the Moderator or Chief Ruler of the Synagogue, though the name is sometimes applied to the other Elders, Luke 13:14, Mark 5:22. It was his duty, with the Council of Elders, to superintend the services, administer the affairs of the congregation, and give liberty to preach, Acts 13:15.

(c) The Sheliach, or Officiating Minister – the *legatees*, or delegates of the congregation, to read the prayers and the Law – the άγγελος, or people's messenger to speak to God for them.

(d) The Chazzan, or servant of the Congregation; according to Vitranga, answering to the διάκονος, or deacon; according to the Rabbis, answering to our English sexton. In any case his business was to open the doors, get the building ready for service, keep order, and scourge the condemned. Luke 4:20, the υπηρετής, or “minister”.

Note. The Elders, Sheliach, and Chazzan, were all consecrated to their offices by the imposition of hands.

(e) The Battlanim, ten men of leisure – *otiosi*. They seem to have been appointed for the purpose of always making up a congregation – ten being the minimum number – and to collect alms.

5. Here then again there is no Caste Priesthood. Here is a simple, but effective, and popular organization; graciously suggested by God to His people from their isolation in Babylon; and perhaps foreshadowed long

before, among the Sons of the Prophets, in their weekly and monthly meetings for prayer and exhortation. (“Wherefore wilt thou go to him today? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath,” 2 Kings 4:23.) An institution where the true worshiper could worship in spirit and in truth; where the mind and heart attuned by the Psalmody, and the spirit of the Law, and the Prophets, and the “word of exhortation” of the Elders, might rise to a “reasonable service,” undisturbed by “carnal ordinances”; where the poor heathen might come without any fear of being charged as having “polluted this Holy Place”; and where the Sons of Aaron were on no higher footing than any of their brethren, save the very trifling one of “complimentary precedence”. An institution, too, which our Lord while on earth sanctioned and patronized every Sabbath day (Luke 4:16); and within which He read and preached, and performed not a few of His mighty works.

6. Such was the cradle of the infant Ecclesia. Nay more, such were the outlines which the Christian Church was to fill up and develop and expand by its Sacraments and Apostolic doctrines and teachings. It might, and indeed it was necessary that it should, have a cast or *role* of its own. Its terminology must to a certain extent undergo a change. New ideas, new circumstances, new developments, new adaptations, and above all its spiritual Charismata must find expression. But the great landmarks even of nomenclature must not be removed.

(a) Elder (πρεσβύτερος), that old word, widely and officially consecrated since and perhaps before the days of Eliezer the Damascene, must not be discarded. It had been in the past the keystone of all the varied constitutions of the Israelites; and it was and still is up to our own times found even in heathen lands – *Sheikh*, among the Arabians and Moors, being the venerable *old man*, the chief of the tribe. A Council of Elders, with their President, and the Congregation, must therefore be the fountainhead of all authority in the early Ecclesia. And so the Apostles, and Elders, and Brethren at Jerusalem came together to consider the question of the Circumcision of Gentile converts, and James as President of the Council sums up the debate, and endorses the judgment of the Assembly by διδεγὼ κρίνω, (Acts 15:19) – where εγὼ expresses not so much his own individual opinion, as the duly authoritative and supported Sentence of the President of the Council.

(b) Bishop (ἐπίσκοπος) had too an ancient and a wide range. Thus we find it in Homer as the guardian or protector of treatises and wares; in

Plutarch of laws; and in the Septuagint of public works and cities. It was a word therefore familiar both to the Jewish and Gentile mind; and was used simply and at first in the Christian Church as the Greek equivalent of the *πρεσβύτερος* of the Jewish polity. Thus in the 10th chapter of the Acts, we find the officers of the Ephesian Church at the 17th verse styled Presbyters, and the same officers at the 28th verse styled Bishops.

Nor, indeed, have either the Greek or Latin fathers denied that, in Apostolic times, Presbyters and Bishops were any more than strictly synonymous terms.

(c) Deacon (*διάκονος*) was also a well-known word; denoting among the Greeks a higher class of servant than the *δουλος*; and in the Ecclesia would fitly correspond to the Chazzan or *υπηρέτης* (Luke 4:20) of the Synagogue. Whether or not there were Deacons in the Church before the seven appointed in the Acts, has been debated; but in any case, we may fairly look upon that appointment as the first official institution of the Order. The temporalities of God's children must be attended to as well as their spiritualities: the "ministry of the Word" and the "serving of tables" must go hand in hand; and the latter evidently was to be the special work of the Deacons. But as all God's people were now to be a holy priesthood, Philip the Deacon goes forth as an Evangelist, and preaches Christ, and baptizes in many cities.

Note. The Deacons also, like the Elders, were consecrated to their office, by prayer and the laying on of hands. And it is clear that all the ministers and officers of the Church, from Matthias, were nominated to their offices, as a rule, or wherever convenient, by the people, or whole body of the brethren, and then commissioned by the Apostles (while they lived, or were present) and the Presbytery – the Council of Elders. "The hands of the presbytery," 1 Tim. 4:14; and "the putting on of my hands," 2 Tim. 1:6, can have no other rational meaning than that St. Paul was the President of the Council of Elders at Timothy's ordination.

7. Here then is the sufficiently plain, simple, and popular Organization of the Christian Church of the New Testament. A President, or *primus inter pares*, a Council of Colleagues, or Presbytery, Deacons, and the Brethren.

And here we must take our stand against all Sacerdotalism.

There is not a trace of a return to the Aaronic Priesthood.

There is not a line, nor a word, nor an act recorded in the New Testament of Apostolic Succession.

Everything is arranged to stamp out the *ιερευς*. Rather indeed all Christians are declared to be *ιερεις τω φεω*, Priests unto God, as offering Him spiritual sacrifices: Rev. 1:6; 1 Peter 2:5.

Yea, the very word chosen to designate the higher ministerial office, *πρεσβύτερος*, Elder or Presbyter, with its equivalents and cognates, is one which directly and emphatically excludes the idea of any sacerdotal character.

The only seeming objection to our argument, and that which has weighed with weak or uninstructed and prejudiced minds, is to be found in the cases of Timothy and Titus. But when duly considered, they afford one of the strongest proofs we could desire.

(a) Timothy at Ephesus and Titus in Crete (1 Tim. 1:3, Titus 1:5) were simply the deputies of the Apostle.

(b) There is no (Scriptural) evidence even of their office being permanent as regarded themselves. “Till I come” is the note of time, or delegated authority to Timothy. Titus is also left for a season in Crete – *απέλιπον* (the true reading), and not *κατέλιπον* (an alteration most probably, made from ecclesiastical motives), for a permanency.

(c) There is not a scintilla of evidence to prove that the delegation of Timothy and Titus created a new Order – that of Bishop in the modern sense of the term.

(d) The perfect equality of Elders and Bishops is yet undisturbed – *πρεσβύτερος* and *επίσκοπος* are still unmistakably synonymous terms, Titus 1:5–7.

(e) The advocates of the absolute necessity of prelatical episcopacy lay much stress on the word “ordain,” Titus 1:5. But *καταστήσης* is better rendered by *appoint* or *place*; and the force of the clause, “as I prescribed to thee” – *διεταξάμην* referring as well to the fact of appointing elders, as to the manner of their appointment (De Wette) – is sunk or forgotten.

(f) It is therefore, we contend, clear and demonstrable, that the position of Titus in Crete, and by parity of reasoning, that of Timothy at Ephesus, officially only meant, that they were to manage affairs in the absence of the Apostle, as he had previously laid down and directed – that on every opening for a new Christian Church, Presbyters *alias* Bishops were to be appointed according to the stereotyped Apostolic rule – by the

Brethren and a Council of Elders: of which Councils, Timothy and Titus, when able, might be, and most probably were, the Presidents.

(g) We may confidently challenge, in all exegetical fairness and in calmness, any Scriptural proof to the contrary of these propositions.

8. As Bible students, and here Bible students alone, we have nothing to do with later times. If men forgot, as they did forget, to hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints, and by processes of priestly architecture, to build on other foundations than those of the Apostles and Prophets, they evidently did so at their own peril, and the peril of the sacerdotal structures which they founded. If Presidents of larger Church Councils became arrogant Bishops, and assumed authority over brother Presidents in their provinces; and if the arrogant Bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria assumed supremacy over the whole Church, we can only say that they did so, unsanctioned and condemned by the pattern of the Apostolic Church.

9. But while we would thus maintain the truth, we must guard against a fatal error. We have endeavoured to show, notwithstanding the repeated assertions of latitudinarians to the contrary, that there is an unmistakable line of Church Government to be traced in the *examples* of the New Testament; but we are not bound to maintain that that line is “hard and fast”. While it might have been better had the Churches of Christ more *palpably* adhered to it, if they could, though not perhaps with altogether rigid inelasticity, yet we cannot but remember, that the genius of Christianity, so far as regards its external organization, consists in flexibility. As a universal religion it could not be otherwise. And if we have at all succeeded in proving that the *adaptation* of the framework of religion to *circumstances*, was God’s principle in the older economies, much more must it be true and demonstrable now.

10. The result of our argument therefore is, that while a Presiding Pastor, with his co-Presbyters and Deacons – nominated, or acquiesced in, by the Brethren – is the form of Church Government found in the New Testament – the one best adapted to restrain pride and lording it over God’s heritage – and which it might have been well had the universal Church cordially and more explicitly adopted wherever attainable, – for conditions of persecution and dispersion, or surrounding corruptions might render it impossible; yet at the same time, neither our modern Episcopacy, nor Presbyterianism, nor Wesleyanism, nor Congregationalism, if carried out in the spirit of the Gospel, “faith, hope, charity,” excludes from the Visible

Church, inasmuch as they all build on the Rock Christ; and the Ministers of such Churches, when duly called and ordained, are the Ministers of Christ. But any ecclesiastical system that would impose upon mankind, as a Vicegerency of Heaven, like that of Rome, or would despise the Holy Sacraments of our Lord, and a stated lawful ministry, as the Quakers, we are called upon in all faithfulness to class as outside the Visible Church, and to reject its apostles, by whatever name they be called, as the ministers of Christ.

11. Even in Ritual, we must be content to leave a sufficiently wide margin. If Christianity was to be established in the north and south, in the east and west, it is only an axiomatical truth, that concessions must be made to climate and the temperament of the worshipers. To come home to our own country, while the sturdy Scotchman is pleased with his vocal psalmody and a minister in a black gown or no gown at all, the phlegmatic Englishman may be better suited with his organ and trained choir, and his minister in a surplice. The aesthetics of religion must, we think, be allowed to pass, so long as all things are done decently and in order, and there is no intended or self-evident symbolism of idolatry, and no positive or wayward breach of the customs or rubrics of a Church.

12. We now come to alleged passages in the Epistles of Ignatius – (flourished about A.D. 101) – in which the authority of Bishops is so highly exalted.

(a) The generally received Epistles of Ignatius are six, written on his last journey and way to martyrdom: four from Smyrna – to the Churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome; and two from Troas – to the Churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna: the so-called Epistle to Polycarp, owing to its style, being considered spurious.

(b) These Epistles appear in two ancient Greek MS. editions, a longer and a shorter; but they are both, the smaller as well as the larger, regarded, except by men of extreme views, as considerably corrupted and interpolated, in order to sustain the opinions of a much later age.

(c) Somewhat recently in a Nitrian Monastery, three of these Epistles – to Polycarp, the Ephesians, Romans – have been discovered in a Syriac version, and which are still shorter than the short Greek copies; and though they contain the parts common to the larger and smaller Greek editions, yet they *omit* the passages in which those editions differ – among them *those that magnify the office of a Bishop*.

(d) Now this is precisely what we should have expected. Had Ignatius lived in the third century when the Bishops of the larger cities came arrogantly to the front, and by their overbearing conduct towards the laity and their brother Bishops of humbler churches, began to rend asunder the Body of Christ, we should have been prepared for all the passages which the writers of ultra schools so ardently prize and defend. But we cannot think that the disciple of the beloved and loving John, much less the man whose motto was, Κατα Χριστομαθία, “According to the Instruction of Christ” (Epist. ad Philadelph.), in his last and measured hour, could stay so long to occupy his pen in mere official exaltations. Nor is it at all natural to suppose that the unassuming court of Apostolic structure – a Council of Elders – could or did so hierarchically degenerate in a decade or two of years.

(e) It might be amusing, if it were not indeed at the same time painful, to observe how some professedly and confessedly learned men harp upon that one note of Ignatius: χωρις τούτων (επισκόπου, πρεσβυτερων, και διακόνων) Ἐκκλησία ου καλεῖται – “Without these (Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons), a Church is not called” (ad Trall.). Even granted it is his, there is nothing in it, save the misleading manner in which it is pitched and translated. It simply means that there was then no recognized Church, so far as Ignatius knew, which was not constituted in the usual Apostolic way – with its Presiding Pastor, or Episcopus, its Presbyters or Elders, and its Deacons – its three officers, or orders if you will, of Bishop, Presbyter, Deacon; but of Bishop or Priest, in the after perverted sense and meaning of those terms, it could not, as an historical fact and utterance, and it does not, say anything.

(f) The only argument then that can be legitimately drawn from the Epistles of Ignatius, confirms all that we have endeavoured or desire to prove, namely, that in the days of the Apostles, and their immediate successors, there was a threefold order of management in the Church – a Presiding Pastor, with his co-Presbyters, and Deacons – nominated, or acquiesced in, by the Brethren. And granting, as we have said, that the words quoted above are genuine, it only goes to show that the Presiding Pastor was thus early and distinctly known as “Bishop”.

(g) And such is after all – only that prejudice and lack of knowledge prevent its being generally seen – in substance the form of Ecclesiastical Government, less or more definitely wrought out and recognized in all the

Churches of God to the present day. Nor indeed is it possible to conceive of any safe, popular, and permanent Ecclesiastical Society, without these component parts. And the moment that any one of them assumes autocracy, or unduly trespasses or tramples on the rights and duties of the other, that moment there is a fatal departure from the order and ordinance of God.

13. Thus then, if we only calmly and honestly gather up and weave together the threads of the New Testament and Apostolic times, we have a popular and beautifully effective Form of Church Government, in which “the whole Church” of a given locality nominate to offices, and the nominees, if approved, are commissioned by the Council of Elders.

And such is, we repeat, only that partisan feelings bar reflection and prevent all but mere surface examination, less or more, substantially the order of all the Churches of God. And therefore there is no reason why the Episcopalian, and the Presbyterian, and the Wesleyan, and the Congregationalist should look so askance upon each other. They are all building, though with somewhat different tools, on the same model; or if we may use a Masonic expression, without giving offence to the noble Craft – they are *working* (though with some slight difference of ritual) *in the same Degree*. Indeed if only something of the broad humanity of Free Masonry could be infused into the Churches of Christ, we should not be such biters and devourers of one another. Heresy and priestcraft we must oppose; but where these do not exist, charity should cover a multitude of sins. Heresy and priestcraft we must oppose, as did all the noble army of confessors and martyrs, because they are the main pillars of the kingdom of Satan. But so long as the One Saviour and the One Gospel are proclaimed and confessed, let us have a common platform broad enough in every corner of the globe, for all the missionaries of the Cross, and all the people of God. These are not words written on the spur or impulse of the moment: they are words long weighed: they are too the aspirations, if we mistake not, of the children of Our Heavenly Father, in all sections of so unhappily divided Christendom – of the “seven thousand,” the watching, praying men and women, who have not bowed their knees unto Baal.

14. It were deeply instructive to watch the predicted “wolves” of St. Paul as they gather round the infant Ecclesia and onwards. But this, as we have intimated, belongs rather to the professedly ecclesiastical historian than to the expositor. We have however prepared a considerable quantity of material on this head, and hope to be enabled to embody it in a future

volume. For the present it must suffice to say, that these “grievous wolves” may fitly be described as false teachers, hungry for place and power and supremacy, and the sordid gains which these too often bring – one antichrist after another rending the Church by their divisions and schisms, and their assumptions of princely authority, until at last the Great Antichrist, in the person of the Roman Pontiff, had well nigh annihilated the vitality of true religion in Christendom, save in her mountain fastnesses, in “dens and caves of the earth”.

Monarchy In Spiritual Things Has Been The Curse Of Christianity.

Modern Writers and Opinions.

Plumptree: –

We quote Professor (now Dean) Plumptree, by way of preface, disregarding for the moment chronological order, inasmuch as he deservedly stands so high in the theological world.

“It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that the worship of the [primitive Christian] Church was identical with that of the Synagogue modified (1) by the new truths, (2) by the new institution of the Supper of the Lord, (3) by the spiritual *Charismata*” (Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible, Art. *Synagogue*).

“The language of the New Testament writers in relation to the priesthood ought not to be passed over. They recognize in Christ, the firstborn, the king, the anointed, the representative of the true primeval priesthood after the order of Melchizedek (Heb. 7, 8), from which that of Aaron, however necessary for the time, is now seen to have been a deflection. But there is no trace of an order in the new Christian society, bearing the name and exercising functions like those of the priests of the older Covenant. The Synagogue and not the Temple furnishes the pattern for the organization of the Church. The idea which pervades the teaching of the Epistles is that of an universal priesthood. All true believers are made kings and priests (Rev. 1:6; 1 Peter 2:9), offer spiritual sacrifices (Rom. 12:1), may *draw near*, may enter into the holiest (Heb. 10:19–22) as having received a true priestly consecration. They too have been washed and sprinkled as the sons of Aaron were (Heb. 10:22). It was the thought of a succeeding age that the old classification of the high-priest, priests, and Levites was reproduced in the bishops, priests, and deacons of the Christian Church. The idea which was thus expressed rested, it is true, on the broad

analogy of a threefold gradation, and the terms, ‘priest,’ ‘altar,’ ‘sacrifice,’ might be used without involving more than a legitimate symbolism, but they brought with them the inevitable danger of reproducing and perpetuating in the history of the Christian Church many of the feelings which belonged to Judaism, and ought to have been left behind with it. If the evil has not proved so fatal to the life of Christendom as it might have done, it is because no bishop or pope, however much he might exaggerate the harmony of the two systems, has ever dreamt of making the Christian priesthood hereditary. We have perhaps reason to be thankful that two errors tend to neutralize each other, and that the age which witnessed the most extravagant sacerdotalism was one in which the celibacy of the clergy was first exalted, then urged, and at last enforced” (Smith’s Diet., Art. *Priest*).

Mosheim: –

“Originally the teachers and the people conjointly administered the affairs of the Church; but these teachers, in process of time, assumed a loftier spirit, and, trampling on the rights of the people, they claimed sovereign power both in sacred and secular affairs. At last things gradually came to this, that one person held supreme power over the whole Church, or at least affected to hold it. Among these governors and guides of the Church, some obtained by their writings preeminent fame and influence; and as these were by after ages regarded as oracles and blindly followed, they ought to rank among the *governors* of the Church, whether they held offices in it or not. ...

“As to the external form of the Church and the mode of governing it, neither *Christ* himself nor his apostles gave any express precepts. We are therefore to understand that this matter is left chiefly to be regulated by circumstances, and by the discretion of civil and ecclesiastical rulers. If, however, what no Christian can doubt, the apostles of Jesus Christ acted by divine command and guidance, then that form of the primitive churches, which was derived from the Church of Jerusalem erected and organized by the apostles themselves, must be accounted *divine*; yet it will not follow that this form of the Church was to be perpetual and unalterable. In those primitive times, each Christian Church was composed of the *people*, the *presiding officers*, and the *assistants* or *deacons*. These *must* be the component parts of every society. The highest authority was in the *people*, or whole body of Christians; for even the apostles themselves inculcated by their example, that nothing of any moment was to be done or determined

on, but with the knowledge and consent of the brotherhood. Acts 1:15, 6:3, 15:4, 21:22. ...

“The assembled people therefore elected their own rulers and teachers, or received without constraint those recommended to them. ... In a word, the people did everything which belongs to those in whom the *supreme power* of the community is vested. ...

“The rulers of the Church were denominated sometimes *presbyters* and *elders*, a designation borrowed from the Jews, and indicative rather of the wisdom than the age of the persons, and sometimes, also, *bishops*; for it is manifest that *both terms* are promiscuously used in the New Testament for one and the same class of persons. Acts 20:17–28, Phil. 1:1, Titus 1:5–7; 1 Tim. 3:1. These were men of gravity, and distinguished for their reputation, influence, and sanctity. 1 Tim. 3:1, etc.; Titus 1:5, etc. ...

“That the Church had its public servants or *deacons*, from its first foundation, there can be no doubt, since no association can exist without its servants; and least of all such associations as the first Christian churches. ...

“In this manner Christians managed ecclesiastical affairs so long as their congregations were small or not very numerous. Three or four presbyters, men of gravity and holiness, placed over those little societies, could easily proceed with harmony, and needed no head or president. But when the churches became larger, and the number of presbyters and deacons, as well as the amount of duties to be performed, was increased, it became necessary that the council of presbyters should have a president, a man of distinguished gravity and prudence, who should distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and be, as it were, the central point of the whole society. He was at first denominated *the angel* (Rev. chs. 2, 3), but afterwards *the bishop*, a Greek title indicative of his principal business. ...

“But whoever supposes that the bishops of the first and golden age of the church corresponded with the bishops of the following centuries, must blend and confound characters which are very different. For, in this century and the next, a bishop had charge of a *single* church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house; nor was he its *lord*, but was in reality its *minister* or servant; he instructed the people, conducted all parts of public worship, and attended on the sick and the necessitous in person: and what he was unable thus to perform, he committed to the care of the presbyters, but without power to determine or sanction anything except by the votes of the presbyters and people. ...

“All the Churches in those primitive times were *independent* bodies, none of them subject to the jurisdiction of any other” (Eccl. Hist. Cent. I.).

[*Maclaine*: –

“Those who imagine that Christ himself or the apostles by his direction and authority appointed a certain fixed *form of church government*, are not agreed what that form was. The principal opinions which have been adopted upon this head may be reduced to the *four* following. The first is that of the *Roman Catholics*, who maintain that Christ’s intention and appointment was, that his followers should be collected into *one sacred empire, subjected to the government of St. Peter and his successors*, and divided, like the kingdoms of this world, into several provinces; that, in consequence thereof, Peter fixed the seat of ecclesiastical dominion at Rome, but afterwards, to alleviate the burthen of his office, divided the church into three greater provinces, according to the division of the world at that time, and appointed a person to preside in each who was dignified with the title of *patriarch*; that the European patriarch resided at Rome, the Asiatic at Antioch, and the African at Alexandria; that the bishops of each province, among whom there were various ranks, were to reverence the authority of their respective patriarchs; and that both bishops and patriarchs were to be passively subject to the supreme dominion of the *Roman Pontiff*. ... This romantic account scarcely deserves a serious refutation. The *second* opinion concerning the government of the church, makes no mention of a supreme head or of patriarchs constituted by divine authority; but it supposes that the Apostles divided the Roman empire into as many ecclesiastical provinces as there were secular or civil ones; that the metropolitan bishops, i.e., the prelate who resided in the capital city of each province, presided over the clergy of that province; and that the other bishops were subject to his authority. This opinion has been adopted by some of the most learned of the Romish Church ... and has also been favoured by some of the most eminent British divines (Hammond, Beveridge, Ussher). ... The *third* opinion is that of those who acknowledge that when the Christians began to multiply exceedingly, metropolitans, patriarchs, and archbishops were indeed created, but only by *human* appointment and authority; though they confess, at the same time, that it is consonant to the orders and intentions of Christ and his apostles, that there should be in every Christian church one person invested with the highest authority, and clothed with certain rights and privileges above the other

doctors of that assembly. This opinion has been embraced by many English divines of the first rank in the learned world, and also by many in other countries and communions. The *fourth* and last opinion is that of the Presbyterians, who affirm that Christ's intention was that the Christian doctors and ministers should all enjoy the same rank and authority, without any sort of preeminence or subordination, or any distinction of rights and privileges" (Note to Mosheim, Cant. I.).]

When men leave the lines of Revelation, imagination, as a rule, must *run riot*.

Neander: –

“What Moses expressed as a wish (Num. 11:29) – that the Spirit of God might rest upon all, and all might be prophets – seems to me a prediction of that which was to be realized through Christ. By him was to be instituted a fellowship of divine life, which proceeding from the equal and equally immediate relation of all to the one God, as the divine source of life to all, should remove those boundaries within which, at the Old Testament position, the development of the higher life was still confined; and hence the fellowship thus derived would essentially distinguish itself from the constitution of all previously existing religious societies. There could, in such a society, be no longer a priestly or prophetic office, constituted to serve as a medium for the propagation and development of the kingdom of God, on which office the religious consciousness of the community was to be dependent. Such a guild of priests as existed in the previous systems of religion, empowered to guide other men, who remained, as it were, in a state of religious pupillage; having the *exclusive* care of providing for their religious wants, and serving as mediators by whom all other men must first be placed in connection with God and divine things – such a priestly caste could find no place within Christianity. In removing that which separated men *from God*, in communicating to all the same fellowship *with God*, Christ also removed the barrier which had hitherto divided men *from one another*. Christ, the Prophet and High Priest for entire humanity, was the end of the prophetic office and of the priesthood. There was now the same High Priest and Mediator for all, through whom all men, being once reconciled and united with God are themselves made a priestly and spiritual race; one heavenly King, Guide, and Teacher, through whom all are taught of God; one faith, one hope, one Spirit which should quicken all; one oracle in the hearts of all, the voice of

the Spirit proceeding from the Father; – all were to be citizens of one heavenly kingdom, with whose heavenly powers, even while strangers in the world, they should be already furnished. When the Apostles applied the Old Testament idea of the priesthood to Christianity, this seems to me to have been done invariably for the simple purpose of showing that no such visible, particular priesthood could find place in the new community; that since free access to God and to heaven had by the one High Priest, even Christ, been opened once for all to believers, they had, by virtue of their union to him, become themselves a spiritual people, consecrated to God, their calling being none other than to dedicate their entire life to God as a thank offering for the grace of redemption, to publish abroad the power and grace of him who had called them out of the kingdom of darkness into his marvelous light, to make their life one continual priesthood, one spiritual worship springing from the temper of faith working by love – one continuous testimony for their Saviour (compare 1 Peter 2:9, Rom. 12:1, and the spirit and whole train of thought running through the Epistle to the Hebrews). So, too, the advancement of God's kingdom in general, and in particular the diffusion of Christianity among the heathens, and the good of each particular community, was now to be the duty, not of one select class of Christians alone, but the immediate concern of each individual. Every one, from the position assigned him by the invisible Head of the Church, ought to cooperate in promoting this object by the special gifts which God had bestowed upon him – gifts grounded in *his peculiar nature*, but that nature renewed and ennobled by the Holy Spirit. ...

“Christianity freely appropriated to its own use such existing forms as were adapted to its spirit and essential character. Now in the Jewish synagogue, and in all the sects that sprang out of Judaism, there existed a form of government which was not monarchical but aristocratical, consisting of a Council of Elders סִנְגֵד, πρεσβύτεροι, who had the guidance of all affairs belonging, to the common interest. To this form Christianity, which unfolded itself out of Judaism, would most naturally attach itself. The same polity, moreover, would appear most natural whenever churches were founded among the pagans in any part of the Roman empire, for here men had long been accustomed to see the affairs of state administered by a senate or assembly of decuriones. It is, to my mind, an evidence of such an affinity between the ecclesiastical and the civil form of administration, that at a somewhat later period the clergy were denominated *ordo*, the guiding

senate of the community, since *ordo* stands preeminently for the *ordo senatorum*.

“The guidance of the communities was therefore most probably entrusted everywhere to a Council of Elders. It was not necessary that these should be the oldest in years, though some respect doubtless was had to age. Age was here generally a designation of worth, as in the Latin ‘senatus’ and in the Greek ‘γεροσύα’. Besides the usual name, πρεσβύτεροι, given to the heads of the Church, there were also many others, denoting their appropriate sphere of action; as, ποιμένες, shepherds; ἡγουμένοι, προεστώτες των αδελφών. The founding of Churches among the pagans led to another name, more conformable to the Grecian mode of designating such relations than the terms above cited, which clearly bespeak their Jewish origin. This name was ἐπίσκοποι, borrowed from the civil form of government among the Greeks, and applied to the presiding officers of the Christian Churches, as overseers of the whole and leaders of the community.

“That the name ἐπίσκοποι, or bishops, was altogether *synonymous* with that of presbyters, is clearly evident from those passages of Scripture where both passages are used interchangeably (Acts 20, comp. verse 17 with verse 28; Ep. to Titus, ch. i. verse 5 with verse 7), and from those where the office of deacon is named immediately after that of bishops, so that between these two officers no third one could possibly intervene” (Ep. to Philipp. i. 1; 1 Tim. 1:1, 8. – [High Churchmen contend for a third order above both elders and deacons, namely, *Apostles appointed by Apostles*, now represented, as alleged, by the Bishops of the Church.] – “This interchange of the two appellations shows that originally they were perfectly identical. Even were the name Bishops originally nothing more than the distinctive title of a president of this church senate, of a *Primus inter pares*, yet even in this case such an interchange would be altogether inadmissible. So, too, in the letter which Clement, the disciple of Paul, writes in the name of the Roman Church, the deacons are immediately named after the bishops as the rulers of the Churches. ...

“These presbyters or bishops, then, as we variously call the same functionaries considered from different points of view, had the general superintendence of the communities, the direction of all affairs pertaining to the common interest. ...

“The following seems to have been the regular course (of election to office): the offices of the Church were entrusted in preference to the first converts, provided that in other respects they possessed the requisite qualifications. Clement of Rome cites the following rule as one which had been handed down from the apostles, relative to the appointment of church offices: ‘*that persons should be appointed to them by approved men, the whole Church consenting.*’ The general practice may have been for the presbyters themselves, in case of a vacancy, to propose someone to the Church in place of the deceased, and leave it to the whole body either to ratify or annul their selection for definite reasons.” – [This comes very near, but is scarcely in strict accordance with the primitive Apostolic Rule traced out by us above: where we found that *the Brethren* rather nominated, etc.] – “Wherever asking for the assent of the whole Church had not become a mere formality, this mode of filling the offices had the salutary effect of causing the votes of the majority to be guided by those capable of judging and of suppressing divisions, while at the same time no one was obtruded on the community who would not be welcome to them.

“Again, as regards the relation in which these presbyters stood to their several churches, they were not designed to be absolute monarchs, but to act as presiding officers and guides of an ecclesiastical republic; consequently to conduct all things with the cooperation of the communities whose ministers and not masters they were. In this light the apostles seem to have regarded this relation when they addressed their epistles, which treat not barely of matters of doctrine, but of such as concern the life and discipline of the Church, not only to the rulers of the churches, but to the entire communities. When the Apostle St. Paul pronounces a sentence of excommunication from the fellowship of the Church, he speaks of himself as united in spirit with the whole community (1 Cor. 5:4), assuming that, in a matter of such common concern, the concurrence of the whole Church would as a rule be beneficial” (History of the Church, vol. i., sect. ii.).

Lord Thomas Cromwell; Crammer, Archbishop of Canterbury; Edward, Archbishop of York; The Bishops of London, Durham, Lincoln, Bath, Ely, Bangor, Salisbury, Hereford, Worcester, Rochester, Chichester; with other signatures: –

“The truth is that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons or ministers, and of priests or bishops; nor is there any word spoken of any other ceremony

used in the conferring of this sacrament, but only of prayer, and the imposition of the bishop's hands" (A Declaration made of the Functions and Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests).

Lambert, Martyr: –

"As touching priesthood in the primitive Church, when virtue bare most room, there were no more officers in the Church of God than bishops and deacons; that is to say, ministers: as witnesseth, beside Scripture, fully, apertly, Jerome, in his commentaries upon the Epistles of Paul, where he saith that those whom we call priests were all one, and none other but bishops; and the bishops none other but priests; men ancient both in age and learning, so near as they could be chosen.

"Neither were they instituted and chosen, as they be nowadays, with small regard by a bishop or his officer, only opposing them if they can construe a collect; but they were chosen not only by the bishop but also with consent of the people, among whom they should have their living, as showeth St. Cyprian; and the people (as he saith) ought to have power to choose priests that be men of good learning, of good and honest report. But, alack for pity! such elections are now banished, and new fashions brought in, which, if we should confer with the form of the election showed of Christ by his Apostle Paul, we should find no small diversity, but all turned upside down" (The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe).

It may be well to add a short description of the execution of this holy Martyr of God: – "After that his legs were consumed and burned up to the stumps, and that the wretched tormentors and enemies of God had withdrawn the fire from him, so that but a small fire and coals were left under him, then two that stood on each side of him with their halberts pitched him upon their pikes, as far as the chain would reach. ... Then he, lifting up such hands as he had, and his fingers' ends flaming with fire, cried unto the people in these words, 'None but Christ, none but Christ!' and so being let down again from their halberts, fell into the fire, and there gave up his life."

All Popery! after which so many of the Church of England hanker, and which they do so amorously treat with tenderness and regard.

Bishop Hooper, Martyr: –

"Such as teacheth people to know the Church by these signs, namely, the traditions of men, and the succession of bishops, teach wrong" (A Declaration of Christ and His Office).

“As concerning the ministers of the Church, I believe that the Church is bound to no sort of people, or any ordinary succession of bishops, cardinals, or such like, but unto the only Word of God; and none of them should be believed but when they speak the Word of God” (Godly Confession).

Bishop Jewel: –

“Of succession St. Paul saith to the faithful at Ephesus: ‘I know that after my departure hence ravening wolves shall enter and succeed me. And out of yourselves there shall (by succession) spring up men speaking perversely.’ Therefore St. Hierome saith: ‘They be not always the children of holy men that (by succession) have the places of holy men.’

“Touching the Church of Rome, I will say no more for this present, but only that was spoken openly by Cornelius, the Bishop of Bitonto, in the late Council of Trident: ‘Would God they were not gone as it were utterly by consent together from religion to superstition, from faith to infidelity, from Christ to antichrist!’ These few words, considering either the speaker or the place where they were spoken, may seem sufficient. They are gone from faith to infidelity, from Christ to antichrist. And yet, all other things failing, they must hold only by succession; and, only because they sit in Moses’ chair. They must claim the possession of the whole. This is the right and virtue of their succession. ...

“But wherefore telleth us M. Harding this long tale of succession? Have these men their own succession in so safe record? Who was then the Bishop of Rome next by succession unto Peter? Who was the second? Who the third? Who the fourth? Irenaeus reckoneth them together in this order: Petrus, Linus, Anacletus, Clemens. Epiphanius thus: Petrus, Linus, Cletus, Clemens. Optatus thus: Petrus, Linus, Clemens, Anacletus. Clemens says that he himself was next unto Peter; and then must the reckoning go thus, Petrus, Clemens, Linus, Anacletus. Hereby it is clear that of the four first Bishops of Rome, M. Harding cannot certainly tell us who in order succeeded other. And thus, talking so much of succession, they are not well able to blase their own succession” (Answer to M. Harding’s Confutation).

Hooker: –

“The necessity of polity and regiment in all churches may be held without holding any one certain form to be necessary in them all. ...

“Neither God’s being Author of laws for government of his Church nor his committing them unto Scripture is any reason sufficient wherefore

all Churches should forever be bound to keep them without change. ...

“Touching the ministry of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the whole body of the Church being divided into laity and clergy, the clergy are either presbyters or deacons. ...

“Bishops, albeit they may avouch, with conformity of truth, that their authority had thus descended even from the very apostles themselves, yet the absolute and everlasting continuance of it they cannot say that any commandment of the Lord doth enjoin; and therefore must acknowledge that the Church hath power by universal consent upon urgent cause to take it away. ...

“Wherefore lest bishops forget themselves, as if none on earth had authority to touch their states, let them continually bear in mind that it is rather *the force of custom* whereby the Church, having so long found it good to continue under the regiment of her virtuous bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honour them in that respect, than that any such *true and heavenly law* can be showed, by the evidence whereof it may of a truth appear that the Lord himself hath appointed presbyters for ever to be under the regiment of bishops, in what sort soever they behave themselves. ...

“Now whereas hereupon some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops, which have had their ordination likewise by other bishops before them, till we come to the very apostles of Christ themselves; in which respect it was demanded of Beza, at Poissie, by what authority he could administer the holy sacraments, being not thereunto ordained by any other than Calvin, or by such as to whom the power of ordination did not belong, according to the ancient order and customs of the Church. ...

“To this we answer that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop. The whole Church visible being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than bishops alone to ordain: howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from those ordinary ways. Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God himself doth of himself raise up any, whose labour he useth without requiring that men should authorize them; but then he doth ratify their calling by manifest signs and tokens himself from heaven: and thus even such as believed not our Saviour’s

teaching, did yet acknowledge him a lawful Teacher sent from God: ‘Thou art a Teacher sent from God, otherwise none could do those things which thou doest.’ Luther did but reasonably, therefore, in declaring that the Senate of Melheuse should do well to ask of Muncer, from whence he received power to teach? who it was that had called him? and if his answer were, that God had given him his charge, then to require at his hands some evident sign thereof for men’s satisfaction: because so God is wont, when he himself is the author of any extraordinary calling. Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep: where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither bath, nor can have possibly, a Bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give, place. And therefore we are not, simply without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued succession of Bishops in every effectual Ordination” (Ecclesiastical Polity).

“Good” *Bishop Hall* (Author of Divine Right of Episcopacy): –

“The imputation pretended to be cast by this tenet [the Divine right of Episcopacy] upon all the Reformed Churches which want this government, I endeavoured so to satisfy that I might justly decline the envy which is intended to be thereby raised against us; for which cause I professed that we do ‘love and honour those our sister churches, as the dear spouse of Christ,’ and give zealous testimonies of my well-wishing to them. Your uncharitableness offers to choke me with those scandalous censures and disgraceful terms which some of ours have let fall upon those churches and their eminent professors, which, I confess, it is more easy to be sorry for than, on some hands, to excuse. The error of a few may not be imputed to all. My just defense is that no such consequent can be drawn from our opinion; forasmuch as the Divine or Apostolical right which we hold goes not so high as if there were an express command, that, upon an absolute necessity, there must be either episcopacy or no Church” (Defence of Humble Remonstrance).

“Blessed be God, there is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. We accord in every point of Christian doctrine without the least variation; their public Confessions [Augsburg, Sneveland, Basle, Helvetia, Saxony, Wirtemberg, France, England, Belgia, Bohemia, Scotland] and ours are

sufficient convictions to the world of our full and absolute agreement. The only difference is in the form of outward administration; wherein also we are so far agreed as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a Church, though much importing the well or better being of it, according to our several apprehensions thereof, and that we do all retain a reverence and loving opinion of each other in our own several ways, not seeing any reason why so poor a diversity should work any alienation of affection in us one towards another” (The Peacemaker).

The “Learned” *Bingham*: –

“Mr. Baxter’s next exception is in favour of the Churchmen, who ‘like not the description given of the visible Church in the nineteenth Article, and think that the Church of Rome never erred in matters of faith, contrary to what is there asserted.’ But what is that description of the visible Church which they dislike? Why, that it is ‘a congregation of faithful men in which the pure Word of God is preached and the sacraments are duly administered according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.’ And are there any Churchmen that dislike this? Yes; because there is no mention of *bishops or their government* in it. And would Mr. Baxter have liked it better if there had been? No, but he is concerned for the Churchmen who cannot subscribe this Article but contrary to their judgment! But these Episcopal Churchmen have often told him and others that it is not contrary to their judgment to subscribe this Article.

“For in all their disputes with the Papists, they never require more than *these two notes* of a Church. They say, with Bishop Andrewes, ‘that, though Episcopal Government be of Divine institution, yet it is not so absolutely necessary as that there can be no Church, nor Sacraments, nor Salvation without it. He is blind that sees not many Churches flourishing without it; and he must have a heart as hard as iron that will deny them salvation. Something may be wanting, that is of Divine right, in the exterior regimen of the Church, and yet salvation be obtained therein.’ Now this is the case of the French Church, which Bishop Andrewes and his followers allow to have *all the necessary and essential notes of a true Church, though Episcopal Government was never settled among them*” (French Church’s Apology, etc.).

“Indeed, the name of *indelible character* [‘a perpetual spiritual power or authority impressed upon the soul of a priest, which no removal from his

office can take from him'] occurs never so much as once expressly in any act or canon of an ancient council. And they who have been most inquisitive after its synodical establishment are at a loss to find it anywhere else but in the Council of Florence, or the Council of Trent, which is an argument that the ancient councils knew nothing of it. ...

“Calvin wrote his *Antidote*, and Chemnitius his *Examen*, of the Council of Trent, and they both reject and refute it as a modern fiction. Calvin says, ‘It was a fable first invented in the schools of the ignorant monks, and that the ancients were altogether strangers to it; and that it had more of the nature of a magical enchantment than of the sound doctrine of the Gospel in it.’ And therefore it might be rejected with the same facility that it was invented” (Scholastic History of the Practice of the Church, etc.).

Note. If then Holy Orders are not indelible, but *delible*, how, as Mr. Harrison (*Whose are the Fathers?*) so well puts it, do our Anglo-Catholics, *alias* Puseyites, get a safe-conduct for their Apostolical Succession?

Archbishop Wake –

“I bless God that I was born and have been bred in an Episcopal Church, which I am convinced has been the government established in the Christian Church from the very time of the Apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm that, where the ministry is not Episcopal, there is no Church, not any true administration of the Sacraments. And very many there are among us who are zealous for episcopacy, yet dare not go so far as to annul the ordinances of God performed by any other ministry” (Letter to Courager).

“The Reformed Churches, though in some things differing from our English Church, I willingly embrace. I could have wished, indeed, that the Episcopal form of Church Government had been retained by all of them. In the meanwhile be it far from me to be so iron-hearted that on account of a defect of this kind (such I may be permitted without offence to call it) I should believe that some of them are to be broken off from our communion or, with certain insane writers (*furiosis scriptoribus*) among us, should assert that they have no true and valid sacraments, and thus are scarcely Christians” (Letter to Le Clerc).

Archbishop Secker: –

“Our inclination is to live in friendship with *all the Protestant Churches*. We assist and protect those on the continent of Europe as well as

we are able. We show our regard to that of Scotland as often as we have an opportunity” (Answer to Mayhew).

“Supposing we had even acted without, and separated from, our Church governors, as our Protestant brethren abroad were forced to do: was there not a cause? ... When Church authority became inconsistent with the ends for which it was established, *what remedy was there but to throw it off and form new establishments? If in these there were any irregularities, they were the faults of those who forced men into them, and are of no consequence in comparison with the reason that made a change necessary*” (Sermons).

Bishop Tomline: –

“I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every Church should be governed by Bishops. No Church can exist without some government; but though there must be rules and orders for the proper discharge of the offices of public worship; though there must be fixed regulations concerning the appointment of ministers; and though a subordination among them is expedient in the highest degree, yet it does not follow that all these things must be precisely the same in every Christian country: they may vary with the other varying circumstances of human society, with the extent of a country, the manners of its inhabitants, the nature of its civil government, and many other peculiarities which might be specified. As it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness” (Exposition of the Articles).

Dean Goode: –

By an appeal to “some of the best of the Fathers” (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine), shows that, in their view –

“(1) The Apostolical Succession, in the sense of a succession of *persons* only, does not secure to a Church *soundness in the fundamentals of the faith*, and that those who have not the latter, though they have the former, are to be avoided.

“(2) That the only absolutely essential point is *doctrinal* succession, or the holding the same faith the Apostles did; and that where that faith is held, there, though perhaps labouring under irregularities and imperfections

in other respects, Christ's Church is to be found, and consequently the presence of his Spirit" (Divine Rule of Faith and Practice).

Harrison: –

"Before concluding this chapter, it will be suitable to notice that the Fathers generally have taught respecting the Christian priesthood. In our research for information on the subject of this book, we have no recollection of noticing any attempt on their part to justify from Scripture their very common practice of designating the Christian ministry and priesthood, and the several ranks or orders of it as high priests, priests, and Levites. We know that there is no foundation for this in the Holy Scriptures; and, notwithstanding the marvelous facility with which the Fathers generally can accommodate the Scriptures to suit their convenience, they do not appear to have done so in this instance. They give ample proof from Scripture for the priesthood of the Christian laity, whether men, women, or children; but none, so far as we have seen, for what they call the priesthood of the clergy as distinct from the laity. These Anglicans of our Church are very zealous for what they consider the priesthood of the bishops or presbyter, in contradistinction to the laity; that a presbyter has a sacrifice to offer, and is a sacrificer in a sense which they are not. Dean Hook maintains this in his Church Dictionary. It is true the distinction held by him is exceedingly attenuated; still, however, it may be sufficient for those who take the Dean as their instructor, to induce them to believe that he, and every priest or presbyter in our Church, is a sacrificer in a sense that a baptized layman is not.

"As Dr. Wordsworth has given his young Student an explicit account of the priesthood and its sacrifices, as generally held by these Anglicans, he shall represent them: –

"Q. But it is asked, since the Church cannot exist without a *priesthood* (S. Hieron. adv. Lucif. c. 8. "Ecclesia non est quae non habet *sacerdotes*"), nor a priesthood without a sacrifice, can it be said that there is any sacrifice in the Church of England; and if not, has she a true priesthood, and is she a true Church?"

"In answer to this question, we are informed that the Church of England has the following sacrifices: 'a sacrificium *primitivum*, a sacrificium *eucharisticum*, a sacrificium *votivum*, a sacrificium *commemoraticum*, a sacrificium *repraesentativum*, a sacrificium *impetrativum*, a sacrificium *applicativum*.' Truly a goodly, and withal a

perfect number, just seven, and neither more nor less. All these so-called sacrifices, as explained by Dr. Wordsworth, Christian laymen *have the same scriptural right to offer* as any order of clergy; and but for one single reference of his, it might have been concluded that that was his meaning. But in proof that ‘a Church cannot exist without a priesthood,’ we are referred to Jerome: ‘There is no Church which has not a priest.’ Jerome is referring to Hilary the deacon, who, he said, could not prepare the Eucharist, not having bishops and presbyters. And he goes on to say, ‘A deacon cannot ordain a clergyman. But there is no Church which has not a priest (*sacerdotem*).’ By the term priest, Jerome means that every Church should have at least a bishop or a presbyter, but has no reference to a *sacrificing* priest.

“In the same treatise from which Dr. Wordsworth made the above extract, Jerome represents every baptized person as having a priesthood, and quotes Scripture in proof of it: –

“Let him lay aside the priesthood of a layman, that is baptism. ... For it is written, “He hath made us a kingdom and priests unto his Father.” And again, “A holy nation, a royal priesthood.” “A chosen race, royal and priestly, which properly belongs to Christians who are anointed with spiritual oil; concerning whom it is written, ‘God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.’” “All who have been baptized unto Christ are a priestly and royal race.”

“Justin Martyr represents all those who have put away their sins as high priests of God, as God himself testifies, saying: –

“That in every place among the Gentiles they offer sacrifices pure and well pleasing to him. But God accepts not sacrifices from any except through his priests; God has therefore beforehand declared that all who through this name offer those sacrifices which Jesus, who is the Christ, commanded to be offered, that is to say, in the Eucharist of the bread and of the cup, which are offered in every part of the world by us Christians, are well pleasing to Him.’

“Irenaeus says, ‘All righteous men hold the priestly order.’

“Tertullian is most express on the priesthood of the laity. He says, ‘Are not we laymen priests? It is written, “He hath made us a kingdom, and priests to God and his Father.”’

“Cyprian teaches that the people are as much sacrificers as the priests:

–

“When we come together into one place with the brethren, and celebrate divine sacrifices with the priest of God (*cum Dei sacerdote*).’

“He also states: –

“Christians become partners as well of the anointing (of Christ) as of the name, and are called Christians from Christ ... ordained of God the priests of holiness.’

“Victorinus maintains that the entire Church are priests of God. Ambrose states, ‘All the sons of the Church are priests, for we are anointed to be a holy priesthood.’ And again, in a work commonly attributed to him, he regards all the elect of God as priests, because they are members of the High priest. Hilary the deacon says, ‘Is not our faith a heavenly altar on which we offer our prayers daily?’

“Augustine says: –

“Every Christian is sanctified, that he may understand that he is not only the participator of priestly and royal dignity,’ etc. Scarcely any one of the faithful doubts that the priesthood of the Jews was a figure of the royal priesthood to come, which is in the Church, to which priesthood all are consecrated who belong to the body of Christ. But as we all are called Christians on account of our mystical chrism, so also all are priests, since they are the members of the One Priest.’

“Chrysostom states: –

“In old times these three sorts were anointed; but we have not now one of these dignities; but all three preeminently [Prophet, Priest, King]. For we are both to enjoy a kingdom and are made priests by offering our bodies for a sacrifice, for he saith, “Present your members a living sacrifice acceptable unto God”; and withal we are constituted prophets too, for what things “eye hath not seen nor ear heard,” these have been revealed unto us.’

“Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, regards the literal Jewish priesthood as having its correspondence or fulfillment in the spiritual priesthood of all Christians. Remigius states: –

“In the New Testament all the faithful are anointed, not so much with visible oil as invisible grace, that is to say, with the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the imposition of hands, and they become kings of souls and priests of people, to sanctify those according to which Peter says, “Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood.””

“The testimony of Bede is very express upon this point. He says: –

“Peter instructs us that we ourselves are a holy priesthood. ... Therefore he calls every Church a holy priesthood, that which under the Law the house of Aaron had in office and in name; because, doubtless, we are all members of the High Priest.’ ‘No one of the saints who is spiritual is without the office of the Priesthood, since he becomes a member of the Eternal Priest.’ ‘But as we are all called Christians by reason of the mystical chrism, so we are all Priests, we are members of One Priest.’

“In proof that the presbyter offers a sacrifice in the Lord’s Supper which the people do not, Dr. “Wordsworth has adduced the testimony of Archbishop Laud: –

“In the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices; one by the priest only, that is the *commemorative* sacrifice of Christ’s death, *represented* in bread broken and wine poured.’ He has also made, in his notes on Hebrews 8:4, a quotation from Theodoret, which at first sight seems to confirm this view –

“The Priests of the New Testament perform the mystical service (Lord’s Supper). For the Lord himself commanded us, saying, “Do this in remembrance of me”; and this we do, in order that by contemplation we may call to mind the figure of the sufferings of Christ which he underwent for us, and may stir up our love.’ Now, who are to call to mind these sufferings of Christ? And when he says, ‘and may stir up our love,’ whom does he mean? Plainly in both cases not exclusively the ministers, but the laity of both sexes. For the blessed command, ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ applies alike to all believers. But elsewhere Theodoret has so spoken upon this point that we cannot mistake his meaning: –

“For he calls the Church his body, and by this Church the priesthood is discharged as a man, but he receives those things which are offered as God. The Church offers the symbols of his body and blood.’ Chrysostom confirms this view of the case: ‘The offering (sacrament of the Lord’s Supper) is the same, Whether A Common Man, Or Paul, Or Peter Offer It”’ (“Whose are the Fathers?”)

High Churchmen.

Bishop Andrews: –

“And yet, though our government be by Divine Right, it follows not, either that there is ‘no salvation,’ or that ‘a Church cannot stand without it.’ He must needs be stone blind that sees not Churches standing without it: he

must needs be made of iron and hard-hearted, that denies them salvation. We are not made of that metal, we are none of those ironsides: we put a wide difference betwixt them. Somewhat may be wanting that is of Divine right (at least in the external government), and yet salvation may be had” (Second Lett. to Du Moulin).

Bishop Cosin: –

“Though we may safely say and maintain it, that their ministers (the French Protestants) are not so duly and rightly ordained as they should be by those prelates and bishops of the Church who since the Apostles’ time have only had the ordinary power and authority to make and constitute a priest; yet that, by reason of this defect, there is *a total nullity in their Ordination, or that they be therefore no priests or ministers of the Church at all, because they are ordained by those only who are no more but priests and ministers among them: for my part I would be loth to affirm and determine it against them.* And these are my reasons. First: I conceive that the power of Ordination was restrained to Bishops rather by apostolical practice and the perpetual custom and canons of the Church, than by any absolute precept that either Christ or his Apostles gave about it. ... Therefore, if at any time a minister so ordained in these French Churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance in many other before my time), our Bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted him to his charge, as they must have done, if his former Ordination here in France had been void. Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received amongst us, and to subscribe the Articles established. ... Secondly. There have been both learned and eminent men (as well in former ages as in this, and even among the Roman Catholics as well as Protestants), who have held and maintained it for good and passable divinity, that presbyters have the intrinsic power of Ordination *in actu primo*; though for the avoiding of schism (as St. Hierom speaks) and preserving order and discipline in the Church, they have been restrained ever since the first times and still are (but where they take a liberty to themselves that was never duly given them), from exercising their power *in actu secunclo*; and therefore that however their act of ordaining of other presbyters shall be void, according to the strictness of the canon (in regard they were universally prohibited from executing that act, and breaking the

order and discipline of the Church), yet that the same act shall not be simply void in the nature of the thing, in regard that intrinsic power remained, when the exercise of it was suspended and taken from them. Of this opinion and judgment in the old time were St. Hierom and his followers; and of later times, the Master of the Sentences (Peter Lombard), Bonaventure, with other schoolmen, as Aureolus, and Anton de Rosellis; and in this latter age, not only Armachanus, Alphons. a Castro, Mich. Medina, among the Roman Catholics; but likewise Cassander, besides Melancthon, Chemnitius, Geradus, and Calixtus, amongst the Protestants; and Bishop Jewel, Dr. Field, Hooker, and Mason, among the divines of our own Church. All which authors are of so great credit with you and me, that though we are not altogether of their mind, yet we would be loth to let the world see that we contradict them all, and. condemn their judgment openly; as needs we must, *if we hold the contrary, and say, that the Ministers of the Reformed French Churches, for want of Episcopal Ordination, Have No Order At All. ...*” (Letter to Mr. Cordel, who scrupled to communicate with the French Protestants, on the ground that they “had no Priests”).

Archbishop Bramhall: –

“There is A Great Latitude Left to particular Churches *in the constitution of their ecclesiastical regiment*, according to the *exigence of time and place and persons*, so as order and his own institution be observed” (Serpent-Salve).

“I cannot assent to his minor proposition, that either all or any considerable part of the Episcopal divines in England do unchurch either all or the most part of the Protestant Churches. No man is hurt, but by himself. They unchurch none at all, but leave them to stand or fall to their own Master. They do not unchurch the Swedish, Danish, Bohemian Churches, and many other Churches in Polonia, Hungary, and those parts of the world which have an ordinary uninterrupted succession of *pastors*, some by the names of Bishops, others under the name of Seniors, unto this day. (I meddle not with the Socinians.) They unchurch not the Lutheran Churches in Germany, who both assert Episcopacy in their confessions, and have actual superintendents in their practice, and would have Bishops, name and thing, if it were in their power. Let him not mistake himself: those Churches which he is so tender of, though they be better known to us by reason of their vicinity, are so far from being ‘all or the most part of the Protestant Churches,’ that being all put together, they amount not to so great a

proportion as the Britannic Churches alone. And if one secluded out of them all those who want an ordinary succession without their own faults, out of invincible ignorance or necessity, and all those who desire to have an ordinary succession, either explicitly or implicitly, they will be reduced to a little flock indeed. But let him set his heart at rest. I will remove this scruple out of his mind, that he may sleep securely upon both ears. *Episcopal divines do not deny Those Churches to be True Churches wherein salvation may be had.* ... Episcopal divines will readily subscribe to the determination of the learned Bishop of Winchester (Andrewes) in his Answer to the Second Epistle Molineus. [Quoted above.] This mistake proceedeth from not distinguishing between *the true nature and essence of a Church, Which We Do Readily Grant Them*, and the integrity or perfection of a Church, which we cannot grant them, without swerving from the judgment of the Catholic Church” (Vindication of himself and the Episcopal Clergy).

“All these (‘most of the Protestant Churches in High Germany’) have their bishops or superintendents, *which is all one.*” ... “Three parts of four of the Protestant Churches have either bishops or superintendents, *which is all one*” (Serpent-Salve).

Archbishop Laud: –

“I do not find any one of the ancient Fathers that makes *local, personal, visible, and continued succession* a necessary sign or mark of the true Church in any one place. And where Vicentius Lirinensis calls for antiquity, universality, and consent, as great notes of truth, he hath not *one word of succession.*”

“And once more, before I leave this point. Most evident it is that the succession which the Fathers meant is not tied to *place* or *person*, but ’tis tied to the Verity Of Doctrine. For so Tertullian expressly. Beside the order of Bishops running down (in succession) from the beginning, there is required *consanguinitas doctrinae*, that the doctrine be allied in blood to that of Christ and his apostles. So that, if the doctrine be no kin to Christ, *all the succession become strangers, what nearness soever they pretend.* And Irenaeus speaks plainer than he, ‘We are to obey those presbyters which, together with the succession of their bishoprics, have received *charisma veritatis, the gift of Truth*’ (Conference with Fisher).

Archbishop Sancroft (Nonjuror): –

Admonishes his clergy – “That they warmly and most affectionately exhort our brethren the Protestant Dissenters to join with us in daily fervent

prayer to the God of peace for the universal *blessed union of all Reformed Churches both at home and abroad* against our common enemies; that all they who do confess the holy name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the truth of his holy word, *may also meet in one holy communion, and live imperfect unity and godly love*” (D’Oyly’s Life of).

Keble, Gladstone, the authors of the *Tracts for the Times* (principally written and compiled by Pusey, Keble, and Newman before his perversion), and many other noted Tractarians, candidly admit that the doctrine of Apostolical Succession is a mystery, vague and indistinct, and only dimly revealed in Scripture; or that Scripture is silent on the subject. So that, as Tract 10 says: “We must honour the Bishop, because he is the Bishop. ... This is *Faith*, to look at things not as seen, but as unseen; to be as sure that the Bishop is *Christ’s* appointed representative as if we actually saw him work miracles as St. Peter and St. Paul did”!!!

Here then is a cloud of witnesses (and many more might be adduced: the only difficulty being selection) – High Church and Low Church; and the practical conclusion to be arrived at from all is, that the Tractarian doctrine of Apostolical Succession is a fond, vain figment; unknown to, or at least unrevealed by, the writers of the New Testament; unknown to the Fathers; and utterly untenable on any sober grounds. And that the true Apostolical Succession is – The Doctrine And Faith Of The Apostles.

We now come to the express wording of the Articles before us, and the Preface to the Ordinal. And here in accordance with our rule throughout – to introduce the student to what has been already well written, rather than draw too largely on our own pen – we beg to quote Professor Boulton, who ably summarizes the views of some of our leading writers; and whose remarks will thus in the main prove a fitting résumé of our argument: –

“Article XXIII is so general in its terms that it might be admitted by any body of Christians who maintain the principle of an order of ministers set apart for the service of the Church.

“The question, therefore, which arises, and which will need illustration from competent English sources, will be how far the twenty-third Article is interpreted or limited by the thirty-sixth, or by any other Church of England document.

“Our inquiry in the first instance resolves itself into the question whether the thirty-sixth Article is meant to have simply an inclusive force,

or also an exclusive force. That is, whether it means only to maintain the validity of the English mode of ordination as against objectors to the same, or also to pronounce against the validity of other modes. It seems clear that the thirty-sixth Article can have no such exclusive force for this reason. If it excludes *any*, it excludes *all* who are not consecrated or ordained according to our form, whether episcopally or not; which would prove too much. This Article therefore asserts the validity of our orders, and leaves the question of other modes of ordination untouched.

“The preface to the Ordinal may at first sight be considered more exclusive. It declares that the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons have continued from the time of the Apostles; and it proceeds to order that none shall be accounted to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon of the Church of England who has not been ordained according to this ritual, or has not previously received episcopal ordination.

“This prohibitory clause was added in 1662. It therefore stands as part of the more exclusive system adopted at the Restoration, and embodied in the Act of Uniformity of Charles II. Before that time, an Act of Parliament, 1571, permitted men ordained otherwise than by the form of the English Church to hold benefices in England, on condition of their duly subscribing the Articles of Religion, and reading them during morning service in their own church.

“That this continued to be the practice is witnessed by the unexceptionable testimony of Bishop Cosin in a letter written in 1650, quoted in Dean Goode’s ‘Rule of Faith.’ [See above.]

“It appears, therefore, that previously to the Act of Uniformity of 1662, the Church of England admitted the validity of the ordinations in the foreign Protestant churches. That Act for the first time required that episcopal ordination should be an absolute requisite for ministering in our Church, and at the same time the above clause was added in the preface to the Ordination Service denying the character of a minister of the Church of England to anyone not episcopally ordained. The change thus introduced will be judged of in different ways according to the sympathies of different persons. But the conclusion is inevitable that our Church has passed no opinion in any of her formularies on the usages of foreign non-episcopal Churches, but has simply ruled since 1662 that their ministers shall not be admissible, as such, into her service.

“Our position, therefore, so far, is this. The Church of England has pronounced episcopacy to be of primitive and apostolical antiquity. She has also for the last two hundred years absolutely required episcopal ordination for all her own ministers. With regard to other differently constituted foreign Churches, she is silent. ...

“The regular transmission of holy orders from generation to generation, in episcopal lines from the Apostles’ time to our own, is usually styled apostolical succession. We shall next, in pursuance of the plan of this work, exhibit the opinions of some representative English divines on the *necessity*, not the *fact*, of this succession. We may first refer to Hooker, the great defender of the Church of England. Book VII. 14, he thus writes: –

“We have already referred, under Art. XIX, to Field, ‘Of the Church,’ and his discussion of succession as one of Bellarmine’s ‘Notes of the Church’ (Book II. c. 6). The subject is further treated by him in the following important passage: ‘There is no reason to be given, but that in case of necessity, wherein all bishops were extinguished by death, or, being fallen into heresy, should refuse to ordain any to serve God in his true worship, but that presbyters, as they may do all other acts, whatsoever special challenge bishops in ordinary course make upon them, may do this also (i.e. may ordain). Who, then, dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God that were ordained by presbyters, in sundry churches of the world, at such times as bishops, in those parts where they lived, opposed themselves against the truth of God, and persecuted such as professed it?’ Again, ‘If the bishops become enemies to God and true religion, in case of such necessity, as the care and government of the Church is devolved to the presbyters remaining Catholic and being of a better spirit, so the duty of ordaining such as are to assist or succeed them in the work of the ministry pertains to them likewise.’

“There can be no question that this was the tone of the leading English divines in the reigns of, Elizabeth and James I. They did not meet their violent Puritan opponents, who claimed the divine right of Presbyterianism, with an absolute counter-claim of the indefeasible divine right of Episcopacy. They were content to prove it lawful in its use, and primitive in its origin. It is well known, however, that in the time of Charles I, the increasing bitterness of controversy induced the episcopal divines to make larger claims on behalf of their Church polity. Still they stopped short of rejecting the validity of other modes of ordination, and denying that the

foreign Protestant communities were Churches of Christ. Perhaps, among the Stuart divines of this class, no more typical names could be alleged than those of Archbishop Laud and Bishop Cosin. The Archbishop, in his ‘Conference with Fisher the Jesuit,’ denies the necessity of ‘continued visible succession,’ or the existence of any promise that it should be uninterruptedly continued in any Church. He proceeds to say, ‘for succession in the general I shall say this; it is a great happiness where it may be had visible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the ancient Fathers that makes local, personal, visible, and continued succession a necessary mark or sign of the true Church in any one place.’

“Bishop Cosin, in a letter quoted by Dean Goode, severely censures the Protestant Churches of France and Geneva for their ‘defect of Episcopacy,’ but says, ‘I dare not take upon me to condemn or determine a nullity of their own ordinations against them.’ He further acknowledges that in the face of certain passages in St. Jerome, some schoolmen, Jewel, Field, Hooker, and others, he cannot say ‘that the ministers of the Reformed French Churches, for want of episcopal ordination, have no order at all.’ He recommends his correspondent to communicate, if need be, with the French Protestants, rather than with the Roman Church. [See the Letter more fully quoted above.]

“IT HAS BEEN THE UNHAPPY LOT OF OUR OWN DAYS TO SEE THE GROUND TAKEN BY THE GREAT WRITERS OF OUR CHURCH ABANDONED, AND THE DEFINITIONS OF OUR ARTICLES AND OF OUR RECOGNIZED DIVINES FORSAKEN FOR THE ‘NOTES OF THE CHURCH,’ MAINTAINED BY BELLARMINE OR OTHER ROMAN CONTROVERSIALISTS” (Introduction to the Theology of the Church of England).

Article XXIV.

The Church: Its Ministers – The Use of the Vulgar Tongue.

On speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth. – It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have Public Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people.

De loquendo in Ecclesia lingua quam Populus intelligit. – Lingua Populo non intellecta publicas in Ecclesia preces peragere, aut Sacramenta administrare verbo Dei, et primitivae Ecclesiae consuetudini plane repugnat.

The Romish system is a sad compound of the ridiculous and the corrupt. It seems absurd to have to prove that a father should pray with and for his children in a tongue understood by them. And yet that is just the proposition before us as against Rome. True, in modern times she has been so far shamed into reason and common sense as to have some prayers in the languages of her people; yet it is a dubious reform, suggestive of artifice and fear of scandal, so long as other prayers and the Canon of the Mass remain locked up in an unknown tongue.

The Custom originated in Priestcraft.

In deep and striking, unholy contrast with the example of the Apostles on the Day of Pentecost, the Popes of the Middle Age and its *Parousia* played upon the ignorant and superstitious minds of the incursive Barbarians with fond and carnal, unsanctified inventions. Thus we have the Latin litanies, and hymns, and Mass Canon, with the pathetic invocations of saints and angels and similar works of Gregory the Great riveting their deluded souls with sound posture and spell – not to instruction and conversion, but to destruction. And putting aside altogether the temporal and disastrous results of Papal policy, it is a fact only too patent that the so-called conversion of barbarians, conducted as it was on lines of superstition and sensual allurements, only tended rapidly to increase the corruptions of Christianity. If you want to save, “let every man hear in his own tongue, wherein he was born, the wonderful works of God.” If you want to enslave and destroy, juggle with the mummeries of human contrivance and expediency. It has been said that these and such like devices, under the circumstances, were necessary. We deny it. There is nothing necessary or effectual to civilization or salvation, but the grace of ourselves, and the imparting of a knowledge of the grace of God. To diverge for a moment: We as Englishmen have tried all other possible “graces” – the grace of forcible annexation – the grace of the sword and the cannon – the grace of parties and politics – the grace of sops to Maynooth – the grace of Free Trade *versus* Fair Trade – the grace of Disestablishment – the grace of tearing up safe and judicious, preventive Acts of Parliament, immediately followed and substituted by autocratic and illegal infringements on liberty

carried at the point of the bayonet – the grace of Land Bills which protect the idle tenant, rob the proprietor, and ignore altogether the slave on the soil. And where are we now (1881)? On the very edge of the rapids of moral and civil and social national decay. What blood have we shed? How many widows and orphans are cursing “Christian” England? The Gospel in one hand, and Opium and Rum or the Sword in the other! Now, what our conquered or incorporated but ever-revolting heathen want is the grace of ourselves to develop their minds, and if need be to develop the natural resources of their countries: bringing them the while to a knowledge of the grace of God. And what poor, enslaved, trodden-down Ireland wants is to develop her fisheries and harbors for the untold treasures of the sea and her coasts, to help her to reclaim her wastes and effete bog lands, to introduce some of our manufactories, or aid her in expanding her own. In a word, *Work and a Fair Wage*; and the putrid, pestilential Missal of Gregory replaced by the pure, living Word of God.

And thus the crafty Pontiffs of Rome enforced their own language on the rest of Europe, and by ignoring all others – even the dialects of Italy, France, Spain, etc., founded though they had been on the ancient Latin – kept the key of their worship and ecclesiastical domination in their own hands; and denied the people a “reasonable service”. Nor indeed when the provincial Latin and rustic Roman died out, was there any desire evinced either by priest or people to have the worship of God in the vernacular. The latter were too unenlightened – too long in bondage to know their God; and the former found in his dumb Missal too valuable an instrument of mystery, and the secret influence which he thereby wielded over the minds of men.

And so the Council of Trent decreed: – “Though the Mass [Public Prayers and the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper] contains a great instruction of the faithful people, yet it doth not seem *expedient* (!) to the Fathers that it should be everywhere celebrated in the vulgar tongue.” And again: “If anyone say that the rite or custom of the Church of Rome, whereby part of the canon and words of the consecration are uttered with a low voice, is to be condemned; or that Mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue. ... Let him be Accursed.”

The Custom is “plainly Repugnant to the Word of God.”

And here the Bible teaches abundantly by example as well as precept.

In the Old Testament it is true we have no express condemnation in words of speaking in an unknown tongue, for the simple reason that no such sin existed; still the whole structure of the book – in its Law, Prophets, and Psalter – shows that it was meant to “feed with knowledge and understanding,” and to affect the heart. Nor indeed could a more conclusive argument against the practice of Rome be conceived than the example of Ezra. Whether the word translated “distinctly” in Nehemiah 8:8, refers to a choral recitative, in which the thirteen Scribes or Levites that stood on the right and left accompanied Ezra, or should be taken as it stands, it is clear that the great object of Ezra on the First Feast of Tabernacles was to make the whole convocation, men and women, “understand the words of the Law” – the entire body of the Old Covenant, when read or sung in the worship of God: and that in and by the very way that Rome has rejected – a translation into the vernacular: the vernacular of the mixed Chaldee dialect of the Captivity. And there is more, and a still nicer point in the argument. The Hebrew and Chaldee were not different, but kindred languages – yea, rather, only *sister dialects*! How minutely careful was the Spirit of God to give His own children *an easy copy* of holy Scripture, with its Liturgical Hymn book. How minutely careful has Rome been to withhold the Bible from her people, and feed them on the husks of a Latin Missal!

And when we come to the New Testament, one of the parting blessings of the ascending Lord to them that believe was, “They shall speak with new tongues.” And so at the very commencement of the history of the Apostles, we have a miracle performed – the Gift of Tongues – to enable them to preach everywhere so as to be understood and administer their holy functions.

We have no sympathy whatever with the view that the gift of tongues was not for teaching, but for ecstatic outbursts of praise and adoration, which no one understood! How German theology can read all this between the lines we cannot tell. How Englishmen can adopt it is still more of a puzzle. It destroys the gravity of the narrative and the occasion; is against the sober sense of the words employed by the historian; and lays the foundation of the Church of God, not in faith, avowedly not in understanding, but in the rhapsodies of an Irvingite delusion. “We do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God.” That is sufficient. No further argument is required. As to St. Paul’s excursus on the tongues in Corinthians, there need be no mystery. They were for a season and an all-

important purpose; but not among the permanent economies of the Spirit, nor regulated by the laws of those economies. And therefore we may very well suppose that in the Corinthian Church, where their value would seem to have become too highly exalted (ζηλωταί εστε πνευμάτων – “ye are zealots of spirits”), and threatened to disparage or displace the ordinary means of grace, a check was there put upon them, at least so far as to require an interpreter – a phase of which there is no trace whatever on the Day of Pentecost, but all and everything to the direct contrary.

And thus it is that St. Paul is led, as if by anticipation, to leave on record one of the most express and telling protests against the pantomimes and dumb theatricals of Romish idolatry – 1 Cor. 14.

“Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either in (εν – by way of) revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophesying, or in doctrine?” [This passage we think – notwithstanding the gloss that “except” (εάν) is only parallel to “if” (the first εάν), and not dependent on “what shall I profit you” (ωφελήσω) – clearly enough shows, that the use of tongues for teaching (“revelation,” “knowledge,” “prophesying,” “doctrine”) was still possible perhaps even at Corinth, and certainly had not “ceased” in the Church of God. For in no other way can we so well account either for the success or venture of the Apostles in their missionary travels, than their power and facility, and consciousness of being able to instruct in native dialects and languages]. “Things without life, giving sound, whether pipe or harp, yet, if they do not give a distinction in their sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet also give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for war? So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak to the air.” [A terrible, caustic comment on the school that has made the Apostles “speak to the air” on the Day of Pentecost!] “There are, it may be, so many kinds of languages in the world, and none of them is inarticulate. Therefore, if I know not the meaning of the language, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh a barbarian unto me. So likewise ye, emulous as ye are of spiritual gifts, seek them, that ye may abound in them, to the edification of the Church.” [So much for preaching or public reading in the Church. Now for public prayer.] “Wherefore let him who speaketh with a tongue, when praying strive that he may interpret. For when I pray in a tongue, my spirit πνευμά μου – my highest being) prays,

but my understanding (νοῦς μου – my intellectual part) is unfruitful (in you God-ward?) What is it then? (What is my resolve in the case?) I will pray with my spirit, but I will pray with my understanding also: I will sing with my spirit, but I will sing with my understanding also.” [To the joint edification of himself and the church.] “Else, when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned (ἰδιώτου – one who has not the gift of a tongue or of interpreting, or as we say a lay person – a plain Christian) say the Amen (το Ἄμην) at thy giving of thanks, seeing he knoweth not what thou sayest?” [*How CAN Rome meet this?*] “For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified. I thank God, I speak in tongues more than you all.” [Irony apart, may we not ask the modern Irvingite school, whether these words mean that St. Paul was the greatest unintelligible Rhapsodist or the greatest miraculously endowed Linguist of his day?] “Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue. ... If therefore the whole church be assembled together, and all speak with tongues, and there come in the unlearned (plain Christians) or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?” [Yes, certainly, any one that comes to the Popish masses, and hears a sound, but understandeth not a word of what is said, will surely think them to be mad, mad people that go to pray to the eternal God, and yet know not what is said. And this doth not only make for public prayers, but for *all* public services whatsoever; and the Sacraments amongst the rest, which our Saviour, and His Apostles after Him, administered in a *known tongue*. But we have a generation now sprung up that thinks themselves wiser than their Maker and Redeemer, and know better what language His Sacraments are to be administered in than Himself did. – *Beveridge*.] “But if all prophesy (προφητεύωσιν – speak out intelligibly the mind of God – the word and doctrine of Christ, as His ministers), and there come in an unbeliever or a plain Christian, he is convicted by all (penetrated by each speaker in turn): he is searched into by all: the hidden things of his heart are made manifest (‘his whole hitherto unrecognized personal character laid out’ and revealed before him); and so, falling down on his face he will worship God, declaring that God is among you of a truth.”

And so does St. Paul “write the things that are the Lord’s commandments” as to tongues in public prayer and preaching – interweaving the kindred subjects; and further on lays down similar rules

for prophesying: grounding the whole on the fundamental principle – “Let all things be done unto Edification,” or in its closing form, “Let all things be done decently and in order.”

What a plain, pointed homily against the sin, the unprofitableness, the unreasonableness, and the unnaturalness of conducting the services of God in an “unknown tongue”! Above all, “the sin” – *in spite* of “the commandments of the Lord”! Alas! Rome! Alas! rather, her deluded votaries! “If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.”

Public Prayer, or the Administration of the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the People, is also “plainly Repugnant to the Custom of the Primitive Church.”

Long even before the Christian era, God in His gracious providence raised up men, or suggested institutions, to supply His Church with a vernacular Scripture, and its Book of Common Prayer. Thus when, in the Babylonish Captivity, the Jews, scattered up and down a vast empire, had lost much of their nationality, and with it to a great extent their knowledge of the ancient Hebrew, synagogues were organized or reestablished to explain to them, on their return, the Scriptures in the Chaldee or Aramaic tongue of their exile. And so, too, when, by the conquests of Alexander the Great, the Greek language prevailed, we have the Septuagint, or Alexandrian Greek version for the Jews of the great Hellenistic Dispersion: and which moreover proved not only the fusion of Eastern and Western thought, but also “the door to the Gentiles to Christ.”

Nor had Christianity got well beyond its infancy, when the Syriac version of the Old Testament was made for the converts of Edessa. And this was soon followed by the Latin version of the Bible, in Africa, for the Christians there.

Thus then we have the Scriptures translated into the three leading languages of the world – Greek, Syriac, Latin – at the Advent or in the early Primitive Church; and version has since followed upon version until our own day. In fact the natural, or shall we not say the divine, law which seems to have led and governed every converted nation, has been to have God’s Word in the vernacular.

Now every such translation is a protest against the Romish usage. And if so, the moral and cumulative argument from all is simply and clearly this, that Rome is against all the world besides, and all the world besides is

against Rome. A fatal blow to her vaunted Catholicity, and boasted care for the fold of Christ's sheep.

And when we turn to the actual routine of the primitive Christians in their public prayers and services, we find abundant, explicit, unvarying evidence against the unnatural, sinful custom in question.

Justin Martyr: – “How we dedicated ourselves to God, being made new through Christ, I will now declare unto you, lest, if I omit this, I should appear to be cheating in my explanation. All then who are persuaded and do believe that those things, which are taught and affirmed by us, are true, and who promise to lead lives according to them, are instructed by us to pray and to ask of God, with fasting, forgiveness of their former sins; and we pray and fast with them. ... After thus washing him who has professed, and given his assent, we bring him to those who are called brethren; where they are assembled together, to offer prayers in common both for ourselves, and for the person who has received illumination, and all others everywhere, with all our hearts, that we might be vouchsafed, now we have learnt the truth, by our works also to be found good citizens and keepers of the commandments, that we may obtain everlasting salvation. ... And the President [when the brethren have brought him the elements] offers up praise and glory to the Father of all timings, through the Name of his Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and he returns thanks at length, for our being vouchsafed these things by him. When he has concluded the prayers and thanksgiving, all the people who are present *express their assent* by saying Amen. And this word, Amen, signifies in the Hebrew tongue, So be it. ...

“And on the day which is called Sunday, there is an assembly in the same place of all who live in cities, or in country districts; and the books of the Prophets, or the writings of the Apostles, are there read, as long as time will permit. When the reader has done, he who presides in the assembly makes a discourse, in which he admonishes and exhorts us to imitate and practice the excellent things *we have heard*. Then we all rise up *with one consent, and send forth our prayers to God*.” And the Eucharist proceeds as above.

Here then in his First Apology, Justin Martyr, who lived within the half century following the death of the Apostle John, indisputably shows that the entire public service of God was conducted in a known tongue.

Tertullian: – “We assemble ourselves together, in our congregations, that if I may so say, as an army we may force God with our prayers; and

this violence is pleasing to God. We pray also for the emperors, for their ministers, and for the powers of this world, for peace, and for the retarding the end of the world. We meet also to read the Holy Scriptures, according as the emergency of our present wants requires, either to instruct or remind us of our duties. We assuredly nourish our faith by these sacred oracles, we raise our hope, we strengthen our confidence, at all events we enforce discipline by the constant repetition of the divine commandments: in the same place also exhortations, reproofs, and divine censures are given. And our judgments are given with great weight, as by those who are assured that they are under the eye of God.”

An army (“*manu facta*”) must be in concert, and the trumpet give a known sound.

Origen: – “The Greeks in the Greek language, the Romans in the Roman language; and so everyone prays in his own tongue, and praises God according as he is able; and he that is the Lord of all languages heareth them pray in what dialect soever they pray, and understandeth them speaking in so different languages no less than if they all used one voice.”

Cyprian: – “When we stand up to pray, my dearly beloved brethren, we ought to watch, and attend to our prayers with our whole heart. All carnal and worldly thoughts should be discarded, and the mind should be solely intent upon what it prays for. And therefore the priest, before the prayer, doth by a preface prepare the minds of the brethren, saying, ‘Lift up your hearts’; that while the people answer, ‘We lift them up unto the Lord,’ they may be admonished that they ought to think of nothing else but the Lord. Our breast should be then shut against the adversary, and open to God only; neither should God’s enemy be suffered to come near it in the time of prayer. For he frequently steals upon us, and gets admission into us, and by his subtle deceits diverts our prayers from God; so that we have one thing in our heart and another in our mouth: whereas we ought to pray to the Lord, not only with the sound of the voice, but with the sincere intensesness of the mind and spirit.”

Hilary: – “Any one standing without the Church may hear the voice of the people praying, note the well-known sounds of the hymns, and in the offices of the divine Sacraments also recognize the response of the devout confession.”

Cyril: – “When the priest says, ‘Lift up your hearts,’ the people answer, ‘We lift them up unto the Lord’; then the priest says, ‘Let us give

thanks unto the Lord,' and the people say, 'It is meet and right.'"

Basil: – "And so with divers songs and prayers passing over the night, at the dawning of the day all together, even as it were with one mouth and one heart, sing unto the Lord a song of confession, every man framing unto himself meet words of repentance." And again: "If the sea be fair, how is not the assembly of the congregation much more fair, in which a *joined sound of men, women, and children* (as it were of the waves beating on the shore) is sent forth in our prayers unto our God?"

Ambrose: – "This is it that he saith (St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14:2), because he which speaketh in an unknown tongue speaketh to God, for he knoweth all things; but men know not, and therefore there is no profit of this thing." And again: "That is (verse 16), if thou speak the praise of God in a tongue unknown to the hearers. For the unlearned, hearing that which he understandeth not, knoweth not the end of the prayer, and answereth not Amen: which word is as much to say as 'Truth,' that the blessing or thanksgiving may be confirmed. For the confirmation of the prayer is fulfilled by them that do answer Amen, that all things spoken might be confirmed in the minds of the hearers through the testimony of the truth. ... The conclusion is this, that nothing should be done in the Church in vain, and that this thing ought chiefly to be laboured for, that the unlearned also might take profit, lest any part of the body should be dark through ignorance." And specifically as to public prayer (1 Cor. 14:28): "Let him pray secretly [if any man hath a 'tongue,' and there be no interpreter], or speak to God, who heareth all things that be dumb: for in the Church must he speak that may profit all persons."

Jerome: – "At the funeral of Paula, the Psalms were sung in Greek, Latin, and Syriac, because men of each of those languages were there."

Augustine: – "What this should be [singing praises unto the Lord] we ought to understand, that we may sing with reason of man, and not with chattering of birds. For owls, popinjays, ravens, pies, and other such like birds are taught by men to prate they know not what: but to sing with understanding is given by God's holy will to the nature of man." And again: "There needeth no speech when we pray, saving perhaps as the priests do for to declare their meaning, not that God, but that men may hear them. And so, being put in remembrance by consenting with the priest, they may hang upon God."

Justinian the Emperor: – “We command that all bishops and priests do celebrate the holy oblation, and the prayers used in holy baptism, not speaking low, but with a clear or loud voice, which may be heard of the people, that thereby the mind of the hearers may be stirred up with great devotion, in uttering the prayers of the Lord God; for so the holy Apostle teacheth, in his first epistle to the Corinthians (14:16–17), saying, ‘Truly, if thou only bless or give thanks in spirit, how doth he, that occupieth the place of the unlearned, say, Amen, at thy giving thanks unto God; for he understandeth not what thou sayest? Thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified.’ And again, in the epistle to the Romans (10:10), he saith, ‘With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.’ Therefore, for these causes it is convenient, that, among other prayers, those things also which are spoken in the holy oblation, be uttered and spoken of the most religious bishops and priests, unto our Lord Jesus Christ our God, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, with a loud voice. And let the most righteous priests know this, that if they neglect any of these things, they shall give an account for them in the dreadful judgment of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. Neither will we, when we know it, rest and leave it unrevenge” (Novell. 137).

Schoolmen and Roman Catholics.

Aquinas: – “In the primitive Church, it was a madness for anyone to say prayers in an unknown tongue, because then they were ignorant of the ecclesiastical rites, and knew not what was done there.”

Lyra: – “In the primitive Church, the blessings and other common prayers were made in the vulgar tongue.”

Harding: – “In the time of the primitive Church, the people celebrated holy things in the vulgar tongue.”

Bellarmino: – “In the time of the Apostles, the whole people was wont to answer, Amen, in the celebration of divine service, and not, as now, by one appointed in their stead. For Justin Martyr testifieth expressly in his second Apology, that the whole people was wont to answer Amen, when the priest ended his prayer or thanksgiving. And it is evident that the same use was continued a long time after, both in the East and West, as it appeareth by the Liturgy of Chrysostom, where the things that were to be said by the priest, deacon, and people are distinctly set down. And by

Cyprian, in his Sermon on the Lord's Prayer, where he saith, 'The people do answer, We lift them up unto the Lord, when the priest willeth them to lift up their hearts.' And by Hierome, praefat. Lib. ii. in Epist. ad Galat., who writeth 'that in the churches of the city of Rome the people are heard with so loud a voice sounding out Amen, as if it were a thundering from heaven'" (Tom. 1, *de Verbo Dei*). [Which argueth that they had their service in a *known tongue*; for otherwise, how could they thus have answered to the several parts of the divine service, as they were appointed to do? Surely the *long answers* of the people to the priest, in their prayers found in *sundry liturgies*, are a *demonstration* that it was so." – Field, Of the Church.]

Finally, when we bear in mind the example of Christ and His Apostles – ministering on all occasions in the vulgar tongue; the joint Church Litany and Psalmody indicated in Acts 4:24–30, 1 Cor. 14:26, Col. 3:16, etc.; with the "Common Prayers" (κοιναι ευχαι) referred to by Justin Martyr; the "Appointed Prayers" (ευχαι προσταχθείσαι) mentioned by Origen; the "Stated Prayers" (Preces Solemnes) spoken of by Cyprian; the "Authorized Prayers" (ευχαι ενθεσμοι) of the Court of Constantine the Great, as alleged by Eusebius; as also the ancient Liturgies of various Churches: all which Liturgies and Prayers be it remembered were in the vernacular: we cannot but conclude, with the patent testimony of all early and contemporaneous writers and the documents handed down to us – nor indeed can we well conceive of anything so firmly established, for there is not a particle of rebutting evidence – that in the words of our Article, "It is a thing plainly repugnant to the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people."

Rome's Defence.

Infallibility. A blasphemous plea – against the whole revealed Word of God. An arrogant plea – in face of all her apostasy. A convenient but worthless plea – for every superstition may adopt it.

Expediency. So, as we have seen, the Council of Trent: "Though the Mass contains a great instruction of the faithful people, yet it doth not seem expedient to the Fathers that it should be everywhere celebrated in the vulgar tongue." Now, if the public prayers and Sacraments of Rome do contain a great instruction of the faithful people, is it not cruel and faithless to their souls' interests to deprive them of that "great instruction"? Is it not

more expedient before God to enlighten than to keep in darkness? to follow the example of Christ, the Apostles, and the Primitive Church, rather than that of impious and crafty Pontiffs? But in fact well nigh the whole of the credenda as well as the agenda of the Papal Obeisance is hung upon the rotten and miserable peg of expediency: and needs only a tap to show its unsoundness.

To Preserve the words of Consecration in one of the Languages of the Cross. But the shift is transparent. Why not use *Greek*, and thus at once preserve the very words of our Saviour, as well as one of the three languages of the Superscription? Is there anything more sacred in *Hoc est corpus Meum*, than in *Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ Σωμὰ Μου*?

To Preserve the Canon of the Mass as said in the Primitive Times. But the Missal does not, and could not, actually agree with the primitive Liturgies, for the plain and simple reason, that these Liturgies do not agree among themselves.

The Mass is a Sacrifice unto God, and the words therefore do not concern the Worshiper. But this openly contradicts the Tridentine Decree: “The Mass contains a great Instruction of the faithful people.” May we not ask, in What? – in Pageantry? – in Blasphemy? – in Dangerous Deceit? – *or in all?*

The Communion of Saints. “In order to which they think it is necessary that Priests, wheresoever they go, may be able to officiate, which they cannot do if every nation worships God in its own language. And this was indeed very necessary in those ages in which the See of Rome did by provisions, and the other inventions of the Canonists, dispose of the best benefices to their own creatures and servants. That trade would have been spoiled, if strangers might not have been admitted till they had learned the language of the country: and thus, instead of taking care of the people that ought to be edified by the public worship, provision was made at their cost for such vagrant Priests as have been in all ages the scandals of the Church, and the reproaches of religion.” – *Burnet*.

We shall only add, that the Ritualists of the present day, as a rule, so *mutter* and hurry over the prayers and lessons – the counterfeit of the low voice of the Mass Priest being not unfrequently “fabricated with such exquisite skill as to render it the achievement of criticism to distinguish them from originals” – that they plainly fall under the condemnation of the Article, and officiate in a tongue *not* understood of the people.

Really our Bishops should see that, after the terse rendering of Hooper, *due and distinct pronunciation be added to vernacular language.*

Article XXVI.

The Church: Its Ministers – Their Unworthiness.

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

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

De vi Institutionum Divinarum quod eam non tollat malitia Ministrorum. – Quamvis in Ecclesia visibile, semper sunt admixti, atque interdum ministeris Verbi et Sacramentorum administrationi praesint; tamen cum non suo, sed Christi nomini agant, cjusque mandato et auctoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in verbo Dei audiendo, tum in Sacramentis percipiendis. Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipiunt quae propter institutionem Christi et promissionem efficacia sunt, licet per malos administrentur.

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

History.

Theoretical and theological arguments may be sound, but practical arguments, where reason has a place, sway mankind. We confess, if we had only an evil minister and a godly one, between whom to choose, we should instinctively attend the ministrations of the latter, and reject those of the former: and so would all free and unbiassed men.

At the period of the Reformation, the scandalous lives of the Romish clergy naturally produced a revulsion in the minds of honest Englishmen; and not a few, bewildered and excited in the ferment of a religious revolution, unhappily fell back upon the error of the Donatists – that the Church, its ministers and members, should be absolutely holy. So does history, with some minor differences perhaps of light and shade, repeat itself.

But they forgot the teaching of Augustine: “Such men, not from hatred of other men’s iniquity, but zeal for their own disputes, ensnaring the weak by the credit of their name, attempt to draw them entirely away, or at least to separate them; swollen with pride, raving with petulance, insidious in calumny, turbulent in sedition. That it may not be seen how void they are of the light of truth, they cover themselves with the shadow of a stern severity; the correction of a brother’s fault, which in Scripture is enjoined to be done with moderation, without impairing the sincerity of love or breaking the bond of peace, they pervert to sacrilegious schism and purposes of excision. Thus Satan transforms himself into an angel of light when, under pretext of a just severity, he persuades to savage cruelty, desiring nothing more than to violate and burst the bond of unity and peace; because, when it is maintained, all his power of mischief is feeble, his wily traps are broken; and his schemes of subversion vanish” (contra Parmen).

This is severe, and much of it paints the Anabaptists of the era in question. But their sin was not so much that of schism, as in letting that schism run riot – the curse, as a rule, of almost all schisms. Still, we must ever bear in mind the standpoint of schismatics. If false doctrine is the offence at which they grieve, men are bound, after due and unavailing protest, to secede; if only morals, the question becomes more difficult: and here again we must distinguish between corrupt morals arising out of and sanctioned by a system, and those which may be less or more accidental and for a time. But we own, that it was a hard struggle for human nature to be reconciled to gross immorality and vicar-of-brayism – to pulpits that were now occupied by openly wicked priests, and anon, in so many cases, by the very same men, whose only letters-patent were Acts of Parliament. However, God brings order out of confusion; and in the very seed-plots of wild Anabaptism, Puritanism ultimately grew, and corrected and so blessed the Church of England. Where would England have been without the old Puritan Fathers? And even in later days, where would Evangelicalism have

been without the trumpet call and stimulus of John Wesley? Schism almost ever deplorably begets schism; and it is no part of our duty or desire unduly to foment it. Yet we cannot but rejoice that this violent remedy has gone far to cure the pitiable lethargy and supineness of the Church of England; and therefore we hail with joy every revival of true religion coming though it may from outside the pale of the Church to which we belong. And one main object of this Exposition is, as we have already announced, to plead for the union – ecclesiastical if you please and can, but far above all that is merely denominational, the National Union of those who love the Lord. There is no use in Bishop Ryle's wail: "At the rate at which we are going, it would never surprise me if within fifty years the Crown of England were no longer on a Protestant head, and High Mass were once more celebrated in Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's." If the ritual of our once Protestant Church is indeed becoming so rapidly Romanized, whose fault is it? The fault of the Bishops of the Church of England, and especially the fault of her Evangelical Bishops, if forsooth any such remain. They see, or profess to see, the rebel hosts advance, but beyond a few idle platitudes, they have never led one single charge, nor formed one thin red line of battle. But thank God there are still Englishmen who can write as follows: –

"The question of the hour is, What is the Remedy? Can the powers of Romanism and Rationalism be successfully withstood? As a humble servant of Jesus Christ, a lover of my country, and a deeply interested observer of events, I would submit that our only hope lies in the union of all who love Protestant Evangelical truth in defense of the Gospel. In the days of James II the preservation of our political liberties was the result of such a union; it is essential nowadays for the preservation of our religion. Rome's tactics have always been 'to divide and conquer'. She has succeeded in sowing seed which is springing up in the division of the ranks of Protestant-Evangelicals into a variety of parties, between which jealousy and strife have raised apparently impassable barriers. The situation in the main may be described as follows: Popery and Infidelity are undermining the very foundations of true religion; it is attacked on all sides. Meanwhile those who should defend the citadel are quarrelling about the outworks. The defenders of the truth are broadly divided into two parties – Churchmen and Dissenters. The former are wholly engrossed in attempts to preserve the fort of the 'Establishment,' the latter are entirely absorbed with the bulwarks (as they think it) of 'religious liberty'. This war is between brethren, who are

wasting their resources in fighting one another over these two questions, whilst the enemy is making enormous breaches in the citadel. Both parties seem to forget that the preservation of our Evangelical Protestantism as a nation is the only foundation upon which either the Establishment or Religious Liberty can securely rest. Churchmen forget practically that this is rapidly going from the Church, and if this goes – all goes. Dissenters forget that if Romanism or Infidelity once gain the power, religious liberty will soon be a thing of the past. If all who love the truth as expressed in the word Protestantism coalesce, there is hope; if not, what is to hinder the ultimate success of the machinations of Jesuits in England? Men would never rest satisfied long with infidelity, even if that prevailed for a time” (Edward Carr, Sleaford, *Rock*, February 17, 1882).

Can ungodly clergymen rightly and duly administer the Sacraments? Clearly not, if the grace of the Sacraments flows from them. Who can give what he hath not? But the Sacraments are Christ’s Sacraments; and the effect of Christ’s ordinances can neither be taken away nor diminished by the unworthiness of the administrator: otherwise the whole Gospel would be ineffectual to salvation. And for this simple reason, “There is none good but one, that is God.” If it be a fundamental principle of our holy religion, that all men are sinners, “for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God”; and if the words of St. James, founded on the Sermon on the Mount, are to be received, “Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all,” the reasoning of the Donatist of the 4th century, and the Anabaptist of the 16th, falls to the ground. “Earthen vessels” are the stated and ordinary appointment for the treasures of the Gospel. God forbid that we should not distinguish between degrees of wickedness; or palliate for a moment any sin; much less ignore the safeguards of the Apostolic rule, “Sober, just, holy, temperate”: we only say, that so far as mere argument, or even the patent ruling of God’s economy goes, the Donatist and the Anabaptist stand equally confounded. Assumed laic or priestly perfection must ever be the death knell of all godliness – the practical sink of Rome, in theory exchanged for the not less fatal sink of alleged sinlessness. The grace of the ordinances of Christ, thank God, hinges not upon him who serveth, but upon the heart and will of the recipient influenced by the Holy Ghost. Still, we are free to acknowledge that there is a subsidiary grace, if we may so speak, on the part of the preacher and administrator. Who has not felt the power of the

Gospel of God, and the unction of ordinances, when proclaimed and administered by faithful men, as compared with unfaithful or doubtful ones? “The medicine of the physician is not unfrequently more potent when dispensed by a sympathizing nurse.”

But the proposition of our Article is defective, by not covering the whole ground. Clearly it should have run – to meet any possible objection against the compilers of leaning too much on the mere office of the ministry: That though the unworthiness of Ministers does not hinder the effect of the Sacraments, yet that their unworthiness is a practical bar to the vitality of the Church. Of course this may have been in some measure contemplated in the closing paragraph; but the idea is not by any means brought out, as pointedly as it deserves to be, and as we hope it may be on any revision of the Articles. No Ministry, however faultless its orders, even though if it were possible only one remove from the Apostles themselves, unless full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, can ever prove a blessing, nay rather must prove a curse, to any people.

The question of heretical baptism, which agitated the primitive Church – whether it was necessary to rebaptize those who had been baptized by heretics, which Tertullian and Cyprian maintained; and the principle of which the Donatists practically avowed by rebaptizing their converts; as also the Anabaptists, who not only rebaptized infants who had been baptized with Christ’s baptism already, but adults in like manner who came over to them from other communities – is usually mixed up with this Article: but we think needlessly, for here we have to deal with Ministers acknowledged to be duly summoned and authorized, and not with the deposed, or those in antagonism.

But the Doctrine of Intention is less or more bound up with this Article; for over and above negating the question of the unworthiness of ministers hindering the effect of the sacraments, and so far agreeing with our Article, Rome declares that the intention of the Priest is essential to make a Sacrament effectual, so that without it no sacrament can be administered, or is at all valid. This monstrous and blasphemous doctrine was expressly affirmed by the Council of Florence, under Pope Eugenius IV, 1442: –

“... All these (seven) sacraments [baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony] are perfected by three things, namely, by *things* as to the *matter*, by *words* as to the *form*,

and by the *person* of the administrator, who confers the sacrament with the INTENTION of doing what the Church does; of which, if any be wanting, the Sacrament is NOT perfected.”

And by the Council of Trent, 1547: –

“If any one shall say that in Ministers, while they form and give the Sacraments, *intention* is not required, at least of doing what the Church does, Let him be Accursed.”

Let us for a moment hear also Dens: –

“Intention is the act of the will referring to an end: whence the necessary intention in the Minister consists in the act of his will whereby he wills the external act of the sacrament, under the profession of doing what the Church does. The intention is distinguished into *actual*, *virtual*, *habitual*, and *interpretative*.

“(1) An *habitual* intention is not sufficient to the perfecting of a sacrament, because this does not suffice for performing a human act; nay, it is properly no intention.

“(2) Nor is an *interpretative* intention enough; for though, from the preceding volition, the sacramental act can be as voluntary as an effect in a cause, yet here it is not now exercised by the Minister, as by a rational agent.

“(3) But the *actual* intention suffices, seeing it is the best. Although it is not necessary, yet the Minister should study to obtain it.

“(4) But a *virtual* intention is sufficient, which, by the force of the preceding act, flows into the following one; and hence it is sufficient to the human act. Hence he who formally goes to the baptistery, the confessional, the altar, etc., about to minister, validly baptizes, absolves, consecrates, etc., although during the time of his ministry he is distracted. ...

“Is a right or direct intention required in the Minister for the perfection of the sacrament? Answer: Provided the intention is esteemed direct or right in respect of the sacrament, or if there be only an implied intention of administering that ordinance, it will be valid, although the ulterior intention is not right. Whence St. Thomas saith, ‘If a Priest intend to baptize a certain female that he abuse her, or if he intend to make the body of Christ that he may use it in order to poison, and because the former intention did depend on the latter, hence it follows that the perversity of such an intention does not destroy the verity of the institution. ...

“Whether the intention of the Minister ought to be determined as to a certain person or matter? – Answer, affirmatively, as appears from the very forms of the sacraments. ... Hence in the Roman Missal, where on the ‘defects of the Mass,’ sec. 7, it reads thus: ‘If anyone has before him eleven wafers, and intends to consecrate only ten, not determining what ten he intends, in these cases he does not consecrate, because the intention is required.’

“What if any one supposes that there are only ten wafers and there were eleven, or that he held only one when he held two? Answer: All will be regularly consecrated; because he hath the intention of consecrating that which was formally placed before him, or, his intention is simply carried toward the present matter.”

But we shall not further trifle with the reader.

Here then is a doctrine, freighted with the most injurious, revolting, appalling consequences; amongst which are the following: –

1. That the Priest, and not Christ, is the master of the Sacraments.
2. That, as no man can enter into the heart and discern the thoughts of another, we cannot know –
 - (a) Whether we are baptized.
 - (b) Whether we are confirmed.
 - (c) Whether we have ever received the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.
 - (d) Whether we who are priests have ever been ordained; or we who are bishops have ever been consecrated.
 - (e) Whether we have been married; or our children are bastards.
 - (f) Whether Priestly absolution is ever ratified in heaven; or extreme unction is any saving unction at all.
 - (g) Whether there is a Church, or any Gospel of God.

Query. What can become of Rome’s dogma of the grace, *ex opere operato* (Trent sess. 7. can. 8), of the Sacraments? “Such contradiction of sinners against Jesus the Author and Finisher of our Faith!” Such contradiction of sinners – against themselves!

That we have neither misstated nor overstated this almost incredible doctrine let Cardinal Bellarmine, the one “great reasoner” and champion *par excellence* of Rome, himself confess: –

“No one can be certain with the certainty of faith that he has a true Sacrament, since the Sacrament is not formed without the intention of the

Minister, and no one can see the intention of another” (tom. i. p. 488).

The remarks of Bishop Burnet are apposite: –

“... And thus they make the secret acts of a priest’s mind enter so far into those divine appointments, that by his malice, irreligion, or atheism, he can make those sacraments which he visibly blesses and administers, to be only the outward shows of sacraments, but no real ones. We do not pretend that the sacraments are of the nature of charms; so that if a man should in the way of open mockery and profanation go about them, that, therefore, because matter and form are observed, they should be true sacraments: but though we make the serious appearances of a Christian action to be necessary to the making it a sacrament, yet we may carry this no further to the inward and secret acts of the priest, as if they were essential to the being of it. If this is true, no man can have quiet in his mind.

“It is a profanation for an unbaptized person to receive the Eucharist; so if baptism is not true when a priest sets his intention cross to it, then a man in orders must be in perpetual doubt whether he is not living in a continual state of sacrilege in administering the other sacraments while he is not yet baptized; and if baptism be so necessary to salvation that no man who is not baptized can hope to be saved, here a perpetual scruple must arise which can never be removed. Nor can a man be sure but that, when he thinks he is worshipping the true body of Jesus Christ, he is committing idolatry, and worshipping only a piece of bread; for it is no more, according to them, if the priest had an intention against consecrating it. No orders are given if an intention lies against them; and then he who passes for a priest is no priest, and all his consecrations and absolutions are so many invalid things, and a continued course of sacrilege.

“Now what reason soever men may have in this case to hope for the pardon of those sins, since it is certain that the ignorance is invincible; yet here strange thoughts must arise concerning Christ and his gospel if, in those actions that are made necessary to salvation, it should be in the power of a false Christian, or an atheistic bishop or priest, to make them all void, so that by consequence it should be in his power to damn them: for since they are taught to expect grace and justification from the sacraments, if these are no true sacraments which they take for such, but only the shadows and the phantasms of them, then neither grace nor justification can follow upon them. This may be carried so far as even to evacuate the very being of a Church: for a man not truly baptized can never be in orders, so that the

whole ordinations of a Church, and the succession of it, may be broke by the impiety of any one priest. This we look on as such a chain of absurdities, that if this doctrine of intention were true, it alone might serve to destroy the whole credit of the Christian religion, in which the sacraments are taught to be both so necessary and so efficacious; and yet all this is made to depend on that which can neither be known nor prevented” (Exposition of the Articles).

On the general proposition of our Article we need only quote a very few Patristic Testimonies: –

Chrysostom: – “It was not right that those who draw near with faith to the symbols of our salvation should be hindered through the wickedness of another” (in Johan. Homil. 86).

“Neither baptism, nor the body of Christ, nor the offering ought to be administered by such, if grace looked for worthiness everywhere. But now God is wont to work even by the unworthy, and the grace of baptism is not at all hindered by the life of the priest” (in 1 Cor. Homil. 8).

Augustine: – “The manners of evil men do not hinder the sacraments of God, so as to make them either not to be at all, or less holy” (contra Literas Petil).

“A Minister, that is, a dispenser of the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel, if he be a good man, is an associate with the Gospel; but if he be a bad man, he is not therefore no dispenser of the Gospel. Peter preached it, as did likewise other good men; and so did Judas, though unwillingly; and yet being sent together with them, he also preached it: they have reward for dispensing it, though its dispensation was likewise committed to him” (Idem, *ibid.*).

“I myself also say, that it is better to have the sacraments administered by worthy than by unworthy ministers” (contra Creston).

“But if God be present at his sacrament and word by whomsoever they are administered, the sacraments of God are always right” (de Bapt. contra Donat.).

“It matters not as to the integrity of baptism how much the worse he is that administers it: for there is not so much difference between bad and worse as there is between good and bad; and yet when a bad man baptizes, he does not give any other thing than a good man does” (Idem, *ibid.*).

Isidore of Pelusium – “He that is baptized receives no damage from the symbols of salvation, if the priest be not a good liver” (Epist. 37, Lib.

2).

“If a wicked man approaches the altar, and unholily handles sacred things, he shall bear his punishment, but the altar receives no contamination” (Epist. 340, Lib. 3).

It were needless to enlarge on the concluding paragraph of our Article. The principle there laid down has been less or more strictly acted upon by all churches and at all times, except by Rome, since she became apostate. Her Code of priestly morality is so lax, and her patents of crime so enormous, that to make inquiry of evil ministers would be simply the reversal of her policy, and to depose them would be to expose the depths of her depravity. *Removal from the scene of scandal* is, as a rule, the only punishment that it is safe to inflict on a priest who has failed to “keep appearances”.

In the primitive Church, ministers who had been excommunicated for misconduct might be received again into fellowship, but were not again admitted to the functions of their order: receivable into the peace of the Church; but to communicate among the laity.

Scriptural Proof.

- (1) In the Visible Church the evil are mixed with the good. – Proved –
(a) From the Parable of the Tares:

“The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn ... He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this

world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be the wailing and the gnashing of the teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear” (Matt. 13:24–30, 37–43).

“The parable has an historical importance, having been much in the mouths and writings of the Donatists, who, maintaining that the Church is a perfectly holy congregation, denied the applicability of this Scripture to convict them of error, seeing that it is spoken not of the Church but of the world; missing the deeper truth which would have led them to see that, after all, the world *is the Church*, only overrun by these very tares” (Alford, *in loco*).

(b) From the Parable of the Net:

“The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind: which when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the wailing and the gnashing of the teeth” (Matt. 13:47–50).

(c) From the Baptist’s parabolical description of the Coming Husbandman:

“Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his flour, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire” (Matt. 3:12).

“Thinking there is no church where there is not complete purity and integrity of conduct, they (the Donatists, Anabaptists, etc.), through hatred of wickedness, withdraw from a genuine church, while they think they are shunning the company of the ungodly. They allege that the Church of God is holy. But that they may at the same time understand that it contains a mixture of good and bad, let them hear from the lips of our Saviour that parable in which he compares the Church to a net in which all kinds of fishes are taken, but not separated until they are brought ashore. Let them hear it compared to a field which, planted with good seed, is by the fraud of an enemy mingled with tares, and is not freed of them until the harvest is brought into the barn. Let them hear, in fine, that it is a thrashing floor in which the collected wheat lies concealed under the chaff, until, cleansed by

the fanners and the sieve, it is at length laid up in the granary. If the Lord declares that the Church will labour under the defect of being burdened with a multitude of wicked until the day of judgment, it is in vain to look for a Church altogether free from blemish” (Calvin).

(d) Other Scriptures. The Parable of the Marriage Feast, Matt. 22:2–14. St. Paul’s comparison of the Church to a great House, with its vessels, some to honour and some to dishonour, 2 Tim. 2:20–21. The ark of Noah, preserving the clean and the unclean.

“I conclude, therefore, as the ancient Catholics did against the Donatists, that within the church, in the public profession and external communication thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and hereafter saved; and together with them other persons void of all saving grace, and hereafter to be damned; and that church containing these of both kinds may well be called ‘holy,’ as St. Matthew called Jerusalem ‘the holy city’ (Matt. 4:5, 27:53), even at that time when our Saviour did but begin to preach, when we know there was in that city a general corruption in manners and worship.

“Of these promiscuously contained in the Church, such as are void of all saving grace while they live, and communicate with the rest of the Church, and, when they pass out of this life, die in their sins, and remain under the eternal wrath of God; as they were not in their persons holy while they lived, so are they no way of the Church after their death, neither as members of it, nor as contained in it. Through their own demerit they fall short of the glory unto which they were called; and, being by death separated from the external communion of the Church, and having no internal communion with the members and the Head thereof, are totally and finally cut off from the Church of Christ. On the contrary, such as are efficaciously called, justified, and sanctified, while they live are truly holy, and when they die are perfectly holy; nor are they by their death separated from the Church, but remain united still by virtue of that internal union by which they were before conjoined both to the members and the Head. As therefore the Church is truly holy, not only by a holiness of institution, but also by a personal sanctity in reference to these saints while they live, so is it also perfectly holy in relation to the same saints glorified in heaven. And at the end of the world, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, and consequently all cut off from the communion of the Church; when the

members of the Church remaining being perfectly sanctified, shall be eternally glorified; then shall the whole Church be truly and perfectly holy.

“Then shall that be completely fulfilled, that Christ shall ‘present unto himself a glorious Church,’ which shall ‘be holy and without blemish’ (Eph. 5:27). Not that there are two Churches of Christ: one, in which good and bad are mingled together; another in which there are good alone; one, in which the saints are imperfectly holy; another, in which they are perfectly such: but one and the same Church, in relation to different times – [This was it which the Catholics answered to the Donatists objecting that they made two distinct Churches. August., *Collat. tertii Diei*, cap. 10] – admitteth or not admitteth the permission of the wicked, or the imperfection of the godly” (Pearson on the Creed, Article 9).

(2) Sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments.

“Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve” (John 6:70–71).

“Judas was numbered with us (the Apostles), and had obtained his lot (τονκληρον) in this Ministry” (Acts 1:17).

“Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth out of the Church” (3 John 9:10).

“But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of” (2 Peter 2:1–2).

(3) Yet forasmuch as they do not minister in their own name, but in Christ’s and by His commission and authority, we may use their Ministry.

“The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat: all things therefore (ουv) whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say and do not” (Matt. 23:2–3).

“The ουv here is very significant: – *because* they sit on Moses’ seat: and this clears the meaning, and shows it to be, ‘all things which they, as successors of Moses, out of his law, command you to observe, do;’ there

being a distinction between their lawful teaching as expounders of the law, and their frivolous traditions superadded thereto, and blamed below” (Alford).

“Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: the one preach Christ out of self-seeking (επιθείας – not derived from έρις, contention, but from έριθος, a hired workman), not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds: but the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defense of the gospel. What then notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is preached; and therein do I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice” (Phil. 1:15-18).

(4) Ordinances are effectual, through faith, because of Christ’s institution and promise.

“And Jesus said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation (‘πέσητη κτίσει – κτίσις appears never in the New Testament to be used of *mankind alone*. Bengel’s “religuis creaturis secundario” may be illustrated in the blessings which Christianity confers on the inferior creatures and the face of the earth by bringing civilization in its wake’ – Alford). He that believeth and. is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned” (Mark 16:15–16).

“Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples” (John 4:2).

“Probably for the same reason that Paul did not baptize usually (1 Cor. 1:14–16); viz., because his office was to preach and teach; – and the disciples as yet had no office of this kind. To assume a further reason, e.g., that there might not be ground for those whom the Lord himself had baptized to boast of it, is arbitrary and unnecessary. Johannes, minister, sua manu baptizavit; discipuli ejus, ut videtur, neminem. At Christus baptizat Spiritu Sancto.’ Bengel” (Alford).

“*Jesus baptizeth – and yet Jesus himself was not baptizing.* Both are true; for Jesus did baptize, in that he *cleansed* those who were baptized; and he did not baptize, in that he did not administer Baptism with his own hands. The Apostles were the human instruments by which his Divine Majesty worked in his Baptism, ministered by their hands. (Aug.)

“John the Baptist, a human minister, had a baptism, which was called by his name – the baptism of John. (Matt. 21:25). But our Lord would not allow his own baptism to be called by any man’s name, in order that he himself might always baptize, and might be rightly said to baptize those whom he does not baptize by his own hands, but by his Ministers; and that

we might understand that whosoever is baptized by his Ministers, is baptized by Christ. If he had committed his baptism to any one person like John, his baptism might have been called the baptism of Peter, or of Paul; but now it is the baptism of Christ, in Whom all, who are baptized, must place their hope and trust. (Aug.)

“Judas was among the disciples, and they who were baptized by Judas, were not baptized again; for they whom even Judas, who was Christ’s Apostle, baptized, were baptized by Christ.

“If Christian baptism is ministered by an evil Minister, yet it is still the baptism of Christ. So that we may always say with St. John the Baptist (Matt. 3:11), He it is who baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. (Aug.)” (Bishop Wordsworth on John 4:1–2).

“Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to each (εκάστῳ). I planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the growth. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the growth. Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one (εν – ‘generically, in the nature of their ministry’): but each shall receive his own reward according to his own labour” 1 Cor. 3:5–8).

(5) Ministers especially, as ensamples to their flocks, should be men of holiness; and evil Ministers should be deposed.

“And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified” (Lev. 10:1–3). “And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto the priests the sons of Aaron, and say unto them ... They shall be holy unto their God, and not profane the name of their God: for the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and the bread of their God, they do offer: therefore they shall be holy” (Lev. 21:1, 6). “Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness; and let thy saints shout for joy” (Psa. 132:9).

Hence our Liturgy: “Endue Thy ministers with righteousness, and make Thy chosen people joyful.” Though both – the righteousness of God’s priests and the joy of God’s saints – flow from the blessing of Jehovah and His presence in the ark of his strength, yet the latter, in the Psalmist’s mind,

would seem to follow as a natural and necessary compliment of the former. And this, we believe, has been the experience of all the churches of God.

“Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord” (Isa. 52:11).

“Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being priest unto the Lord; that he might fulfill the word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the house of Eli in Shiloh” (1 Kings 2:27). “Holding faith, and a good conscience, which some having thrust from them, made shipwreck concerning the faith: among whom is Hymenmus and Alexander; whom I delivered over unto Satan, that they may be taught by chastisement (παιδευθωσι – disciplined) not to blaspheme” (1 Tim. 1:19–20). “Them that sin [evidently sinning Presbyters, from the connection: hence some of the ancient MSS. read δέ – But them that sin] rebuke before all, that others also may fear” (1 Tim. 5:20).

Article XXXII.

The Church: Its Ministers – A Celibate Life.

Of the Marriage of Priests. – 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 also 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.

De Conjugio Sacerdotum. – Episcopis, Presbyteris, et Diaconis nullo mandato divino praceptum est, ut aut coelibatum voveant, aut a matrimonio abstineant. Licet igitur etiam illis, ut caeteris omnibus Christianis, ubi hoc ad pietatem magis facere judicaverint, pro suo arbitratu matrimonium contrahere.

History.

“Honour to whom honour is due.” Rome has not the “honour” of introducing celibacy; but she has the dishonour of incorporating it into her creed, and unblushingly retaining it there in face of all the disgusting revelations of her depravity and corruption.

We would rather not touch the subject, in its polluted phase. It is one of those daring sins which cannot be faithfully exposed, as regards the Romish system, without referring to some of the most loathsome pictures of the Papal charnel house. It is, we have long thought, better suited for our criminal law courts, than for moral argument. Every case of compulsory and imposed celibacy should be placed in the same category as unnatural crime – so far at least as the abettors and accessories are concerned.

“It is a great sin to swear unto a sin,
But greater sin to force a sinful oath.”

We could not, on any occasion, or on any plea, admit a celibate bishop or priest into our family circle.

Inoculated with Oriental philosophy as to the malignity of matter, the Essenes (probably from the Chald. *Asay*, to heal, as they seem to have studied medicinal herbs, etc.), a Jewish sect, are found about two hundred years before the Christian era, on the Western shores of the Dead Sea, as a communistic society, retiring from the conflicts and distractions of the world; and who, regarding the body the mere prison house of the soul, aimed at a mystical and absolute standard of holiness, and sent forth their colonies over Syria and Palestine. These were followed by a similar sect, the Therapeutae (φεραπεύω, to *worship* or *heal*), who took up their abode about the lake Moeris, in northern Egypt, in separate cells. Marked by some characteristic differences – the rule of the latter being the more strict and severe, an advance upon the asceticism of the Essenes, just as that was upon the strictness of the Pharisees – both agreed, among other means of overcoming the flesh, in repudiating marriage.

The origin therefore of Celibacy and Monasticism is clearly and directly traceable to *Heathenism* (Oriental, Parsic, and Chaldaic elements), through *Judaism*, and not to Christianity, inasmuch as it was yet unborn. But at length persecution, enthusiasm, and indolence contributed to spread the foul leprosy alarmingly throughout the Christendom especially of the third and fourth centuries; and when persecution ceased, the other two factors, enthusiasm and indolence, backed by lust, only became the more potent to carry the plague onwards and onwards still, until the world was overrun, and all things green and good were eaten up or despoiled by the “celibate” locusts of the Middle Ages. Alas that such men as the eminent Basil, justly surnamed the Great, from his genius, eloquence, and theological acumen; the indefatigable but excitable Jerome; and the noble and dignified Ambrose, should have been so deeply involved in this awful outrage against God and humanity. By the way, it is a suggestive though humbling thought, that in this frenzy, especially for the celibacy of women, was strenuously proclaimed, about the end of the fourth century, the Perpetual Virginity of Mary.

Thus, as the primitive and Apostolic idea of a universal Christian priesthood, with its true consecration of the entire life, began to wane, a

mock consecration of monks and nuns and caste clergy set in, and found at hand and readily assimilated the devices of Satan originally elaborated in the heathen world. Redemption of the whole man was forgotten, and a war against the body, the temple of the Holy Ghost, was mistaken for sanctification of the heart.

But nature had her revenge – then as ever. Instead of holiness, we have pollution; instead of purity of body and soul, we have indulgence to the full in every criminal passion and appetite; instead of spotless virgins, and immaculate monks and priests, we have “unnatural forms of society between the two sexes – under the pretense of a purely spiritual connection!”

True, there were honest men and Councils that tried to keep alive something of a sound sense of Gospel truth. But the floodgates of licentiousness, when once opened, are difficult to close. Local dressings and appliances are of little use when the system is blood-poisoned. That is a terrible point, at which God and nature say, Let the wicked Alone. But Christendom would not hear, and for centuries the awful woe must needs and did go forth, *Let them Alone!* on her monks and nuns and priests, in their hideous crimes and open war against the gracious provisions of a Creator God.

We need not drag the reader through the celibate slime of the Middle Ages, for phases sufficiently typical will have to be further on recounted. It may be well however to chronicle to some extent the

Conciliar Enactments on Celibacy.

Notwithstanding the example of the Gnostics, Encratites, Marcionites, and other heretics who, following the lead of the Essenes, condemned or despised marriage, it is clear that Celibacy was not the rule of, nor imposed on, the Clergy for *The first three centuries of Christianity*. And indeed if we go further on, even to Leo IX and Gregory VIII, in the eleventh century, we shall find that, despite the innumerable decretals against marriage, the law of celibacy was ever and anon honoured in the breach, while the poor, pitiable priest who had not the will nor the manliness to break it, only gave himself over – as he ever must do – to abandon or concubinage: *As a Rule*.

Thus it is certain that some at least of the Apostles were *married*; probably all; while it is undeniable that all had the power. See 1 Cor. 9:5, etc.

Married Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons are spoken of from the earliest times without any stain or dishonour attaching to them on that account.

Polycarp says of Valens, a Presbyter of Philippi: "I am exceedingly sorry for him and his *wife*."

Cyprian speaks of Felix and Numidians, Presbyters, and their *wives*.

Eusebius mentions Choeremon, Bishop of the city of Nilus, a very old man, who flying together with his *wife* to the Arabian mountain, in the persecution under Maximin, never returned from thence. Also Phileas, Bishop of Thurnis, "a man who had passed through the public offices and services in his own country with distinction," and others in the Diocletian persecution who when pressed to deny their religion, and spare their *wives* and *children*, remained steadfast to Christ.

Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, 180, succeeded no less than seven of his ancestors.

Gregory Nazianzen, Bishop and son of a Bishop, says (4th century): "A good and diligent Bishop serves in the ministry nothing the worse for being married, but rather the better, and with more ability to do good." And of his mother Nonna: "She was given to his father of God, and became not only his helper, but also his leader, both by life and conversation, training him to the best things; and though in others it was best for her to be subject to him, on account of the right of marriage, yet in religion and godliness she doubted not to become his leader and teacher."

Sozomen too informs us that Spiridion, a popular Bishop in the Council of Nice, had a *wife* and *children*, but was not therefore inferior in the things that pertain to God.

Hilary of Poitiers, who for twenty years stood preeminent among the Gallic Bishops, and was the principal means of rolling back the Arian current which was sweeping over the West, and is acknowledged to be one of the ablest writers of the fourth century, was *married* and had a *daughter*.

To these examples very many more indeed might be added, of high ecclesiastics in the early and purer ages of the Church who were either themselves *married*, or the *sons* of ecclesiastics; together with a goodly list of Bishops or Popes of Rome – not content from their wives, as the Papal advocates so gratuitously assert, after they came to the Clergy.

But the leaven of wickedness was at work.

Even as early as the days of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth from about 170, Pinytus, Bishop of Gnosus in Crete, wished to impose the law of celibacy, and drew forth the remonstrance of his pious and learned brother, that he should consider the weakness of human nature, and not seek to lay such a heavy burden on the necks of men.

In 305, the provincial Council of Elvira (Illiberis, in Spain) decreed, canon 33, that Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, living with their wives, should be deposed from their offices; while the 27th canon forbade Bishops and Clergymen to have in their houses strange women. This proves two things: that the Spanish Clergy at that period were not unaccustomed to marriage; and that concubinage – the natural outcome of unlawful celibacy – was already prevalent. The concubines were called by the Greeks *Συνείσακτοι*, and by the Latins *Mulieres Subintroductae*. Females who had vowed perpetual chastity, were thus received into the houses and even to the beds of the clergy; it being solemnly alleged that there was no criminal intercourse! Such shameful connections were pretended to be a marriage of souls without the marriage of bodies!! – Illiberis is noted as the first Council that enacted Clerical Celibacy.

The Council of Ancyra, 314, by a strange obliquity, decreed, canon 10, that Deacons who, at the time of ordination, declared that they could not tolerate the life of celibacy, might subsequently be allowed to marry; while, on the other hand, those who said nothing on this point at their ordination, yet afterwards married, should be deposed from their office! This half-and-half measure shows the will, but not the power to strike. Men could still make terms.

The Council of New Caesarea, 314: “If a Priest marry after he has been ordained, he ought to be degraded.”

Even the celebrated Council of Nice, 325, the first and greatest of Ecumenical Councils, with its 318 Bishops, decreed that ecclesiastics of the first three grades, when once ordained, should no longer be permitted to marry; and that those unmarried when ordained should continue so: the rest being left to the free choice of each individual. And had it not been for the urgent advice of the venerable Pophuntius, an Egyptian bishop, who had led an ascetic life from his youth, and without reproach, but who nevertheless opposed the motion, on the ground that no yoke ought to be imposed on men which human weakness could not bear, it is probable, yea almost certain, that an absolute law would have been passed, prohibiting altogether,

as was proposed (by Hosius the President? who had been present at the Council of Elvira), the marriage of the clergy, even obliging those married before ordination to abstain from the society of their wives. How strange, that the Council which could decide on the Homousion and the eternal relations between the Father and the Son, should prove themselves so profoundly and lamentably ignorant of the primal and fundamental relations of our common humanity.

A reaction. The Council of Gangra, circ. 365, alive to the spreading delusion, commendably pronounced sentence of condemnation on those who would not hold communion with married ecclesiastics. "If any one separate from a married Presbyter, as if it were unlawful to participate of the Eucharist when such a one ministers, let him be anathema." The decree was leveled against Eustathius, Bishop of Sebaste, and his followers. The Council in a pastoral state: "We ordain these things, not to exclude those who would, according to the advice of holy Scriptures, exercise themselves in the Church by those practices of continence and piety, but against those who use these kinds of austerities for a pretense to satisfy their ambition, who despise those who lead an ordinary life, and who introduce innovations contrary to Scripture and the ecclesiastical laws. We admire virginity when it is accompanied with modesty; we praise abstinence which is joined with piety and prudence. We respect the retirement which is made with humility; but we also honour marriage."

If we may introduce the Apostolic Canons and Constitutions at all, here perhaps is the proper place for them, inasmuch as the 5th Canon below was probably occasioned by the ascetic extravagances of Eustathius. While these works are of course falsely ascribed to the Apostles, and otherwise objectionable, they are nevertheless of considerable value – the Canons, as regards Church order and discipline, and the Constitutions as to points of practice, during the periods before us.

Canon 5: "Let not a Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon put away his wife, under pretext of religion; but if he put her away, let him be excommunicated, and persisting, deposed."

The Constitutions: "We believe that lawful marriage and the begetting of children is honourable and undefiled. For the difference of sexes was formed in Adam and Eve for the increase of mankind. The Bishops assembled at the Council of Gangre, A.D. 324, when heretical and heathenish sentiments, deprecativ of matrimony, had begun to spread

among the people, and to be adopted even by some of the clergy, declared that they honoured the chaste bond of wedlock. The celebrated Paphuntius, who had led a life of perpetual celibacy and unsuspected continence, disinterestedly resisting an attempt which was made at the first Council of Nice to forbid the clergy the company of their wives, loudly, and with the desired effect, affirmed, in the midst of the assembly, that marriage was honourable in all, and the bed undefiled, and pronounced the sexual intercourse of married persons chastity, or modesty. Chrysostom and Theophylact, using nearly the same words, maintained, in opposition to some of the heathen philosophers of their days, that ‘wedlock was in no respect whatever obstructive of virtue.’ The former, indeed, proceeds much farther, and exhibits that holy state in its true point of view: ‘Marriage presents to us no obstacle in our way to heaven; for if it were an impediment to us, and if a wife were to occasion our being ensnared, God, who created her at the beginning, would certainly not have denominated her an assistant to man.’ ‘And truly,’ says Clement of Alexandria, ‘she is, according to Scripture, a requisite assistant.’ In another of his works, the former says, ‘Marriage is a chain – a chain ordained by God.’ In another, he says, ‘Marriage, to those who make a proper use thereof, is a harbour of temperance, inasmuch as it prevents nature from driving at random. For by a legitimate conjunction; as by rocks interposed and resisting the billows of lust, it places and preserves us in the greatest tranquility.’ Again he says, ‘Marriage is the safeguard of chastity,’ an observation concurrent with the precept of St. Paul. ‘To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife,’ etc. Clement of Alexandria, whose language on the subject of second marriages is somewhat reprehensible, speaks highly in favour of wedlock in various passages of his Stromata and Pedagogue. Augustine’s encomiums on marriage are numerous. Gregory of Nyssa, among other commendations, says, ‘It is valuable, inasmuch as it introduces into the world those who may please God.’”

It is time, however, to draw the line of demarcation between the Eastern Church and the Western. And here the results of Schaff are expressly to the point: –

“In the practice of clerical celibacy, the Greek and the Latin Churches diverged in the fourth century, and are to this day divided. The Greek Church stopped halfway, and limited the injunction of celibacy to the higher clergy, who were accordingly chosen generally from the monasteries or

from the ranks of widower-presbyters; while the Latin Church extended the law to the lower clergy, and at the same time carried forward the hierarchical principle to absolute papacy. The Greek Church differs from the Latin, not by any higher standard of marriage, but only by a closer adherence to earlier usage and by less consistent application of the ascetic principle. It is in theory as remote from the evangelical Protestant Church as the Latin is, and approaches it only in practice. It sets virginity far above marriage, and regards marriage only in its aspect of negative utility. In the single marriage of a priest it sees in a measure a necessary evil, at best only a conditional good, a wholesome concession to the flesh for the prevention of immorality, and requires of its highest office-bearers total abstinence from all matrimonial intercourse. It wavers, therefore, between a partial permission and a partial condemnation of priestly marriage.

“In the East, one marriage was always allowed to the clergy, and, at first, even to bishops, and celibacy was left optional. Yet certain restrictions were early introduced, such as the prohibition of marriage *after* ordination (except in deacons and sub-deacons), as well as of *second* marriage *after* baptism; the apostolic direction that a bishop should be the husband of one wife being taken as a prohibition of successive polygamy, and at the same time as an allowance of one marriage. Besides second marriage, the marrying of a concubine, a widow, a harlot, a slave, and an actress, was forbidden to the clergy. With these restrictions, the ‘Apostolic Constitutions’ and ‘Canons’ expressly permitted the marriage of priests contracted before ordination, and the continuance of it *after* ordination. ...

“Accordingly we not unfrequently find in the Oriental Church, so late as the fourth and fifth centuries, not only priests, but even bishops living in wedlock. ... Socrates, whose Church History reaches down to the year 439, says of the practice of his time, that in Thessalia matrimonial intercourse after ordination had been forbidden under penalty of deposition from the time of Heliodorus of Trica, who in his youth had been an amatory-writer; but that in the East the clergy and bishops voluntarily abstained from intercourse with their wives without being required by any law to do so: for many, he adds, have had children during their episcopate by their lawful wives. There were Greek divines, however, like Epiphanius, who agreed with the Roman theory. Justinian I was utterly opposed to the marriage of priests, declared the children of such connection illegitimate, and forbade the election of a married man to episcopal office (A.D. 528). Nevertheless

down to the end of the seventh century many bishops in Africa, Libya, and elsewhere continued to live in the married state, as is expressly said in the Twelfth Canon of the Trullan Council; but this gave offence and was forbidden. From that time the marriage of bishops gradually disappears, while marriage among the lower clergy continues to be the rule.

“This Trullan Council, which was the sixth ecumenical (A.D. 692) (more precisely, the second Trullan council, held in the Trullan hall of the imperial palace in Constantinople; also called *Concilium Quinisextum*, σύνοδος πενθέκτη, being considered a supplement to the fifth and sixth general council), closes the legislation of the Eastern Church on the subject of clerical marriage. Here the continuance of a first marriage contracted before ordination was prohibited in the case of bishops on pain of deposition, but, in accordance with the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons, allowed in the case of presbyters and deacons (contrary to the Roman practice), with the Old Testament restriction, that they abstain from sexual intercourse during the season of official service, because he who administers holy things must be pure. The same relation is thus condemned in the one case as immoral, in the other approved and encouraged as moral; the bishop is deposed if he retains his lawful wife and does not, immediately after being ordained, send her to a distant cloister; while the presbyter or deacon is threatened with deposition and even excommunication for doing the opposite and putting his wife away.

“The Western Church, starting from the perverted and almost Manichaeian ascetic principle, that the married state is incompatible with clerical dignity and holiness, instituted a vigorous effort at the end of the fourth century, to make celibacy, which had hitherto been left to the option of individuals, the universal law of the priesthood; thus placing itself in direct contradiction to the Levitical law, to which in other respects it made so much account of conforming. The law, however, though repeatedly enacted, could not for a long time be consistently enforced. The canon, already mentioned, of the Spanish council of Elvira in 305, was only provincial. The first prohibition of clerical marriage, which laid claim to universal ecclesiastical authority, at least in the West, proceeded in 385 from the Roman Church in the form of a decretal letter of the Bishop Siricius to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona in Spain, who had referred several questions of discipline to the Roman bishop for decision. It is significant of the connection between the celibacy of the clergy and the

interest of the hierarchy, that the first properly papal decree, which was issued in the tone of supreme authority, imposed such an unscriptural, unnatural, and morally dangerous restriction. Siricius contended the appeal of dissenting parties to the Mosaic law, on the ground that the Christian priesthood has to stand not merely for a time, but perpetually, in the service of the sanctuary, and that it is not hereditary, like the Jewish; and he ordained that second marriage and marrying with a widow should incapacitate for ordination, and that continuance in the married state after ordination should be punished with deposition. And with this punishment he threatened not bishops only, but also presbyters and deacons. Leo the Great subsequently extended the requirement of celibacy even to the subdiaconate. The most eminent Latin church fathers, Ambrose, Jerome, and even Augustine – though the last with more moderation – advocated the celibacy of priests. Augustine, with Eusebius of Vercella before him (370), united their clergy in a cloister life, and gave them a monastic stamp; and Martin of Tours, who was a monk from the first, carried his monastic life into his episcopal office. The councils of Italy, Africa, Spain, and Gaul followed the lead of Rome. The synod of Clermont, for example (A.D. 535), declared in its twelfth canon: ‘No one ordained deacon or priest may continue matrimonial intercourse. He is become the brother of her who was his wife. But since some, inflamed with lust, have rejected the girdle of the warfare [of Christ], and returned to marriage intercourse, it is ordered that such must lose their office forever.’ Other councils, like that of Tours, 461, were content with forbidding clergymen, who begat children after ordination, to administer the sacrifice of the mass, and with confining the law of celibacy *ad altiore gradum*.

“But the very fact of the frequent repetition of these enactments, and the necessity of mitigating the penalties of transgression, show the great difficulty of carrying this unnatural restriction into general effect. In the British and Irish church, isolated as it was from the Roman, the marriage of priests continued to prevail down to the Anglo-Saxon period” (History of the Christian Church).

Here then is a halting place for the historian: to look back into Chaldee and Persic Heathendom, and into adulterated Judaism, and then into some six long centuries of Christendom, and see how asceticism, now secretly, now more openly, covered the fair fields of nature, and prepared the very sinews of war for the Papacy utterly to despoil the Church of God

in the Middle Age, save where He laid His prophets and children “by fifty in a cave, and fed them with bread and water.” And here too is a halting place for the general reader and the student: to hear the cry of Jehovah, “Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.”

The more we reflect, and the more we read and write, the oftener and the more intensely do we wonder, how any intelligent and well-informed man or woman can be the *slave* of Rome. We would be thoroughly practical: we have no merely personal point of ambition or aggrandizement to gain: but we have such a detestation of Popery for its sin, its tyranny, its pollution, that if these pages might only be the means of rolling back the tide of Romish and Ritualistic superstition that is now setting in on England, and of rousing up our countrymen and countrywomen to stand once again for God and the glorious Reformation, we should be content, and feel ourselves more than amply repaid.

Can we not form a society of calm, intelligent, practical, earnest, and prayerful men and women, at this the close of the nineteenth century, fearlessly to unfurl the flag of Evangelical Protestantism, and carry it on to victory?

When we see that the University of Oxford has almost become a wreck as to the faith; that the chairs of Cambridge – Charles Simeon’s University – are largely infected with unbelief; that Canon Farrar can imagine a purgatorial fire – and. we are told that “probably a majority of the Clergy hold with him”; and that a Clergyman honoured in high Episcopal circles, can and does dare to commit himself to these horror-striking words: “Rest assured that the old Evangelical belief in an ‘infallible Book’ will not do. The Book [the Bible] is not infallible. The old Anglican theory of thirty years ago, is nearly broken down.” We say, bearing all this and much more of a like nature in mind, is it not time for all who love the Lord to cry, “Once more unto the breach!” We have pulpits still honest in dogma, but none duly “pronounced in action”. We have associations enough for plain or even somewhat ruffled sailing, but we have none for a tempest tossed sea. At all events we have no lifeboat for the threatened wreckage of our common Christianity and our common Protestantism.

We had hoped well of the Church Association. When we first sketched the danger and the want of the hour, in the public press, and sent the correspondence to a reliable quarter, urging the matter at once to be

pushed forward, we did expect important results. But we soon found with deepest regret that the backbone of our suggestions was left out – a College for the training of a thoroughly Protestant Clergy. But is it even now too late? Cannot the Church Association at this the eleventh hour revert to the *original scheme* and carry out the most valuable and practical part of it – a Theological College on the indicated lines Hundreds, yea thousands of faithful men and women would come with their freewill offerings, for the building of this house of God – a defensive and wisely aggressive Protestant College in England.

Only, let the Governing Body of that College be such as we have described, “calm, intelligent, practical, earnest, and prayerful” Christians – men *and women*, we are not ashamed to add, for convinced we are that we lose by ignoring the sanctified intuition of women – and, with God’s blessing, we shall SUCCEED.

It may be well to glance at a few of the remaining dates: –

From the sixth to the eleventh century, and indeed on to the Reformation, the Latin Church in its priesthood, “pious” widows and virgins notwithstanding or rather truly in consequence of the decrees of almost every Council, General and Provincial, enforcing the law of Celibacy, may be fitly described, save where that law was rightly defied or eluded by priestly marriage, as an indescribable Augean sink of corruption – concubinage *singulariter et pluraliter*, capricious desertion, and at last culminating in the sale of indulgences: dispensations “for fornication of Priests, Friars, or Nuns,” and “to keep Concubines at bed and board, and hold a Benefice!!” And, of course, all other debauchery attaching.

The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, 836, forbade Bishops getting drunk. And they state with reprobation the fact that some of their order neglected their charges and travelled here and there, not from necessity but to gratify their avarice or their love of pleasure. Of Presbyters and the inferior clergy they complain that they kept women in their houses to the great scandal of the ministry; and this notwithstanding the attempts of former councils and princes to remove the evil. Also that Presbyters turn bailiffs, frequent taverns, pursue filthy lucre, practice usury, behave shamefully and lewdly in the houses they visit, and do not blush to indulge in revelry and drunkenness. They say of nunneries that “in some places they seemed to be rather *brothels* than monasteries.”

The Council of Pavia, 850: “It is our opinion that Bishops should be contented with *temperate meals*, and should not urge their guests to eat and to drink, but rather set examples of sobriety. Let all provocations to debauchery be removed from their conviviality; let no ludicrous shows, no vain garrulity, no buffoonery of wits, no scurrilous tricks, there find a place.” In a subsequent Canon they forbid Bishops keeping hounds and hawks for hunting, and their having superfluous trains of horses and mules and gaudy dresses for vain display.

The Council of Mayence, 888, decreed: “That the clergy be wholly forbidden to have females resident in their houses. For although there were canons allowing *certain* females [mothers and sisters] to reside in clergymen’s houses, yet what is greatly to be lamented we have often heard that by such permission numerous acts of wickedness have been committed; so that some *priests cohabiting with their own sisters hare had children by them*. (Saepe andivimus, per illam concessionem plurima scelera esse commissa, ita ut quidam sacerdotam cum propriis sororibus concumbentes, filios ex eis generassent.) And therefore this holy synod decrees that no Presbyter shall permit *any* female to live with him in his house; so that the occasion of evil reports or of iniquitous deeds may be wholly removed.” (See Harduin, *Concilia*, as quoted by Murdoch, Mosheim’s Eccl. Hist., cent. ix.).

Now if these and innumerable like enactments were decreed – and we must remember that they are *bona fide* Romish sketches of Romish life by *bona fide* Romish hands – what must the realities, in all their atrocious and sickening detail, have been!

Truly Celibacy is the very lifeblood of the Papacy, while the Confessional may be regarded as its arteries and its veins. Sap one or other of these two strongholds, and the curse of the ages is stamped out. The kitchen maid will declare, and the lady in her drawing room will aver, that once Priests marry, they have done with Confession and the Church of Rome.

And here the ascetic principle, as we have said, supplied Rome with her sinews of war. To have a phalanx of Clergy isolated from the tender cares and all the endearing and humanizing influences of the consecrated marriage state, is the very acme of sacerdotal supremacy. Without a home, and without all ordinary interest in the concerns of their fellowmen, they are the fitting bodyguard of the Man of Sin. Certainly blunted, perhaps

therefore rendered selfish, if not in many cases unscrupulous – save for the sake of appearances. And all this as the necessary and inevitable result of their false position. God help them! There may be, and we hope there are exceptions. But why not be *unslaved*? Surely, at this period in the world's history, and wherever civilization has dawned, men can emancipate themselves from error's chains, without being subjected to the stake.

And this vantage ground, as we have seen, the Popes were not long in descrying, and straining to occupy. "But the way of transgressors is hard." The battle of might against right long and righteously wavered. It took centuries to create and complete the Celibate. Priest and Virgin, Monk and Friar and Nun had vowed; but ever and anon holy Wedlock would vow too. Nor indeed was it until Gregory VII, heralded by Leo IX, came upon the field, that victory, such as it was, could be scored.

The crafty Hildebrand, who had guided the Pontifical councils from the reign of Leo, was no sooner elevated to the chair of St. Peter, than he devoted his great abilities and vast resources to reduce the whole Church, laity as well as clergy – priest, prince, and people, into a mere fiefdom of the Roman Pontiffs. Thanks to the spirit and vigilance of the European sovereigns, he failed fully to accomplish his civil program; but the record stands to the lasting infamy of the crowned heads of Europe, that no one ventured to come forward as the champion of the honourable marriage of the Clergy.

In 1074, Gregory held a Synod at Rome, when, in addition to forbidding simony, he enacted that no priests should henceforth marry, and that such as then had wives or concubines must relinquish either them or the sacred office: handing over all recusants to the magistrate to be dispossessed of their property, and otherwise punished with severity; thus indiscriminately "slaying the righteous with the wicked".

But the commotions were terrible. Husbands and wives and children and concubines throughout Germany, the Netherlands, France, England, and Italy were in tumult. The German Clergy declared: "They would rather lose their priesthood than part with their wives. Let him who despises men see whence he can procure angels for the churches." Those of Passau: "That they neither could nor would abandon the custom which it was clear they had followed from ancient times under all preceding bishops." The French in an assembly at Paris protested against the Pope's insupportable yoke being laid upon them. While the Milanese Clergy seceded from the Church

of Rome, branding Gregory and his satellites with the odious appellation of *Paterini*, or Manicheans.

Gregory, however, remained firm and inflexible. But the conflict ultimately subsided; on the one hand, through the shameful supineness of the sovereigns; and on the other hand, through the devastating wars which followed between the Popes and the Emperors, from Gregory's assumption of the right of Investiture.

And thus it came to pass that, as may be well conceived, in the interval of these centuries, the next stage of concubinage became even worse than the first. "Holy virgins" so diabolically contaminated by priests and monks as to become "demoniac females, who prostituted their bodies to every sort of men." (Ivo Carnotensis to the Bishop of Meaux, cited by Pagi.) But we dare not lift the curtain. We could almost thank God, that much gradually at length escapes from view through the patented safety valve of Indulgences.

In 1139, the Second Lateran Council, acknowledged by Romanists as the Tenth General Council, and composed as they say of more than a thousand Bishops, strictly prohibited the marriage of Ecclesiastics, down to the rank of Sub-deacon inclusive; and forbade the laity to hear Mass performed by any Priest who should have dared to violate this enactment.

"Nor," as a late writer well puts it, "was the marriage of Ecclesiastics prohibited on the simple ground of *mutable and temporary expediency*, but on the lofty ground of *immutable and eternal and inherent unholiness!* Ecclesiastics are forbidden to marry, not *because such prohibition, under certain circumstances of the Church, may be convenient as a point of discipline*, but because, as the Council assures us, it is an UNWORTHY DEED, *that those persons who ought to be the holy vessels of the Lord, should debase themselves so far as to become the vile slaves of Chambering and Uncleanness!!* ("Cum enim ipsi templum Dei, vasa Domini, sacrarium Spiritus Sancti, debeant et esse et dici; Indignum est eos Cubilibus et Immunditiis deservire.")

The Council of Trent, Session 24, decreed: —

Canon 9. "Whosoever shall affirm that persons in Holy Orders, or Regulars, who have made a solemn profession of chastity, may contract marriage, and that the contract is valid, notwithstanding any ecclesiastical law or vow; and that to maintain the contrary is nothing less than to condemn marriage; and that all persons may marry, who feel that though

they should make a vow of chastity they have not the gift thereof: Let him be Accursed. For God does not deny his gifts to those who ask aright, neither does he suffer us to be tempted above that we are able.”

Canon 10. “Whosoever shall affirm that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a life of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not better and more conducive to happiness to remain in virginity, or celibacy, than to be married: Let him be Accursed.”

In England, 1076, the Synod of Winchester, under Archbishop Lanfranc, decreed that neither Canons nor any Priests should in future be married: but country Priests already married might retain their wives. And under Anselm, Lanfranc’s successor, it was firmly decreed, 1102, that neither Priest, nor Deacon, nor Sub-deacon, should be ordained who was not a Celibate: which decree was further confirmed and established by the Council of London, 1108. But we have an important letter from the Pope to Anselm, written in 1107, permitting him to ordain and promote the sons of the Clergy, “because the greatest and best part of the clergy in England consisted of such persons.” This proves two things: (1) That the English Clergy hitherto had nobly dared to obey God rather than man: and (2) That it was no easy matter to enforce obedience to the unnatural and accursed law of celibacy. In 1539, Parliament, on their introduction by the Duke of Norfolk, the great patron of Papal opinion, passed the Six Articles; the third of which ran, that Priests, after the Order of Priesthood, may not marry by the law of God; and the fourth, That vows of chastity (celibacy) ought to be observed by the law of God: with the penalty, for the first offence, perpetual imprisonment and loss of goods and chattels; for the second offence or willful opposition, death. The following answer of Lawnez to the Duke on the passing of the Act, is not unworthy of insertion: “O, my Lawnez (said his Grace to his old Chaplain, knowing him much to favour priests’ matrimony), whether may priests now have wives or no? – If it please your Grace (replied he), I cannot well tell whether priests may have wives or no; but well I wot, I am sure of it, for all your Act, that wives will have priests!” – In 1549, an Act was passed conceding the marriage of the clergy; and in 1552, a declaratory Act which legalized the same to all intents and purposes, legitimized the children of the Clergy, and enabled them to inherit according to law.

Some Pictures of the Results of Compulsory Celibacy.

Udalric, Bishop of Augusta, circ. 870, writes to Pope Nicholas I: “That Gregory the Great, by his decree, deprived Priests of their wives; when shortly after, he commanded that some fish should be caught from the fish ponds, the fishers, instead of fish, found the heads of six thousand infants that had been drowned in the ponds. When Gregory ascertained that the children thus killed were born from the concealed fornications and adulteries of the priests, he forthwith recalled his decree, and purged the sin with worthy fruits of repentance, extolling the apostolic command, ‘It is better to marry than to burn’; adding from himself, ‘It is better to marry than to be the occasion of death.’” This monstrous and almost incredible revelation stands on this certain basis: That the Epistle in which it is contained, is proved to be authentic and genuine by patent and contemporary documents.

Bernard, †1153: “If, according to the prophecy of Ezekiel, we could look behind the partition, that we might see the horrible thing in the house of the Lord, perhaps the foulest abominations would appear on the inside of the partition. Nay, besides fornications, adulteries, and incests, there are not wanting. ... Would that *those things which are not convenient* had never been committed to such an extent as to induce the Apostle to write thus concerning them (Rom. 1:28); neither that it were needful for us to declare, nor that the least credence were to be given to our declaration, that any lust so abominable as this had at any time occupied the mind of man! Alas! the enemy of man has defiled the body of the Church with the execrable ashes of ...” (Sermon to the Clergy on Conversion.)

The Third Lateran Council, 1179: “In England the depraved and detestable custom has long obtained of Clergymen keeping harlots (fornicarias) in their houses.”

Nicholas de Clemangis, circ. 1400: “In many dioceses, the Rectors of parishes, for a certain and stipulated sum to their Prelates, generally and publicly have concubines.”

M’Crie on the Romish Clergy in Scotland: “The lives of the Clergy, exempted from secular jurisdiction, and corrupted by wealth and idleness, were become a scandal to religion, and an outrage on decency. While they professed chastity, and prohibited, under the severest penalties, any of the ecclesiastical order from contracting lawful wedlock, the Bishops set an example of the most shameless profligacy before the inferior clergy; avowedly kept their harlots, provided their natural sons with benefices, and

gave their daughters in marriage to the sons of the nobility and principal gentry; many of whom were so mean as to contaminate the blood of their families by such base alliances, for the sake of the rich dowries which they brought” (Life of John Knox).

Dr. Charles Elliott, who adduces these and many more examples, gives us the following sketch of Popery *in modern times*: –

“It were easy to advance undoubted testimony respecting the corruption of Romish Priests, growing out of their celibacy, in all Popish nations, as the fact is notorious. In South America it is so customary for Priests to have their mistresses, that it ceases to be marvelous. In Cuba a similar custom prevails. In Protestant countries the case is different, at least in appearance. The comparison between the married, chaste Clergy of Protestants, in general, so far affects the Papists, that they dare not, without betraying their cause, indulge in profligacy to that extent of guilt to which they are prone when removed from Protestant observation. But their secret sins are neither few nor small, as is known by sufficient developments, and the nature of the case. Secrecy is their fort. Their own people, who are privy to their sins, hesitate to expose them in the eye of Protestants. If they would, they dare not, as it would insure to them the hatred and revenge of the Clergy. The Priests, being careful to seek concealment for their own vices, shrink from exposing those of their brethren. The secrecy of the confessional also aids in preserving this privacy, when otherwise they would be detected and exposed. The following particulars, if duly considered, will lead us to conclude that the Chastity of the Popish Priesthood is, after all, no very sacred thing: –

“(1) They are men, and only such; therefore they are as liable as others to fall into sin. (2) They are, in general, unconverted men; consequently they are uninfluenced by the power of divine grace, so as to have victory over the lusts of the flesh. (3) They are accustomed generally to luxurious living, and indulge freely in the use of wine and stimulating liquors. (4) They are in direct association with females of every grade, over whom they exercise almost unlimited control. At confession they endeavour to search the heart, and thus become acquainted with human weakness. (5) In the families of Bishops and Priests, females form a part, and are such as they select. (6) They have access to the various sodalities of nuns, sisters of charity, etc., with whom they are on terms of intimate familiarity. (7) They have peculiar means of privacy, by the confessional, the convenience of

their houses, which are adapted to such circumstances, the secrecy which their people are bound to observe. and by their opportunities of concealing, removing, or confining their accomplices, etc. (8) It is a fact, that clerical celibacy, in its origin among Heathens, was followed by licentiousness; among the early Christian heretics, it was depraved; among orthodox ancient believers, it became corrupt; during the middle ages, it was awfully polluted; and at the time of the Reformation, it was the source of unbounded immorality. In all Catholic countries it is the fountain of crime, and pollutes the whole Church. Can we, therefore, suppose that celibate Popish Priests and Bishops in professedly Protestant countries are better than their brethren in former ages? especially when we consider their opportunities of privacy, of which they studiously avail themselves, and by which they are protected from public scrutiny” (Delineation of Romanism).

Romish, etc., Protests against Celibacy.

And here the statement and brief summary of Dr. Elliott must suffice:

—

“In all ages numerous learned and pious Romanists are found who opposed the prohibition of marriage, until it was established by violence. Since then, even in the darker period, there have been many who, revering the testimony of Scripture, and deprecating the horrible scandals of celibacy, opposed the law which enjoined it, and were anxious that the liberty of legitimate marriage should be restored to the Clergy. The Waldenses, A.D. 1160, opposed the celibacy of the Priesthood. A.D. 1270, Thomas Aquinas wrote against it. Durandus and Marsilius rejected it, A.D. 1320. About the same time the poets Dante and Petrarch exposed the enormities of that state. Balus informs us, that about the year 1340 great contests arose concerning the marriage of the Clergy. John Wycliffe opposed celibacy. Sigismund, at the Council of Basil, A.D. 1430, recommended the marriage of the Clergy, because more evil than good resulted from celibacy. Aeneas Sylvius, afterward Pius II, at the same Council deplored the state of the Church on account of it. A cloud of witnesses might easily be brought forward to establish our position. (See Chemnicii Exam. Conc. Trid., tom. iii., pp. 161–166, where many such authorities are given.)

“As there is an increasing esteem for morality and pure Christianity in Germany, the necessity of altering the ecclesiastical law, which forbade the

marriage of Priests, is more and more felt; and as Romish Priests and their supporters continue to abuse the ignorance of a large body of Roman Catholics, in order to uphold the celibacy to inspire the people with superstitious veneration of their purity, and to carry out their selfish plans, so shall we find that the loud voice of reason and of history will prevail. All seem united to restore to the Priests their inalienable rights as men. The representatives of the people in the kingdom of Wirtemberg have several times, from 1828 to 1836, moved in their legislative assembly, that the Catholic Clergy be allowed to marry. A petition, signed by the most respectable Catholics in the grand dukedom of Baden, praying for the repeal of this unnatural ecclesiastical law, was read (1831) in the House of Representatives. This petition was signed not only by many thousand laymen, but also by two hundred and eighty Roman Catholic Clergymen, among whom were many Superintendents, Presidents of Colleges, eighty-six Pastors, twenty-one Vicars, three above seventy, and six from sixty to seventy, years old, fifteen from fifty to sixty years of age, etc. This petition received favourable and promising attention. Since that time associations have been formed in every part of Germany, the object of which is to abolish celibacy in a legitimate manner. At the head of these associations are found Roman Catholic clergymen, supported not only by influential and liberal laymen .of the higher order, but by the voice of public opinion among the higher classes. The members are bound not only to express their convictions and experience of the evil effects of celibacy, but to sign their names to their publications, and to make every proper effort to obtain the privilege of marrying by civil and ecclesiastical law. To accomplish this, periodicals are published, and meetings held, in order to enlighten and encourage each other, and to prepare the people for the change. These societies are under the superintendence of four celebrated Professors. Two months subsequent to the first announcement, a number of highly respected Ecclesiastics and Civilians became members. Among the clergy are names of every age and station in the Church. It is also remarkable that many Priests who are on the verge of the grave, and must therefore be considered impartial, have taken a zealous interest in this enterprise. Members of Roman Catholic Consistories, and of the Theological Faculty of Tubingen, have joined the association. The public press has almost unanimously spoken in favour of this movement. In the diocese of Trier, eighty of the most eminent Priests formed a society in 1835, to accomplish in a lawful

manner a reformation in the ecclesiastical discipline of the Romish Church, especially with regard to celibacy and convents. The Archbishop of Trier has written a pastoral epistle against it, which is proclaimed from the pulpits of the ignorant and fanatical Priests: such threatenings, however, are vain.”

Scriptural Proof.

This might fill a goodly volume, if we were to examine all the puerile and often self-commendatory glosses of the Romanist. But we may not exhaust the reader’s patience in such trifling disputation. The practice of Rome, of which we have had enough, is more eloquent than her flimsy and spider-spun inventions; and therefore we can only here appeal to foundation principles. Indeed, it might suffice to state that marriage is the plain dictate of the Bible of revelation and of the Bible of nature, and so leave the argument. But we must glance at a few passages, and with the utmost possible brevity.

The Old Testament, so far as regards the introduction of our species, may be said to begin with Marriage; and this founded on a universal law admitting, as the words bear out, no exception whatever save incapacity: “It Is Not Good For Man To Be Alone.” This touches the whole question – philosophical, social, moral, religious.

And accordingly we find that the Patriarchs were married; that the priests of the Levitical Dispensation were married; and the Prophets were married. Nor has Rome ever been able to cope with this pregnant argument. If God instituted marriage in the state of innocence; if the Patriarchs, the Priests of their day, and with whom God “talked face to face,” had wives; if the Priest and even the High Priest of the Levitical Dispensation, which latter “carried the consecrated life to its highest point,” were not only permitted, but virtually compelled by the law of God to marry – their sacred functions being tied to their legitimate offspring; if the Prophets too, the Evangelists of the Law, had wives; and, perhaps above all, if “throughout the Old Testament period marriage was regarded as the indispensable duty of every man, nor was it surmised that there existed in it any drawback to the attainment of the highest degree of holiness” (Bevan): here, assuredly, is an overwhelming argument against the advocates of either clerical or monastic celibacy.

And when we come to the New Testament there is really no change whatever, save in the somewhat altered circumstances or surroundings of

the Church. Nor could it be otherwise. The law of nature is unalterable, being founded in the very nature of the unchangeable God, in his infinite holiness, justice, and wisdom.

But between the Old Testament and the New there is an important historical chasm, spanned by the Apocrypha – an interval in which heathen asceticism was developed, as we have seen, in the Jewish Church. And these “altered circumstances” the New Testament had to face, guide, hallow, sanctify – if only Christians would. Man is attracted by novelty and change. It requires no deep philosophy of humankind to see that there were willing converts to the “new way” of celibacy – a fresh road to heaven upon the strength of the old covenant of works. *But nature and salvation cannot be recast.*

Let us begin with Christ. As the Old Testament opens with Marriage, so does also the public mission or official life of our Saviour open with the same. “This beginning of his miracles [turning Water into Wine at the Marriage Feast – thus ‘adorning and beautifying’ Marriage with His Presence and first Miracle] did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.” It cannot be without important and sacred import that the Creation of our species, and the Epiphany of their Saviour, are thus both stamped with Marriage. If it be argued that in the former case it was necessary in the natural order of things, there is obviously no such plea in the latter. The holy estate of wedlock, the chosen type of Christ and His Church, exalted throughout the whole range of scriptural imagery, had encountered, and was about still more ruthlessly to encounter, the malignity of the Evil One: and what more fitting than that the Creator-Redeemer, at the outset of His world-mission, should again place upon Marriage the solemn seal of His approval.

In the 19th chapter of Matthew, we have a passage which has been misunderstood, misinterpreted, and twisted perhaps beyond any other in the Bible – our Lord’s words and Eunuchism. Let us examine it with the context.

“The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him” [How cunning the temptation – our Lord had forbidden divorce before (Matt. 5:32), but now He was in the territory of Herod Antipas!], “and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?” [κατα πασαν αιτίαν – Is arbitrary divorce, according to the school of Hillel, justifiable?] “And he answered and said unto them” [Would not entangle himself in the

disputes as such between the Rabbinical schools of Hillel and Schammai, the latter of whom denied the right of divorce except in the case of adultery; but refers them first to the original ordinance of the Creator], “Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them (αυτούς – the race) male and female” [Used only of Man], “and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two (οιδύο) shall be one flesh?” [The marriage bond, therefore, is abstractedly, and from the nature of the case, indissoluble, while in the flesh. And marriage having been instituted only *between two*, Polygamy should have no place.] “Wherefore they are no more two, but one flesh (εις σάρκα μίαν – *joined into one flesh*). What therefore God hath joined together” [Marriage therefore was and is, in a deep and solemn sense, the creative act of God himself] “let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?” [The Pharisees were not content with our Lord’s argument from the original institution of marriage; and probably thinking that he shrank from the question at issue, now press him still more closely with what they erroneously or dishonestly style a ‘command’ (though only a ‘permission’ – compare their ενετείλατο of v. 7, with our Lord’s correction επέτρεφεν, ‘suffered,’ of v. 8.)] “He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.” [That *bill of divorcement* is a standing proof of your degenerate wickedness. Moses permitted divorce in mercy to your wives, to save them from murder at your hands. But in the patriarchal dispensation men lived closer with God, and it was not so. Moreover the Law of Moses entered, that the offence might abound, in order still more to bring out the necessity of One through whose righteousness grace might reign unto eternal life.] “And I say unto you” [I am not afraid of the question of the Schools], “Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.” [Christ’s Ministers now cannot therefore commendably marry the divorced during the lifetime of either party.] “His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good (συμφέρει – *expedient*: in our unsettled state, or amid the trials of this world) to marry. But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother’s womb, and there are some eunuchs which were

made eunuchs by men, and there are some eunuchs which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.”

And here we join issue with the common interpretation: –

(1) There are three cases of eunuchs mentioned; and unless the Bible is a riddle, we contend that, whatever eunuch means in any one case, it must mean in the others.

(2) If, therefore, eunuchs 1 and 2 are literal eunuchs, eunuch 3 cannot be figurative.

(3) It is of no consequence how the Fathers understood the passage, for many of them wrote when asceticism had grievously infected the Church. But it is perhaps of some consequence to remember how Origen received it – by literally making a eunuch of himself.

(4) We regret that such a learned scholar as Bishop Wordsworth contends that the self-made eunuch (No. 3) is one who “by the extirpation of sensual thoughts” fits himself for abstaining from married life! We are pained at this loose view of the holy estate of wedlock on the part of a Protestant bishop in the nineteenth century. Nor are we less surprised that Dr. Wordsworth's argument for the softening down of the term eunuch is founded on a misreading of ancient history and eastern customs. Thus Potiphar is prominently quoted as a eunuch, and yet married. But really remembering how usage stood, we can see nothing *for* the good Bishop here, but all *against* him, unless indeed he means to say that Potiphar *after* his marriage “extirpated sensual thoughts”! The fact is that the position of a eunuch was and is one of high honour and rank in the East, and that even the marriage of a eunuch is positively supposable. Without going into the surgical and anatomical phase of the case, if Chardin (*Voyages en Perse*) is at all reliable, it is not unknown for eunuchs to have even harems of their own. But as Dr. Hayman well observes: “The original Hebrew word (root Arab. [Arabic characters], *impotens esse ad venerem*, Gesen. s. v.) clearly implies the incapacity which mutilation involves, and perhaps includes all the classes mentioned in Matt. 19:12, not signifying as the Greek ευνουχος, an office merely.”

(5) The figurative eunuch must have originated with Christ on the spot, and been unintelligible to his hearers, as no previous example of such is to be found, save as may be alleged in asceticism. But this only creates “a strong dilemma in a desperate case” – our Lord made to endorse with his

lips that against which his whole life was a practical protest. “The Son of Man came eating and drinking.”

(6) But over and above all this, our Lord *could not*, we speak with reverence, recommend either literal or figurative eunuchism. He could not either abrogate or alter the law of creation and original legislation as laid down in Genesis, “It is not good for man to be alone,” etc.; for that, as we have seen, was a transcript of the law of nature, and the law of nature is founded in the unchangeable nature of God. God may and does alter His positive precepts, the means, modes, and times of worship, and so forth; but he cannot say in Genesis, It is good to Marry, and in Matthew, It is not good to Marry. He cannot endorse Eunuchism, until and unless he changes himself.

(7) What then is meant by “Those to whom it is given”? Simply, the incapacitated from, whether natural or compulsory cause. And what by “He that is able to receive, let him receive?” Simply, he that profanely thinks he can innocuously defy and overcome the law of nature, let him do so. Just as in the next moment He says to the young man, “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.”

(8) Nor must we forget: (a) That Christ did not abhor the *betrothed* virgin’s womb; and that betrothal, in the Jewish law, was of equal *force with marriage*. (b) That Christ chose for his Apostles *married men* – at least St. Peter, the Head, Supreme Pontiff, and Prince of the whole Church, according to Rome; and of whom the Missal says, “As we proclaim Thee wonderful in Thy Apostle Peter, may we receive *through him the fulness of Thy pardon!*”

As to St. Paul. We have often thought if the words “Times of Persecution” were prefixed to the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, and if that chapter were read with the eleventh of 2 Corinthians, the Celibates would not be so ready to quote it. But St. Paul was “faithful”. Once and again does he warn his readers to distinguish between him, the aging and tempest-tossed, and God. And the sum and substance of all that he has to say is simply this: “Concerning *virgins* I have *no commandment of the Lord*” – “I *suppose* this is good for the *present distress*” – only therefore do “I give my judgment” – “and I *think* also (δοκέω – the subjective mental opinion, which may be right, but which always involves the possibility of being wrong) that I have the Spirit of God.”

Conclusion.

Eunuchism, whether literal or “figurative,” has no sanction in the Bible. The Vow of Celibacy is a vow against Nature and against God – awful to make, awful to keep. And all Compulsory Celibacy should be punished by the law of every Christian State.

Articles XX, XXXIV, XXI, XXXIII.

The Church: Its Authority – Creedal, Ritual, Conciliary, and Excommunicatory.

Article XX.

Of the Authority of the Church. – The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith. And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word Written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

Article XXXIV.

Of the Traditions of the Church. – It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse, 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.

Article XXI.

Of the Authority of General Councils. – General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God), they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

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.

Articulus XX. *De Ecclesiae Auctoritate.* – Habet Ecclesia ritus sive caeremonias statuendi jus, et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem: quamvis Ecclesiae non licet quicquam instituere, quod verbo Dei scripto adversetur, nec unum Scriptum locum sic exponere potest, ut alteri contradicat. Quare licet Ecclesia sit divinorum librorum testis et conservatrix attamen ut adversus eos nihil discernere, ita praeter illos nihil credendum de necessitate Salutis debet obtrudere.

Articulus XXXIV. *De Traditionibus Ecclesiasticis.* – Traditiones atque caeremonias easdem non omnino necessarium est ease ubique, aut prorsus consimiles. Nam ut variae semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum, et morum diversitate, modo nihil contra verbum Dei instituatur.

Traditiones, et caeremonias ecclesiasticas, quae cum verbo Dei non pugnant, et sunt auctoritate publica institutae atque probatae, quisquis privato consilio volens, et data opera, publice violaverit, is ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem Ecclesiae, quique laedit auctoritatem Magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut caeteri timeant, arquendus est.

Quaelibet Ecclesia particularis, sine nationalis, auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi caeremonias, aut ritus ecclesiasticos, humana tantum auctoritate institutos, modo omnia ad aedificationem fiant.

Articulus XXI. *De Auctoritate Conciliorum Generalium.* – Generalia Concilia sine jussu et voluntate Principum congregari non possunt; et ubi convenerint, quia et hominibus constant, qui non omnes Spiritu et Verbo Dei reguntur, et errare possunt, et interdum errarunt etiam in his quae ad Deum pertinent: ideoque quae ab illis constituuntur, ut ad salutem necessaria, neque robur habent, neque auctoritatem, nisi ostendi possint e sacris literis esse desumpta.

Articulus XXXIII. *De Excommunicatis Vitandis*. – Qui per publicam Ecclesiae denunciationem rite ab unitate Ecclesiae praecisus est, et excommunicatus, is ab universa fidelium multitudine (donec per poenitentiam publice reconciliatus fuerit arbitrio iudicis competentis) habendus est tanquam ethnicus et publicanus.

History and Doctrine.

The Articles we have thus grouped might be conveniently rendered into one. They all hang more or less directly on the same grand principle – The Paramount Authority of God’s Word Written. The 34th clears up and illustrates the 20th. The 21st rejects the inherent authority of General Councils, and subordinates them to Holy Scripture, while the 33d is simply a corollary naturally following from the Church being a voluntary moral and spiritual association, and an organized or corporate body.

The Supremacy of Sacred Writ having been fully discussed under Article 6, we pass on to the consideration of –

I. – *The Nature and Extent of the Church’s Authority*.

We may remark at the outset, that the opening clause of Article 20 – *Habet Ecclesia ritus sive caeremonias statuendi JUS [properly, right], et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem* – does not exist in some early copies. One of 1563 (Latin, by Reynold Wolfe, authorized by the Queen) has it, except the words, *Sive Caeremonias*. It does not appear in the Parker MS., deposited in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, which bears the autographs of ten Bishops; but this was probably an early draught. Nor is it thought to have been in the copy signed by Convocation. But it appears in that finally sanctioned by the Queen, which was edited by Jewel; as also in the copy of 1604, subscribed by both Houses of Convocation; and stands of course in that of 1662, enforced by the Act of Uniformity. The charge against Laud of forging it does not seem to be sustained.

Campion and Beaumont observe: “Hardwick, in his *History of the Articles of Religion*, decides in favour of the genuineness of the disputed clause. He thinks the authority of the Latin edition by Reynold Wolfe, authorized by the Queen in 1563, more than counterbalances its absence from the Latin MS. of Archbishop Parker, signed by himself and the majority of the Bishops, Jan 29, 1562/3.

“The authority *against* the clause is:

“1. This Parker MS.

“2. English version of Jugge and Cawood in 1563.

“3. English MS. signed by Bishops in Convocation, 1571.

“4. Latin and English edition of Jugge and Cawood, 1571.

“*For its genuineness, we have –*

“1. Latin edition of Reynold Wolfe, 1563.

“2. Two or more English editions of Jugge and Cawood, 1574.

“3. Six or more English editions from 1581 to 1628 and all subsequent copies.

“4. The transcript of the original copy of the Articles made in 1637 and deposited in the registry of the See of Canterbury.

“To judge from internal evidence it seems much more reasonable that the article should commence as other articles do with a positive statement, and that it should then proceed to deny certain positions of opponents, than that it should be simply negative.

“In our Articles of 1552 the clause had not been introduced” (*The Prayer Book Interleaved*).

Beyond, however, being one of the curiosities of literature, the clause in question is of little moment where it stands; inasmuch as its assertion with regard to rites and ceremonies is plainly reiterated in Article 34, and that with regard to controversies of faith, is substantially contained in the closing part of the Article itself. And both points are virtually sustained in our formularies at large. The Romanist on the one hand denied the right of self-action and independence to the Churches; and the Puritan on the other hand loudly protested against anything being retained which had not explicit or implicit sanction in Holy Scripture. Hence it is probable that Elizabeth and our Reformers desired a distinct and dogmatic assertion of the Church’s power by this clause and the statements in general of Articles 20 and 34.

By “the Church” of the twentieth Article is clearly meant “every particular or National Church,” as expressed in the thirty-fourth.

The Nature of the Authority of the Church arises from this, that it is a Christian corporate body, under, or professing allegiance to God. And this authority is at once innate and delegated. Without a Creed and a Ritual, churches would clearly cease to be orderly organizations, and become Babels of confusion; and their power to legislate is abundantly confirmed in the record. Churches are but societies; and the sacredness of their character only emphasizes their right and duty to legislate for their wellbeing. As well might any secular association claim to draw up a Code of laws and

regulations for another, as any particular or national Church arrogate to itself the power to define the faith and ceremonies of a contemporary.

Along the whole stream of history, we find the representatives of God – whether godly Princes or chief Pastors – practically asserting and carrying out the right of instituting or abrogating rites and ceremonies, and determining controversies of faith: ample instances of which we shall find when we come to the consideration of the Councils of the Church.

And although the introduction or alteration of rites, ceremonies, and creeds has for the most part if not altogether been effected, as is fit, by ecclesiastical assemblies *in session*, yet nothing is more patent than the variations of churches, in matters of indifference, even of the same communion. All which goes to show and prove the Church's power and right in the question at issue: the major rule of determining doctrine, covering the minor one of settling ritual; and the minor leading up to and in its own way establishing the major. The one, if not indeed the cement, is yet the stucco for the walls; the other is the building itself.

The Extent of the Authority of the Church is, first, as to rites and ceremonies – Decency, Order, Edification; and, second, as to doctrine – the Word of God. These two divine and Apostolic Rules, clearly cut away at once and for ever the claims of Rome to be considered a Church, much less, *the Church of God*. The rites and ceremonies of the Now Testament she has so honeycombed with her inventions, that little if anything of the patented original is to be seen; and the doctrines of the Gospel have been manufactured at her hands into the delusions of Satan. The rites and ceremonies of the New Covenant are few, simple, and instructive; the rites and ceremonies of Rome are legion, and soul-destroying. They may build up an Ephesian temple of Priestcraft; but they are powerless to prepare or polish a single lively stone for the temple made without hands. *Baptism*, with its propitiatory salt, oil, insufflation, and many other like juggleries. *Confirmation*, with its chrism, unction of the cross, percussion, etc., etc. *Eucharist*, with all its thoroughness of blasphemies. *Extreme Unction*, with its mocking heavenly medicine. And DEATH, with its masses satisfactory, with anniversaries, with its obits, with its requiems, with its dirges, with its placebos, with its trentals.

O God! how long? How long shall men, under the cloak of religion, be permitted to delude and destroy souls for filthy lucre's sake? How long shall Antichrist reign?

But the nature and extent of the Authority of the Church are best brought out in the words of the twentieth Article – that the Church is “a Witness and a Keeper (*testis et conservatrix*) of Holy Writ.” In no sense then is the Church a primary or original authority, that only is the prerogative of God; but in every sense, subordinate to the Word, its authority is judicial, declaratory, decretory.

We shall not weary the reader by quotations.

For the early Church, it must suffice to cite –

Tertullian: “Every doctrine is to be judged as false, which is opposed to the truth taught by the Churches, the Apostles, Christ, and God” (*De Praescript. Haeret.*).

Athanasius: “The Nicene council was gathered together by reason of the Arian heresy, and on account of the feast of Easter; because the Syrians, Cilicians, and Mesopotamians differed from us, and celebrated it at the same time that the Jews do the Passover. But thanks be to the Lord, that as concerning the Faith, so also concerning the Holy Feast, we were all of one mind” (*Ep. ad Episcop. African.*).

Augustine: “Although no certain example of this thing (the rebaptism of heretics) can be adduced out of the canonical Scriptures, yet in this very thing we uphold the truth of the same Scriptures, when we do that which pleaseth the whole Church, which the authority of the Scriptures themselves commandeth” (*c. Cresc. Grammat.*).

For the Reformation Period –

Calvin: “Here then is the difference (between Romanists and Protestants). They place the authority of the Church without the Word of God; we annex it to the Word, and allow it not to be separated from it. And is it strange if the spouse and pupil of Christ is so subject to her Lord and Master as to hang carefully and constantly on his lips? In every well-ordered house the wife obeys the command of her husband, in every well-regulated school the doctrine of the master only is listened to. Wherefore, let not the Church be wise in herself, nor think anything of herself, but let her consider her wisdom terminated when he ceases to speak” (*Institutes*).

Again: “As concerning Rites in particular, let the sentence of Augustine take place, which leaveth it free unto all Churches to receive their own custom. Yea, sometime it profiteth, and is expedient that there be difference, lest men should think that Religion is tied to outward Ceremonies. Always provided, that there be not any emulation, nor that

Churches, delighted with novelty, affect to have that which others have not” (*Respon. ad Med.*).

Cranmer: “Whatsoever the Church teacheth you out of the Canonical Books of the Bible, believe that; but if they teach anything beside that (I mean, which is not agreeable with the same), believe neither that, nor them. For then they are not the Church of Christ, but the synagogue of Satan and Antichrist. For the Church of God (as St. Paul witnesseth) is ‘builded upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets’; not upon the apostles, but upon the same foundation which they laid, that is, Christ Jesus, and his holy Word. And all such unwritten verities as the Papists have in their mouths, though they seem never so glorious a Church to the face of the world, if they be not agreeing (as they are not indeed) to the very Word of God, suspect them, yea, rather, I bid you utterly to abhor and reject them. For their outward and seen Church may, and doth (as is before proved) commonly err in great and weighty matters. Stand fast, therefore, to sound and good doctrine, and waver not. And ‘if any man come unto you, and bring not this doctrine with him, receive him not into your house: bid him not God speed,’ nor have ought to do with him; but count him as an object from God and Christ. But cleave ye fast to the sound and certain doctrine of God’s infallible Word, written in the canonical books of the New and Old Testament, which is able sufficiently to instruct you to eternal salvation, through Jesus Christ our Lord. ...

“The Old Testament was sufficient for the Jews; and why shall not both the New and the Old suffice us?

“Christ and the apostles proved all their doctrines by the law and prophets. What an arrogance is it then in us, to teach anything which we can neither prove by the law, the prophets, the apostles, nor the evangelists!

“The devil, when he tempted Christ, was not so far past all shame to persuade anything without the testimony of the Scriptures, although he did (as his dear children the Papists do) falsely allege them, wrest them from their true meaning to a contrary sense, and also cut off that which should make against them, or declare the true meaning of the Scriptures. ...

“If the Church and the Christian faith did not stay itself upon the Word of God certain, as upon a sure and strong foundation, no man could know whether he had a right faith, and whether he were in the true Church of Christ, or in the Synagogue of Satan.

“If we be bound to believe certain things delivered from the apostles by word of mouth only, without writing, as they would make us believe (but what those things be, no man can tell), it should hereof follow that we are bound to believe we wot not what.

“Without faith it is not possible to please God; and faith cometh by hearing of God’s Word: *ergo*, where God’s Word lacketh, there can be no faith.

“Almighty God, afore he gave to Moses the law written of the ten commandments, wherein he fully taught the true worshipping of him, as it were a preservative against a plague or a poison to come, gave them this notable lesson, worthy alway to be had in memory: ‘You shall add nothing to the words, etc.’; and again he oftentimes repeateth the same sentence both in the law and the prophets, in the gospels, and the epistles of the apostles. And because his people should never forget it, St. John commandeth the same in the last words of all the New Testament, threatening terrible plagues, that is, the loss of his everlasting joys of heaven, and the pain of eternal fire, to all them that either put to or take aught from the Word of God. ...

“The Scribes and the Pharisees sit upon Moses’ seat: whatsoever they bid you do, that do, but after their works do not; for they say, and do not.’ Here, they say, it appeareth plainly that Christ commandeth us to obey the heads of the Church, how evil soever their lives be.

“First, let them look well what manner of men they make themselves, that is, Scribes and Pharisee; the greatest enemies of God, persecutors and murderers of his prophets, of the apostles, and of Christ himself, and so Antichrists.

“Secondly, Moses’ seat is not his office or authority, but his doctrine, and therefore saith St. Augustine, that seat, which is his doctrine, suffereth them not to err: and in another place, They sitting in Moses’ seat teach the law of God; therefore God teacheth by them. But if they will teach their own doctrine, believe them not; for such seek their own, and not Jesus Christ’s. ...

“Behold, I am with you all the days unto the world’s end.’ This promise was not made to the apostles only (for they died shortly after Christ), but to the Church: *ergo*, the Church cannot err.

“I beseech them to begin a little afore, and they shall plainly hear Christ himself unloose this knot. The words before are these in Mark: ‘Go

and preach my gospel to every creature'; and in Matthew: 'Go and teach all people, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son,' etc.; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I will be with you unto the world's end.' Here you may see this promise of Christ, 'I will be with you,' etc., is not absolute or universal, but given under a condition: that is, if you preach my gospel truly, if you baptize rightly, if you teach the baptized to do all things that I have commanded you, lo, then I will be with you unto the world's end. But if you teach any other gospel, or baptize otherwise, or bid them do any other thing, above that which I have commanded you, you have no promise of God, but the curse that Paul threateneth: though we or an angel from heaven preach,' etc.

...

“Stand fast, brethren, and keep the ordinances that ye have learned, either by our preaching or by our epistle.’ Of these words they gather, that Paul taught divers things to the Thessalonians by word of mouth without writing, which nevertheless he commanded them to observe and do.

“I grant that Paul taught many things by word of mouth, which he wrote not in his epistles to the Thessalonians. But how shall they prove that the same things be neither written by him in any other of his epistles, nor in any other place of the holy Bible? For what argument is this? It is not written in this place or to those persons: *ergo*, it is not written in the Scripture at all? ... Moreover, Paul speaketh not here of doctrines of faith and charity, which ever continue without changing, adding, or minishing; but of certain traditions, observations, ceremonies, and outward rites and bodily exercises, which, as he saith, is little worth to God-ward, but to be used for comeliness, decent order, and uniformity in the Church, and to avoid schism: which ceremonies every good man is bound to keep, lest he trouble the common order, and so break the order of charity in offending his weak brethren, so long as they be approved, received, and used by the heads and common consent. But they, and every one of such ceremonies as be neither sacraments, nor commandments of faith and charity, may be altered and changed, and others set in their places, or else utterly taken away by the authority of princes, and other their rulers and subjects in the Church. Yea, also the traditions, made by the apostles in full council at Jerusalem, may be, and already are taken away; as to abstain from things offered unto images, from blood and strangled, are nowhere kept. And this of Paul, that a

man should neither pray nor preach capped, or with his head covered, is also clean abolished” (*A Confutation of Unwritten Verities*).

Preface to the Book of Common Prayer. “The particular Forms of Divine worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place of Authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient.” See also *Of Ceremonies*.

And, finally, among the Apologists, *Hooker*.

But his imperishable *Ecclesiastical Polity* must be read throughout, if the student would thoroughly master the subject. Quotations, to give any grasp of so elaborate a work, would altogether unduly multiply our pages. The following extract from Carwithen (*History of the Church of England*) may not however be out of place.

“The design of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, as stated by himself, was to settle the existing controversies on religion and government, and to ‘follow the light of sound and sincere judgment, without either cloud of prejudice, or mist of passionate affection.’ In his Introduction, he first considered what law is in general, and then distinguished its several kinds, and the obligations which each kind imposes. Having laid this foundation, he proceeded to undermine the ‘main pillar’ of the puritanical fabric, that Scripture ought to be the only rule of human actions. The other and weaker stay of their fabric was, that since God is both Teacher and Governor of his Church, there must of necessity be found in Scripture ‘some particular form of ecclesiastical polity, the laws whereof admit not any kind of alteration.’ The first three books being devoted to the consideration of these fundamental points, the fourth proceeded, ‘from the general grounds and foundations of the puritanical discipline,’ to answer the general accusations of the Puritans against the Church of England. Their general allegation was, that the Apostolical form of Church polity was corrupted by manifold Popish rites and ceremonies, and that the foreign reformed Churches had given an example which England ought to follow. From this general accusation a transition was made to particular charges, and these were discussed in the four remaining books. The fifth book contained an examination of the objections against the Book of Common Prayer and

Administration of the Sacraments. The sixth and seventh books relate to ‘the power of Jurisdiction,’ and two questions are therein discussed: the one, whether laymen, such as governing elders, ought to be invariably vested with this power? the other, whether Bishops may have that power over Pastors, and that accession of temporal dignity, which they possess in the English Church? ‘And because, besides the power of order which all consecrated persons have, and the power of jurisdiction which neither they all nor they only have, there is a third power, a power of ecclesiastical dominion,’ which is communicable to persons not ecclesiastical, and which ought to be restrained to the Sovereign of the whole body politic: the eighth and last book was allotted to this question, and the objections against the regal supremacy in ecclesiastical causes fully answered.”

It must be noted, that not a few questions arise as to the genuineness of the text of the last three books (not published in Hooker’s lifetime), which may not be easily satisfied, but into the discussion of which we cannot here enter. Upon the whole treatise, however, we may fairly say that it is a noble English Pyramid of Judiciousness.

Scriptural Proof.

1. *The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies.*

“There rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter. ... Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole Church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabus; and they wrote letters by them. ... It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well” (Acts 15:5–6, 22–23, 28–29).

For the Feast of *Purim*, instituted by Mordecai, see Esther 9:20–21, 28; Jos. Autt. 11:6, 13. And for that of *Dedication*, instituted by Judas Maccabeus, see 1 Macc. 4:41–59; 2 Macc. 10:1–8; Jos. Autt. 12:7, 7.

2. *The Church hath authority in Controversies of Faith.*

“As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other

doctrine” (1 Tim. 1:3).

“If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is besotted with pride (τετύφωται), understanding nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, ... supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself. ... For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith” (1 Tim. 6:3–5, 10).

“There are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth” (Titus 1:10–11, 13–14).

3. It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word Written.

“Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered” (Mark 7:9, 13). “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8). “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them” (Isa. 8:20).

4. So besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

“Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it” (Deut. 4:2). “The priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts” (Mal. 2:7). “In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men” (Matt. 15:9). “For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book” (Rev. 22:18–19).

The Church is a Witness and a Keeper of holy Writ.

“He established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children: that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children” (Psa. 78:5–6). “This is he, that was in the Church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai; and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us” (Acts 7:38). “The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth” (1 Tim. 3:5).

History and Doctrine.

II. *The Nature, Constitution, and Authority of General Councils.*

The first clause of Article 21, really levelled against the claims of the Popes to summon General Councils, is best treated by Barrow:

“If the Pope were sovereign of the Church, he would have power to convocate its supreme councils and judicatories, and would constantly have exercised it.

“This power therefore the Pope doth claim; and indeed did pretend to it a long time since, before they could obtain to exercise it. ...

“But it is manifest that the Pope cannot pretend to this power by virtue of any old ecclesiastical canon, none such being extant or produced by him; nor can he allege any ancient custom, there having been no general synod before Constantine: and as to the practice from that time, it is very clear, that for some ages the Popes did not assume or exercise such a power, and that it was not taken for their due. Nothing can be more evident, and it were extreme impudence to deny, that the emperors, at their pleasure, and by their authority, did congregate all the first general synods, for so the oldest historians in most express terms do report, so those princes in their edicts did aver, so the synods themselves did declare. The most just and pious emperors, who did bear greatest love to the clergy, and had much respect for the Pope, did call them without scruple; it was deemed their right to do it; none did remonstrate against their practice; the fathers in each synod did refer thereto, with allowance, and commonly with applause; Popes themselves did not contest their right, yea commonly did petition them to exercise it.

“These things are so clear and so obvious, that it is almost vain to prove them; I shall therefore but touch them.

“In general Socrates doth thus attest to the ancient practice; *We, saith he, do continually include time emperors in our history, because upon them, ever since they became Christians, ecclesiastical affairs have depended, and the greatest synods have been and are made by their appointment:* and Justinian in his prefatory type to the fifth general council beginneth thus: *It hath been ever the care of pious and orthodox emperors, by the assembling of the most religious bishops, to cut off heresies, as they did spring up; and by the right faith, sincerely preached, to keep the holy Church of God in peace:* and to do this was so proper to the emperors, that when Ruffin did affirm St. Hilary to have been excommunicated in a synod, St. Jerome, to confute him, did ask: *Tell me, what emperor did command this synod to be congregated?* implying it to be illegal or impossible that a synod should be congregated without the imperial command.

“Particularly Eusebius saith of the first Christian emperor, that *as a common bishop appointed by God he did summon synods of God’s ministers;* so did he command *a great number of bishops to meet at Arles* (for decision of the Donatists’ cause); so did he also *command* the bishops from all quarters to meet at Tyre, for examination of the affairs concerning Athanasius; and that he did convocate the great synod of Nice (the first and most renowned of all general synods) all the historians do agree, he did himself affirm, the fathers thereof in their synodical remonstrances did avow.

“The same course did his son Constantius follow, without impediment; for although he was a favourer of the Arian party, yet did the catholic bishops readily at his call assemble in the great synods of Sardica, of Arminum, of Seleucia, of Sirmium, of Milan, etc. Which he out of a great zeal to compose dissensions among the bishops did convocate.

“After him the emperor Valentinian understanding of dissensions about divine matters, to compose them, did indict a synod in Illyricum.

“A while after, for settlement of the Christian state (which had been greatly disturbed by the persecution of Julian and of Valeus, and by divers factions), Theodosius I did *command*, saith Theodoret, *the bishops of his empire to be assembled together at Constantinople;* the which meeting accordingly did make the second general synod: in the congregation of which the Pope had so little to do, that Baronius saith it was celebrated against his will.

“Afterwards, when Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, affecting to seem wiser than others in explaining the mystery of Christ’s incarnation, had raised a jangle to the disturbance of the Church, for removing it the emperor Theodosius II did *by his edict command the bishops to meet at Ephesus*; who there did celebrate the third general council: in the beginning of each action it is affirmed, that the synod was *convocated by the imperial decree*; the synod itself doth often profess it; the Pope’s own legate doth acknowledge it; and so doth Cyril the president thereof.

“The same emperor, upon occasion of Eutyches being condemned at Constantinople, and the stirs thence arising, did indict the second general synod of Ephesus (which proved abortive by the miscarriages of Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria), as appeareth by his imperial letters to Dioscorus and the other bishops, summoning them to that synod: *We have decreed, that the most holy bishops meeting together, etc. After the same manner the other most reverend bishops were written to, to come to the synod.* And as Pope Leo doth confess, calling it *the council of bishops, which you (Theodosius) commanded to be held at Ephesus.*

“The next general synod of Chalcedon was convocated by the authority of the emperor Marcian; as is expressed in the beginning of each action, as the emperor declareth, as the synod itself, in the front of its Definition, doth avow: *The holy, great, and ecumenical synod, gathered together by the grace of God and the command of our most dread emperors, etc., has determined as follows –*

“The fifth general synod was also congregated by the authority of Justinian I; and the emperor’s letter authorizing it beginneth (as we saw before) with an assertion (backed with a particular enumeration), that all former great synods were called by the same power: the fathers themselves do say, that they had *come together according to the will of God and the command of the most pious emperor.* So little had the Pope to do in it, that, as Baronius himself telleth us, it was congregated *against his will, or with his resistance.*

“The sixth general synod at Constantinople was also indicted by the emperor Constantine Pogonatus; as doth appear by his letters, as is intimated at the entrance of each action, as the synod doth acknowledge, as Pope Leo II (in whose time it was concluded) doth affirm. The synod, in its Definition, as also in its Epistle to Pope Agatha, doth inscribe itself, *The holy and ecumenical synod, congregated by the grace of God, and the*

altogether religious sanction of the most pious and most faithful great emperor Constantine; and in their Definition they say, By this doctrine of peace dictated by God, our most gracious emperor, through the divine wisdom being guided, as a defender of the true faith, and an enemy to the false, having gathered us together in this holy and ecumenical synod, has united the whole frame of the Church, etc. ...

“These are all the great synods which posterity with clear consent did admit as general: for the next two have been disclaimed by great churches (the seventh by most of the western churches, the eighth by the eastern), so that even divers Popes after them did not reckon them for general councils; and all the rest have been only assemblies of western bishops, celebrated after the breach between the oriental and occidental churches. ...

“This power indeed (of convening general councils) upon many just accounts peculiarly doth belong to princes; it suiteth to the dignity of their state, it appertaineth to their duty, they are most able to discharge it. They are the guardians of public tranquility, which constantly is endangered, which commonly is violated by dissensions in religious matters (whence we must pray for them, that by their care *we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty*); they alone can authorize their subjects to take such journeys, or to meet in such assemblies; they alone can well cause the expenses needful for holding synods to be exacted and defrayed; they alone can protect them, can maintain order and peace in them, can procure observance to their determinations; they alone have a sword to constrain resty and refractory persons (and in no cases are men so apt to be such as in debates about these matters), to convene, to confer peaceably, to agree, to observe what is settled; they, as *nursing fathers of the Church*, as *ministers of God’s kingdom*, as *encouragers of all good works*, as the stewards of God, entrusted with the great talents of power, dignity, wealth, enabling them to serve God, are obliged to cause bishops in such cases to perform their duty, according to the example of good princes in Holy Scripture, who are commended for proceedings of this nature” (*Treatise of the Pope’s Supremacy*).

As Dr. Boulton remarks, who briefly indicates Barrow’s argument:

“The historical facts being so clear, the next inquiry is upon what basis the Popes have founded their exclusive claim to summon, to preside over, to dismiss, a General Council. The answer is, that they founded their claim upon those elaborate forgeries and falsifications of ancient

documents, commenced by a writer under the name of Isidore in the middle of the ninth century. He produced what purported to be a collection of about a hundred decrees of the earliest Popes together with spurious writings of other prelates, and Acts of Synods. These decretals reigned unquestioned until the fifteenth century, and are the real basis of the papal claims.

There were other fabrications about the time of Gregory VII. In the middle of the twelfth century all these, with some additions, were engrafted into Gratian's *Decretum*, which became thenceforward the fundamental authority on Canon Law.

“In the middle of the thirteenth century a Catena of spurious passages of Greek Fathers and Councils was presented to Pope Urban IV, containing a basis for the papal claims. The contemporary Thomas Aquinas, unacquainted with Greek, received these forgeries, and adopted them all into his system of theology, which, as is well known, has been since the great authority on dogmatic divinity in the Roman Schools. This is the basis on which the papal claims have been established, and in reliance upon which Leo X and other Popes have issued their bulls claiming absolute jurisdiction in the matter of General Councils” (*Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*).

General Councils are but Synodal Assemblies – the outcome and reflex of national, provincial, diocesan, congregational – and therefore the representative aggregate can have no more inherent authority than the represented component parts of which it consists: “an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God.” Or if we look still more closely into the matter, every member of an ecclesiastical or other body, to prove infallibility, must himself, if an active and consulting or even only consenting agent therein, be infallible; for clearly no collection of fallible units can, in the nature of things, create an infallibility. Fallibility is not a homoeopathic poison, capable of dilution by any means artificial; but is often as potent under the miter as the sackcloth of the friar. To talk of the confirmation of a Pope rendering the decrees of a General Council infallible, is beyond measure childish and absurd; for the decrees are true or false, when made, and before confirmation.

The Fallibility of General Councils therefore arises from the fact of their being composed of fallible men; for before we admit the infallibility of man, we must have undeniable and patent evidence of the same. True, a Pope may claim and decree for himself even Personal Infallibility, as Pius

IX did, by a Conciliar *coup d'état* but this very cunning and loudest blasphemy is in itself one of the best, or worst, positive proofs of all time against the infallibility of Councils, as well as against the expediency or desirability of having Popes at their head.

The Council of the Vatican, convened and ruled by Pope Pius IX, is an eternal stigma burned into the Papacy, of which all honest Romanists must be ashamed.

And we have only further to open the page of history for too full and painful evidence of the fallibility of General Councils. The Council of Nice, 325, and that of Rimini, 359, called by Stillingfleet “the most General Council we read of in Church history,” flatly contradict each other on a vital point: the latter rejecting the Homoousion, and so deciding against the orthodox faith; decreeing only that the Son of God was “*like* (ὅμοιον) to the Father who begat Him.” And many like instances might be added, as will be seen below.

Nor has the conduct of some Councils been of a nature to impress us with their infallibility – notably the Vatican, the “robber Council” of Ephesus, and the lecherous General Council of Constance. So that few impartial readers of Church history will refuse to commend the words of Gregory Nazianzen: “I, if permitted to write the truth, am so affected in my mind, that I would fly from all Councils of Bishops, since I never saw a happy or prosperous end of one Council; for each terminated, not so much to the expulsion of evil as to its accession and increase.”

In 787, the second Council of Nice, convened by the Jezebel Irene, who had accomplished the death of her husband by poison, reversed the decrees of the Council of Constantinople of 754, and ordained the Salutation of images, and that Incense should be offered to them; which blasphemy in its turn was again formally and unanimously rejected by the Council at Frankfort, 794, under Charlemagne, and its sentence endorsed by another Council at Constantinople, 814, assembled by the Emperor Leo. Yet again, the Empress Theodora convened another Council at Constantinople, 842, which reaffirmed the second Nicene decrees, and reinstated the worship of images; confirmed and renewed by a further Council at Constantinople, 879 – which was commemorated by the Greeks in an annual festival called “the Feast of Orthodoxy” – and finally established by Trent. Were it not beyond measure painful and humiliating, what an amusing infallible dueling of infallibilities!

Then we have: –

The fourth Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III, 1215, which asserted Transubstantiation [by silence approving the Pope’s Canon] – “That the Body and Blood of Christ are contained really in the Sacrament of the Altar, under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine into his Blood, by the power of God.” This Council also “insinuated” the doctrine of Seven Sacraments.

The Council of Constance, summoned by Pope John XXIII, 1414, which forbade the Cup to the Laity, and denounced “effectual punishment” against “all such as shall transgress this decree, or shall exhort the people to communicate in both kinds”; though admitting that “Christ did administer this holy sacrament to his disciples in both kinds,” as also that “the faithful in the Primitive Church did receive under both kinds.” And by way of Te Deum burned the bones and writings of Wickliffe, and committed the bodies of Jerome of Prague and John Huss to the flames notwithstanding the “plenary safe-conduct” granted the latter by the Emperor, and sent him by this blood-stained and perjured Council.

The Council of Florence, summoned by Pope Eugene IV, 1439, which decreed the doctrine of Purgatory – “That if any, being truly penitent, depart in the love of God before they have satisfied for their commissions and omissions by the worthy fruits of repentance, their souls are cleansed by the pains of purgatory; and the suffrages of the faithful still alive, such as sacrifices of the mass, prayers, and alms, contribute to the relief of such pains!” What a mine of gold! Rome! *The Judgment Seat of Christ!!* This Council also first sanctioned the Invocation of Saints and Angels.

The Council of Trent, first summoned. By Pope Paul III, 1545, which established and finally decreed the most flagrant blasphemies of former Councils, such as: –

Human Tradition (first mentioned)	Session	4
Justification by Works		6
Seven Sacraments		7
Intention	7	
Transubstantiation		13
Adoration of the Host		13
Auricular Confession and Absolution (first decreed)		14

Prayers for the Dead	20	
Denial of the Cup to the Laity	21	
Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass (first decreed)	22	
Latin Service	22	
Celibacy	24	
Purgatory	25	
Invocation of Angels and Saints	25	
Worship of Images	25	
Worship of Relics	25	

Finally, the Council of the Vatican, convened by Pope. Pius IX, 1870, which decreed the Personal Infallibility of the Pope. And the same Pio Nono, 1854, defined and decreed the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary – a dogma which the Fathers are unanimous against, as well as the thirteen General Councils claimed by Rome, and on which even the Council of Trent declined to make any decree (Session 5). We must add that the Perpetual Virginity of Mary was constituted an Article of Faith by Pope Pius IV, 1564 – another dogma which none of the ancient Creeds maintain, and which none of the Councils of the Church Catholic in East or West defined.

And yet all these things are but samples of the “errors” of General Councils – of the Papacy at war against God and His Word, as well as, in many instances, at war with itself.

Nor were the holy Fathers even of Nicaea very commendable in their philosophy.

“The Councils of Nicaea, Vienna, and the Lateran patronized the hateful and degrading doctrine of materialism. Angels and souls the Nicaeans represented as corporeal. The angels of heaven and the souls of men, if the Nicaean Doctors are to be credited, possess bodies, though of a refined, thin, subtle, and attenuated description. These evangelical and mental forms, the learned metaphysicians admitted, were composed of a substance less gross indeed than the human flesh or nerve, and less firm than the human bone or sinew, but nevertheless material, tangible, and visible. The Council of Vienna improved on that of Nicaea. The holy, infallible Fathers of Vienna declared the soul not only of the same substance, but also essentially and in itself of the true and perfect form of the body. The rational and intellectual mind, therefore, in this system

possesses a material and corporeal shape, and has circumference, diameter, length, breadth, and thickness. This definition the sacred Synod issued, to teach all men the true faith. This doctrine, according to the same authority, is Catholicism, and the contrary is heresy. The Lateran Council, in its eighth session, followed the Viennese definition, and decreed that the human spirit, truly, essentially, and in itself, exists in the form of the human frame. Three holy universal Councils in this manner patronized the materialism which was afterwards obtruded on the world by a Priestly, a Voltaire, and a Hume” (Edgar’s *Variations*).

Of what good then are General Councils? We may answer it –

(1) For the first three hundred years after Christ, there were no General Councils. For when heresies arose, they were suppressed by Provincial Synods, held in different parts of the world, readily communicating with each other, for the maintenance of the common faith. During which period too, we must remember that, in the total absence of General Councils, the Church was constituted, and the Scriptures received; whereas the first catalogue wherein Apocryphal Books were admitted was that of a Council – the Third Carthage, 397. As the Roman Catholic Du Piu frankly acknowledges: “The first Catalogue wherein the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and the two Maccabees were admitted as Canonical, and as having the same authority, is that of the third Council of Carthage, held in the year 397; which confirms the Decree of the Council of Hippo of the year 393, wherein these books were received into the Canon; yet upon condition that the Church beyond sea should be consulted for its confirmation, as is implied in an ancient note on that Canon, which runs thus, *De con firmando isto canone transmarina ecclesia consulatur*” (History of the Canon). And it might have been well perhaps if the example of the first three centuries had been continued.

(2) The first four General Councils were a good. They declared and testified to the Godhead of Christ, of the same substance with the Father, and to the Godhead of the Holy Ghost; and to the true union of the Divine and the human natures in Christ, in one Person, yet without confusion. But as Burnet observes: “These truths we find in the Scriptures, and, therefore, we believe them. We reverence those Councils for the sake of their doctrine; but do not believe the doctrine for the authority of the Councils. There appeared too much of human frailty in some of their other

proceedings, to give us such an implicit submission to them, as to believe things only because they so decided them.”

(3) Although General Councils are in no wise absolutely necessary to the being of the Church, yet as supreme ecclesiastical assemblies, they may be, and have been, of use in maintaining soundness of faith and an essential unity of the Churches, under the blessing and guidance of the Holy Ghost; whereas when controlled and directed by Popes, they have only been the instruments of perpetuating and consolidating the most pernicious and soul-destroying errors. The Authority of General Councils therefore must and can only consist in their conformity to the Word of God.

But we are happily relieved of lengthened discussion, inasmuch as there is *no existing formula in the Church of England binding her members to accept the decisions of any General Council as authoritative, or even in accordance with Scripture*. On this point the remarks of Dr. Boulton are most apposite and valuable: –

“The first Article of Henry VIII (1536) recognized the judgments of the first four Councils against heresies. But that document, as it is well known, has no authority, and is in many respects in direct opposition to the Thirty-nine Articles. The Reformers of Edward’s reign spoke with great respect of the four great Councils. The ‘*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*’ declares that we reverently accept the four great Ecumenical Synods; but this document also has no authority. All this, then, and more which might be quoted, falls short of recognition by our Church. There was, however, in addition to this, a recognition to a certain extent of the four Councils in the Act of Parliament (1 Eliz. Cap. i. 36) which restored the supremacy over the Church to the Crown. Authority having been given to the Crown by that Act to exercise its supremacy by means of commissioners appointed by letters patent under the great seal of England, the proviso was added that such commissioners should ‘not in any wise have authority or power to order, determine, or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as heretofore have been determined, ordered, or adjudged to be heresy by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the *first four General Councils*, or any of them, or by any other General Council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures, or such as shall be ordered, adjudged, or determined to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament of this realm with the assent of the clergy in their Convocation.

“This proviso of the Act was evidently intended to be a check on an undue exercise of the royal prerogative. The dogmatic decisions of the first four Councils relate to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity only, as it is professed in the Creeds, and these were adopted by Parliament as a guide to the Royal Commissioners. The majority of the canons of those Councils refer to matters of organization and discipline, and are wholly omitted in the clause of the Act just quoted, which refers to judgments on questions of *heresy*, not of *discipline*. To this extent, therefore, the doctrinal, but not the disciplinary, canons of the four Councils appear to have been legally binding as a limitation to the judicial authority of the Crown in questions of heresy. But the abolition of the High Commission in 1640 seems to have annulled this also. Vain, then, is the assertion in a recent addition of the Canons of the four Councils that the decrees of the first four General Councils are declared as authoritative by Act of Parliament; whereas several of the disciplinary decrees will be found in direct collision with the usages and organization of the Church of England” (*Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*).

Scriptural Proof.

Under the Old Testament economy, we find that it was “Princes,” or chief rulers, and not High Priests, who convened councils. Thus it was to Moses the Ruler and Judge, and not to Aaron the High Priest, that the Lord said, “Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel,” Num. 11:16. Joshua his successor, and not Eleazer the High Priest, convened a council at Shechem, “to put away the strange gods,” Josh. 24:1, 23. King David “gathered together all the princes of Israel,” and distributed the Priests, and Levites, and Porters into courses, and regulated their offices, 1 Chron. 23–26. Though evidently assisted in the onerous task by Gad the King’s Seer and Nathan the Prophet, 2 Chron. 29:25. It was King Solomon, and not Azariah the High Priest, that “assembled the elders of Israel, and all the heads of the tribes, the chief of the fathers of the children of Israel at Jerusalem,” to consult about “bringing up the ark of the covenant of the Lord out of the city of David,” 1 Kings 8:1. King Asa, and not Azariah (the son of Johanan) the High Priest, “gathered all Judah and Benjamin,” and suppressed idolatry, and renewed the altar of the Lord, 2 Chron. 15. King Hezekiah, and not “Azariah the High Priest of the house of Zadok,” gathered the Priests and Levites, and exhorted them to sanctify themselves,

and cleansed the house of the Lord, 2 Chron. 29. King Josiah, and not Hilkiah the High Priest, “sent and gathered together all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem,” and renewed the national covenant with Jehovah, 2 Chron. 34.

But here we must pause. In the New Testament, we have no record of anything approaching the idea of a General Council, save the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem (Acts 15); but this was altogether unique. As Bishop Burnet observes: “It will not be easy to prove that this was such a Council as to be a pattern to succeeding ones to copy after it. ... Here is no precedent of a Council, much less of a General one: but a decision is made by men that were in other things divinely inspired, which can have no relation to the judgments of other Councils.” In the words of Dr. Grier: “The only Synod, before or since, on which the Holy Spirit may be said to have shed His heavenly influence.”

History and Doctrine.

III. *Excommunication.*

Following, according to their lights, the lines of Apostolic example, the governors of the early Church gradually elaborated a Code of discipline, varied at different times and in different places, which at first sight seems, if not cruel, yet severe. But before we absolutely condemn them, we must assume their standpoint. They had to deal with raw recruits. From Judaism, with its lax and now almost effete spiritual life; from Heathendom, with its sensuous lawlessness. Still, the great end of ecclesiastical discipline is, not to destroy but to *win back* an erring brother, taking tender care that he be not “swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.” And therefore, so far as we may judge, and making every allowance, we venture to think the primitive Church did act at least injudiciously.

Towards the middle of the third century we find an organized system, and a division of penitents into classes:

Flentes, weepers; candidates for admission to penance: prostrate at the church doors, and supplicating the prayers of the faithful.

Audientes, hearers; permitted to hear the Scriptures and sermon, but not admitted to the prayers or Communion.

Genufectens or *Substrati*; kneelers in the nave of the church, joining in the special prayers for them.

Consistentes; co-standers with the faithful at the Holy Table; joining in the common prayers, but not partaking of the Communion.

All penitents, during the time of their probation, had to appear in sackcloth and ashes, with shaven hair, give practical proof of their liberality to the poor, and make public confession.

They were divided into classes, according to their offences; and the duration of their penance adjusted accordingly. For the heavier crimes, years or a lifetime. The Bishop ordinarily was the absolver; and he might abridge the period of excommunication. Nor were princes exempt. Thus St. Ambrose put Theodosius to penance for the slaughter of seven thousand men in Thessalonica.

Still Cyprian could write: “Our patience, facility, and humanity are ready to all who come. I wish all to be brought back into the Church: I wish all our fellow-soldiers to be contained within the camp of Christ and the mansions of God the Father. I forgive all; I disguise much; from an earnest desire of collecting the brotherhood, I do not minutely scrutinize all the faults which have been committed against God. I myself often err, by forgiving offences more than I ought. Those returning in repentance, and those confessing their sins with simple and humble satisfaction, I embrace with prompt and full delight” (Lib. i. Ep. 3). This is the Gospel.

But when Popery became dominant, Excommunication proved a formidable weapon in the hands of the so-called successors of St. Peter; as exemplified in the well-known instances of Huss, Wickliffe, the Emperor Henry IV, and John of England.

Calvin’s system has at least the merit of mercy; and more than this – the basis of Christ’s own law. Private Admonition; Rebukes before Witnesses; Excommunication. See Matt. 18:15–17.

“But as the whole body of the Church are required to act thus mildly, and not to carry their rigour against those who have lapsed to an extreme, but rather to act charitably towards them, according to the precept of Paul, so every private individual ought proportionately to accommodate himself to this clemency and humanity. Such as have, therefore, been expelled from the Church, it belongs not to us to expunge from the number of the elect, or to despair of, as if they were already lost. We may lawfully judge them aliens from the Church, and so aliens from Christ, but only during the time of their excommunication. If then, also, they give greater evidence of petulance than of humility, still let us commit them to the judgment of the

Lord, hoping better of them in future than we see at present, and not ceasing to pray to God for them. And (to sum up in one word) let us not consign to destruction their person, which is in the hand, and subject to the decision, of the Lord alone; but let us merely estimate the character of each man's acts according to the Law of the Lord. In following this rule, we abide by the divine judgment rather than give any judgment of our own. Let us not arrogate to ourselves greater liberty in judging, if we would not limit the power of God, and give the law to his mercy. Whenever it seems good to him, the worst are changed into the best; aliens are ingrafted, and strangers are adopted into the Church. This the Lord does, that he may disappoint the thoughts of men, and confound their rashness – a rashness which, if not curbed, would usurp a power of judging to which it has no title” (Calvin's *Institutes*).

In the Church of England at the present time, we have lost, in a great measure, if indeed not altogether, the power of the keys, so far as ecclesiastical discipline is concerned, except over ecclesiastics. True, our Canons and Articles and Prayer Book assert the principle. But who dares repel? Not a few clergymen know that “open and notorious evil livers” do come to the Holy Communion. But are we not powerless? We may read the Exhortations with emphasis, declaim against the sin of communicating unworthily, or take the very questionable step of preaching at the sinner. But this is about all. Even if it deters, and we have painful cases in which it rather leads to obstinacy and daring, yet it does not vindicate Christ's law. What a lamentable thing, that the Church of England alone of all denominations in Christendom, is practically a Church without discipline – a lay free and easy. The only remedy we can see, is for the Clergy at large, backed by the pious laity, to urge Convocation to appeal to Parliament to sanction and legalize our return to some judicious measure of “godly discipline”. If we are a State Church, it is not the less, but only the more important, that we should be a law-abiding Church. Who knows how much of the anarchy in civil society may not have been engendered by the laxity of our National Church? Lawlessness in religion must perforce beget lawlessness all round. Cease to honour God, and it is less than a hair's breadth to cease to honour man or the most sacred institutions. Let the fountain become contaminated, and every stream is defiled.

As Dr. Boulton observes: –

“The Roman law of excommunication may be seen in any treatise on the Canon Law, and will be found to legalize and require the religious tyranny and persecution of the Middle Ages. The Council of Trent speaks in guarded language on this point in its closing decree, but sufficiently indicates its demand for the exercise of the power of the State to persecute.

“By the Canons of the Church of England (A.D. 1603) impugners of the king’s supremacy, or of the doctrine and ceremonial of the Church, and all schismatics, are declared to be excommunicate. The same sentence is pronounced upon various offenders against sundry regulations, and also upon those guilty of grave immorality.

“By the common law of England the civil courts formerly enforced penalties on the excommunicated. The progress of legal reform since the Reformation gradually diminished this exercise of the civil power; and it has been entirely removed by modern legislation, excepting so far as it may be in vindication of the proper discipline and jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts over ecclesiastics.

“Excommunication can only be pronounced by a lawful ecclesiastical judge, sitting in open court, and after a due hearing of the cause. The expression ‘*ipso facto excommunicated*,’ in several of the Canons, implies no more than that if the person in question be ultimately sentenced, the excommunication will be retrospective and date back from the commission of the offence. But it does not empower any one to deal with the supposed offender as an excommunicated person on his own private judgment. Nothing but a formal and legal sentence of excommunication can justify such a treatment. This is important, as bearing on the Rubrics, in the Burial and Communion Services.

“In the present state of the law it is doubtful how far an ecclesiastical court can pronounce sentence on a lay person in any case whatever” (*Exposition of the Articles*).

Scriptural Proof.

Every religious community, to be in a healthy state, must possess and exercise the power of excluding from its membership those who trample upon its laws.

As Israel was to be God’s peculiar people, we find him enacting innumerable statutes and judgments to guard the sanctity of his chosen ones. It is not our business here to take up the detail of the various

denunciations against sin and pollution under the Mosaic economy, nor examine their fitness of time and place; that were a long and somewhat intricate, though interesting, study. But the principle throughout all is apparent, that “God is greatly to be feared in the assembly of the saints, and to be had in reverence of all them that are about Him.”

Jewish writers enumerate three different degrees of Excommunication, according to the gravity of the offence:

Niddui (נִדְּוִי) – separation for a month, or longer in case of impenitence: involving various restrictions in civil as well as ecclesiastical matters; and to which the ἀφορίζειν of Luke 6:22, and the αποσυνάγωγος of John 9:22, probably refer.

Cherem (כְּרֵם) – a second and more public and formal kind, accompanied with imprecations from Deut. 28; and involving severer restrictions for an indefinite period.

Shammata (שָׁמַטָּא) – complete and irrevocable excommunication, but seldom if ever used.

“Concerning the gates of the temple Godwin observes, that there were two of principal note, both built by Solomon; the one for those that were new married, the other for mourners and excommunicated persons. The mourners, he saith, were distinguished from the excommunicated by having their lips covered with a skirt of their garment; none entered that gate with their lips uncovered but such as were excommunicated. The Mishna saith, ‘All that enter, according to the custom of the temple, go in on the right-hand way, go round and go out on the left-hand way; except a person, *cui accidit aliquid*, who is rendered unclean by a particular circumstance, who goes round and enters on the left. And being asked why he does so, if he answers, Because I mourn, they reply, He who inhabits this house comfort thee. If he answer, Because I am excommunicated, the reply is, according to R. Jose, He who inhabits this house put it into thy heart to hearken to the words of thy companions, or brethren, that they may receive thee.’ It appears from hence (at least according to the opinion of the mishnical rabbis), that excommunicated persons were not excluded from the temple; though they were from the synagogue, as we learn from several passages in the evangelist John, 9:22, 12:42, 16:2, where such persons are said to be αποσυναγωγοι, excluded from the synagogue. Not that we are to infer from this, that the Jews accounted their synagogues more holy than the temple; but it shows what was, and should be, the true intent of excommunication,

namely, the shaming and humbling an offender, in order to bring him to repentance, on which account he was excluded the society of his neighbours in the synagogue; but not his eternal destruction, by driving him from the presence of God in the temple, and depriving him of the use of the most solemn ordinances, and the most effectual means of grace and salvation. The temple was the common place of worship for Israelites; by allowing him to come thither they signified, that they did not exclude him from the common privilege of an Israelite, though they would not receive him into their familiarity and friendship. How much heavier is the yoke of Antichrist than the Jewish yoke of bondage! How much more cruel is the excommunication of Popery, which deprives persons of all their liberties and privileges, of their goods and lives, and consigns over their souls to be tormented in Hell forever! How infinitely more cruel, I say, is this modern excommunication than even that of the wicked and barbarous Jews who crucified the Lord of glory!” (Jennings’s *Jewish Antiquities*.)

In the New Testament, the same broad principles of ecclesiastical discipline are laid down and acted upon. The liberty wherewith Christ hath made His people free, is not allowed to degenerate into a cloak of licentiousness.

Our Lord: “Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained (εκέρδησας – *reclaimed*, gained to God) thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them (παρακούση – obstinately refuse), tell it unto the Church (τη εκκλησια – that congregation of which thou and he are members): but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as the heathen man and the publican (ο – generic, inasmuch and as far as he is a Heathen and a Publican),” Matt. 18:15–17. But note Christ’s Mercy. There is to be no stint or limit to *the spirit of forgiveness*. See verses 21, 22, and Luke 17:4.

St. Paul and the incestuous man. “For I verily, as absent in ‘body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed – 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 unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus” (1 Cor. 5:3–

5). Whatever different views may be taken by commentators upon some of the clauses of this passage, yet all upon the whole are agreed that it refers to and sanctions excommunication. But here again there is mercy. The incestuous man is ultimately forgiven, reinstated, and comforted. See 2 Cor. 6–8.

Parallels. Rom. 16:17; 1 Cor. 5:11; 2 Thess. 3:6, 14–15; Titus 3:10; 2 John 9–11.

But we must remember that this power of binding and loosing belongs not to the Pope, Bishop, or minister, as an individual, but to the Church or Congregation, in its corporate and sessional capacity – its chief officers duly convened, and the whole body of the faithful as assessors. Thus the Apostle, though inspired and possessing miraculous powers, appealed to the assembled Corinthians to reject and restore. And by parity of reasoning, we may conclude that he thus acted in other cases.

The great ends of excommunication therefore are, to vindicate the honour of the Church's divine Head, to deter others, and to bring back the offender to God.

So Calvin: "There are three ends to which the Church has respect in thus correcting and excommunicating. The first is, that God may not be insulted by the name of Christians being given to those who lead shameful and flagitious lives, as if his holy Church were a combination of the wicked and abandoned. For seeing that the Church is the body of Christ, she cannot be defiled by such fetid and putrid members, without bringing some disgrace on her Head. Therefore, that there may be nothing in the Church to bring disgrace on his sacred name, those whose turpitude might throw infamy on the name, must be expelled from his family. And here, also, regard must be had to the Lord's Supper, which might be profaned by a promiscuous admission. For it is most true, that he who is entrusted with the dispensation of it, if he knowingly and willingly admits any unworthy person whom he ought and is able to repel, is as guilty of sacrilege as if he had cast the Lord's body to dogs. Wherefore, Chrysostom bitterly inveighs against priests, who, from fear of the great, dare not keep any one back. 'Blood (says he, Hom. 83, in Matt.) will be required at your hands. If you fear man, he will mock you, but if you fear God, you will be respected also by men. Let us not tremble at fescues, purple, or diadems; our power here is greater. Assuredly I will sooner give up my body to death, and allow my blood to be shed, than be a partaker of that pollution.' Therefore, lest this

most sacred mystery should be exposed to ignominy, great selection is required in dispensing it, and this cannot be except by the jurisdiction of the Church. A second end of discipline is, that the good may not, as usually happens, be corrupted by constant communication with the wicked. For such is our proneness to go astray, that nothing is easier than to seduce us from the right course by bad example. To this use of discipline the apostle referred when he commanded the Corinthians to discard the incestuous man from their society. ‘A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump’ (1 Cor. 5:6). And so much danger did he foresee here, that he prohibited them from keeping company with such persons. ‘If any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one, no not to eat’ (1 Cor. 5:11). A third end of discipline is, that the sinner may be ashamed, and begin to repent of his turpitude. Hence it is for their interest also that their iniquity should be chastised, that whereas they would have become more obstinate by indulgence, they may be aroused by the rod. This the apostle intimates when he thus writes – ‘If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed’ (2 Thess. 3:14). Again, when he says that he had delivered the Corinthian to Satan, ‘that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus’ (1 Cor. 5:5); that is, as I interpret it, he gave him over to temporal condemnation, that he might be made safe for eternity. And he says that he gave him over to Satan because the devil is without the Church, as Christ is in the Church. Some interpret this of a certain infliction on the flesh, but this interpretation seems to me most improbable.” (August. De Verb. Apostol. Serm. 68, *Institutes*.)

The Church. Its Sacraments.

[We think it well to arrange all the Articles on the Sacraments in one group, reciting the English and The Latin in separate, consecutive pages. The reader will perhaps thus be better enabled to pursue the subject as a continuous whole, without the distraction of the several breaks that otherwise occur. At all events, a change in the usual mode of treatment may not be altogether unacceptable.]

Of the Sacraments.

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

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

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

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

Of Baptism.

Article XXVII – Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that he not christened; but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptism of young Children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

Of the Lord’s Supper.

Article XXVIII – The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians: ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ’s death, insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with Faith, receive the same, the Bread

which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ, in the use of the Lord's Supper.

Article XXIX – The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

Of Both Kinds.

Article XXX – The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.

Article XXXI – The Offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

De Sacramentis.

Articulus XXV – Sacramenta a Christo instituta non tantum sunt notae professionis Christianorum, sed certa quaedam potius testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiae, atque bonae in nos voluntatis Dei, per quae invisibiliter ipse in nos operatur, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

Duo a Christo Domino nostro in Evangelio instituta sunt Sacramenta, scilicet Baptismus, et Coena Domini.

Quinque illa vulgo nominata Sacramenta, scilicet Confirmatio, Poenitentia, Ordo, Matrimonium, et Extrema Unctio, pro Sacramentis Evangelicis habenda non sunt: ut quae partim a prava Apostolorum imitatione profluxerunt, partim vitae status sunt in Scripturis quidem probati; sed Sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Coena Domini rationem non habentes, ut quae signum aliquod visibile, seu caeremoniam a Deo institutam, non habeant.

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

De Baptismo.

Articulus XXVII – Baptismus non est tantum professionis signum, ac discriminis nota, qua Christiani a non Christianis discernantur, sed etiam est signum Regenerationis, per quod, tanquam per instrumentum, recte Baptismus suscipientes, Ecclesiae inscuntur, promissiones de remissione peccatorum, atque adoptione nostra in filios Dei per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et vi divinae invocationis gratia augetur.

Baptismus parvularum omnino in Ecclesia retinendus est, ut qui cum Christo institutione optime congruat.

De Coena Domini.

Articulus XXVIII – Coena Domini non est tantum signum mutuae benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est Sacramentum nostrae per mortem Christi redemptionis.

Atque adeo, rite, digne, et eum fide sumentibus, panis quem frangimus est communicatio corporis Christi; similiter poculum benedictionis est communicatio sanguinis Christi.

Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia et sacris literis probari non potest. Sed aperte Scripturae verbis adversatur, Sacramenti naturam evertit, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in Coena, tantum coelesti et spirituali ratione. Medium autem, quo corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in Coena, fides est.

Sacramentum Eucharistiae et institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

De Manducatione Corporis Christi, et impios illud non manducare.

Articulus XXIX – Impii, et fide viva destituti, licet carnaliter et visibiliter (ut Augustinus loquitur) corporis et sanguinis Christi Sacramentum dentibus premant, nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur. Sed potius tantae rei Sacramentum, seu symbolum, ad iudicium sibi manducant et bibunt.

De Utraque Specie.

Articulus XXX – Calix Domini laicis non est denegandus, utraque enim pars Dominici Sacramenti, et Christi institutione et praecepto, omnibus Christianis ex aequo administrari debet.

De unica Christi Oblatione in Cruce Perfecta.

Articulus XXXI. – Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus. Neque praeter illam unicum est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde Missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem poenae, aut culpa, pro vivis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciosae imposturae.

History and Doctrine.

As Luther propounded that Justification by Faith was the *Articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiae*, so we hold that the due appreciation of the Sacraments is the gauge of a standing or a falling Christian.

They are not salvation: as against Rome.

They are not a sort of spiritual substantiality, containing and conveying grace, apart from the soul's own God-drawn action: as against the Schoolmen.

They are not bare and naked signs, or mere external symbols and memorials: as against Zwingli and many modern Dissenters.

But they are the signs and seals and channels of grace, to those that duly and worthily receive them.

They are, moreover, the introduction into the Kingdom of God; and the ordinary means, together with prayer, the Word, and the preaching of that Word, of the sustenance of the life of that kingdom.

They are outwardly the badges of the Christian; and inwardly and spiritually the “earnest of our inheritance in order to the full redemption (εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν) of his purchased possession, for the praise of His glory.”

They are, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

We have thus opened a wide field, on which thousands of lances have been couched; some in furious attack on God's truth, and others nobly in its defense.

Nor is it difficult to understand how the Sacraments have thus been made for so many ages the battleground of Christianity. Satan could not bear to see sons and daughters of undoubting faith brought into the Kingdom of Christ, and sitting down at the Table of the Lord. And therefore as of old he whispers suspicion, and instils his deadly poison. “Yea, hath God said, that washing with water in the name of the Trinity ‘doth save,’

and that eating and drinking consecrated bread and wine doth ‘preserve your bodies and souls unto everlasting life’? God doth surely mean and know that there must be adjuncts to the water, and mysterious changes and properties in and with the bread and wine.” And so the deluded mind of man, once losing its firm hold of and resolute stand by the Word, is led to seek out many inventions. And the consequence is, the Church has been staggered and estranged; and with the deplorable neglect of the Sacraments, and especially of the Supper of the Lord, has gone much of all the other means and ordinances of grace. Is it not a fact, that where the Lord’s Supper is neglected, private and family reading of the Word is too often neglected also, private and family prayer, and careful and prayerful attendance in the House of God? Satan has triumphed.

And even now, notwithstanding all the Reformation did for us, in clearing away the overshadowings of the Evil One and the mists of unbelief, and thus bringing the blessed company of the faithful more and more into one bond of fellowship, the Sacraments are again made the discordant elements for destroying the Unity of the Body of Christ.

But God never said that consecrated water, or bread, or wine, doth save. The whole tenor of Scripture shows, as we shall find, that the Sacraments profit nothing, but by faith and through the power of the Holy Ghost.

Anything like an exhaustive account of Sacramental Literature would fill our pages. We must therefore be content to trace less or more in outline some of the leading opinions which have been held, and briefly examine as we may, within reasonable limits, and having due regard to the importance and extent of the subject, wherein they are against or for the plain teaching of the Bible.

The word Sacrament is of Latin origin, and not found in Scripture. It is derived by some from the *Sacramentum* or military oath, to be faithful, of the Roman soldiers. But we must remember that early writers use it of holy things or sacred mysteries. Thus Augustine: “It were long to dispute of the diversity of signs, which, when they pertain to Divine things, are called Sacraments.” And the Greek μυστήριον, mystery, was often rendered by the old Latin translators, *sacramentum*, sacrament, as a convertible term. “The mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations, but now is manifested to his saints, to whom God would make known the riches of the glory of this sacrament among the Gentiles” (Col. 1:26–27). And again:

“Great is the sacrament of godliness, God manifest in the flesh” (1 Tim. 3:16).

Thus we may see how, through this laxity of phraseology, the term Sacrament came to be employed of divers holy things, other than those we now repute as sacraments.

With the exception of sentimentalists or ultra-spiritualists, and those who take mere rationalistic views, all, Protestants and Romanists, agree in defining a Sacrament as an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, *instituted by Christ*.

This definition, acquiesced in as we have just said by Rome, clearly cuts off her five alleged extra Sacraments. Thus, *Catechism of the Council of Trent*: “A Sacrament is a thing subject to the senses; and possessing, *by divine institution*, at once the power of signifying sanctity and justice, and of imparting, both to the receiver.” (Of course this alleged “power” is not before us at present.) And so Professor Donovan, in his Translation of the Catechism: “Of the many definitions, each of them sufficiently appropriate, which may serve to explain the nature of a sacrament, there is none more comprehensive, none more perspicuous, than that of St. Augustine – a definition which has since been adopted by all scholastic writers; ‘A sacrament,’ says he, ‘is a sign of a sacred thing’; or, in other words of the same import, ‘A sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, *instituted for our justification.*’” And again, *The Abridgment of Christian Doctrine*: “A sacrament is a visible sign of invisible grace, *clearly instituted by Christ for our sanctification.*” But when we descend to particulars, Rome confesses, even in the same Abridgment, for example for Confirmation, one of her so-called sacraments: “The time of Institution is not certain, but divines hold that it was most probably instituted at Christ’s last supper, or between his resurrection and ascension.” And of Matrimony: “When and where Christ instituted this sacrament is uncertain. Some think it done, or at least insinuated, at the wedding in Cana in Galilee, where Christ was present, and wrought his first miracle, by turning water into wine. Others, more probably, say it was done when Christ declared the indissolubility of marriage, saying, ‘Therefore now, they are not two but one flesh: that therefore which God hath joined together, let no man separate.’” And so Rome is forced to forsake her own basis of a sacrament (the “clear institution of Christ”), and take refuge in “probabilities” and the opinions of men – tradition: supplementing the Written Word.

It is painful, but important, to note the rise and development of Sacramental Ritualism. And by *ritualism* we mean, here as elsewhere, the devices of Satan prompting and taking advantage of the weakness and pride of the human heart to draw it away from the simplicity of the Gospel. The infant Church was surrounded on the one hand by a carnal Judaism, and on the other hand by an awe-inspiring, pompous, and sensuous Pagan ritual. Would it not be well and expedient and make for the extension of Christianity to have a gorgeous ritual and a display of sacerdotal power – to have Christ on the altar rather than on Calvary? And the bait took. But, alas! What the Church gained in numbers she lost a hundredfold in spirituality. She “lengthened her cords,” but did not “strengthen her stakes”. She became a Queen, and sat upon many waters, but forgot she was the widowed Bride of the Lamb that was slain.

And thus as early as towards the middle or close of the second century the cloven hoof of superstition was seen. Holy Baptism began to be accompanied with anointing, in unholy mystic symbolism of the unction of the Holy Ghost, and the administration of milk and honey (then the common food of infants) to symbolize a new birth to righteousness and innocence. Holy Communion also began to be included among the mysteries, and treated as a Sacrifice, with mystic solemnity. Both sacraments thus gradually modelled after the pagan mysteries of the East. And the successors of the Overseers and Presbyters of the meek and lowly Church of the Apostles assumed the Sacerdotal titles of Jews and Heathens, and donned their gorgeous apparel.

And when we come to the third century, this also is the express declaration of the Historian: –

“All the monuments of this century which have come down to us show that there was a great increase of ceremonies. To the several causes of this which have already been mentioned, we may add as a principal one, the passion for Platonic philosophy, or rather the popular Oriental superstition respecting demons, adopted by the Platonists, and borrowed by the Christian doctors. ... Hence arose public exorcisms, the multiplication of fasts, and the aversion to matrimony. ... And hence the painful austerities and penances enjoined upon offenders. ... The use of incense was now introduced. ... Longer prayers and more of ceremony were annexed to the Lord’s Supper. ... Neither penitents nor the unbaptized were allowed to be present at the celebration of this ordinance, which practice, it is well known,

was derived from the pagan mysteries. Gold and silver vessels were used in it. ... Some deemed the morning, some the afternoon, and some the evening to be the most suitable time for its celebration. Neither were all agreed how often this most sacred ordinance should be repeated. But all believed it absolutely necessary to the attainment of salvation, and therefore they universally required infants to become partakers of it. They believed that this ordinance rendered persons immortal, and that such as never partook of it had no hopes of a resurrection. ... The effect of Baptism was supposed to be the remission of sins, and it was believed that the bishops, by the imposition of hands and by prayer, conferred those gifts of the Holy Spirit which were necessary for leading a holy life” (*Mosheim*).

Fourth Century: –

“While the fostering care of the emperors sought to advance the Christian religion, the indiscreet piety of the bishops obstructed its true nature, and oppressed its energies by the multiplication of rites and ceremonies. The observation of Augustine is well known – That the yoke once laid upon the Jews was more supportable than that laid on many Christians in his age. For the Christian bishops introduced with but slight alterations into the Christian worship those rites and institutions by which formerly the Greeks and Romans and other nations had manifested their reverence towards their imaginary deities, supposing that the people would more readily embrace Christianity if they perceived the rights, handed down to them from their fathers, still existing unchanged among the Christians, and perceived that Christ and the martyrs were worshipped in the same manner as formerly their gods were. There was, of course, little difference in these times between the public worship of the Christians and that of the Greeks and Romans. In both alike there were splendid robes, miters, tiaras, wax tapers, croziers (the crozier or bishop’s staff was exactly of the form of the litnus, the chief ensign of the ancient Augurs), processions, lustrations, images, golden and silver vases, and innumerable other things. ... The sacred rite of Baptism was always administered, except in cases of necessity, on the vigils of Easter and Whitsuntide, with lighted wax candles and by the bishops, or by the presbyters whom he commissioned for that purpose. In some places salt, a symbol of purity and wisdom, was put into the mouth of the baptized, and everywhere a double anointing was used, the first before and the other after the baptism. ... The Lord’s Supper was also administered at the sepulchers of the martyrs and at funerals, whence arose

afterwards the masses in honour of the saints and for the dead. The bread and wine were now everywhere elevated before distribution, so that they might be seen by the people and be viewed with reverence; and hence arose, not long after, the adoration of the symbols” (*Idem*).

“The records of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries are but the conclusions naturally to be anticipated from the departure from the practice of the ‘faith once delivered to the saints’. But the difference between the histories of the earlier and the later centuries is a striking one. The one exhibits corruption of worship, the other change of creed. Estheticism suggested opinions, habituated the mind to toleration of them, hinted that they might be reconcilable with the great standard, and slowly and steadily broke down the barriers between doctrinal truth and error. It remained, then, but for ministers to preach and councils to maintain the dogmas thus symbolically introduced. Ritualism did its work, and misdirected learning, breaking loose from the restraints of Scripture, occupied the ground it had slowly cleared; and when the council of Constantinople sat, it would have been hard to have discovered the religion of the Prophet of Nazareth in the midst of the services and creeds which then passed current for Christianity” (*Boyd*).

The True Nature of the Sacraments.

And here, after attentively examining no inconsiderable number of writers, we feel we cannot better guide the student and the general reader than by quoting that incomparable system of divinity – *The Westminster Assembly’s Shorter Catechism Explained*: –

What is a Sacrament?

A Sacrament is an holy ordinance, instituted by Christ, wherein, by sensible signs, Christ, and the benefits of the New Covenant, are represented, sealed, and applied to believers.

1. From whence is the word [*sacrament*] derived?

It is of a Latin original, being anciently used by the Romans to signify their military oath; or that oath which their soldiers took to be true and faithful to their prince, and that they would not desert his standard.

2. How is it used by the Church?

Not only to signify something that is sacred, but likewise a solemn engagement to be the Lord’s.

3. What is the general nature of a sacrament?

It is [*an holy ordinance instituted by Christ*].

4. Why is a sacrament called [*an holy ordinance*]?

Because it is appointed not only for holy ends and uses, but likewise for persons federally holy.

5. Is it necessary that a sacrament be [*instituted by Christ*]?

Yes: it is essentially necessary that it have his express and immediate warrant and institution, otherwise it does not deserve the name, 1 Cor. 11:23. *For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you,* etc.

6. Why must sacraments be expressly or immediately instituted by Christ?

Because he alone is the Head of the Church, and has sole power and authority to institute sacraments and other ordinances therein, Eph. 1:22–23.

7. “What are the parts of a sacrament?”

“Two; the one, an outward and sensible sign, used according to Christ’s own appointment; the other, an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified, Matt. 3:11; 1 Peter 3:21.” [Larger Cat., Quest. 163.]

8. What are the outward [*signs*] in sacraments?

They are the sacramental elements, and the sacramental actions; but chiefly the elements, because it is about these that the sacramental actions are exercised.

9. Why called [*sensible*] signs?

Because they are obvious to the outward senses of seeing, tasting, feeling, etc.

10. What kind of signs are sensible signs in a sacrament?

They are not natural, nor merely speculative, but voluntary and practical signs.

11. Why are they not natural signs?

Because natural signs always signify the selfsame thing, as smoke is always a sign of fire, and the morning light a sign of the approaching sun; whereas the signs in a sacrament never signify what they represent in that holy ordinance, but *when sacramentally used*.

12. Why are they practical, and not merely speculative signs?

Because they are designed not only to represent the spiritual grace signified by them, but likewise to seal and apply the same.

13. Why are the signs in a sacrament called voluntary signs?

Because they depend entirely upon the divine institution to make them signs; yet so as there is some analogy or resemblance betwixt the sign and the thing signified.

14. When are sacramental signs *used according to Christ's own appointment*?

When they are dispensed with the words of institution annexed unto them, Matt. 28:19; 1 Cor. 11:23–25.

15. What do the words of institution imply or contain in them?

They contain, “together with a precept authorizing the use” of them, “a promise of benefit to the worthy receivers,” Matt. 28:20. [Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii., sect. 3.]

16. What is the inward and spiritual grace signified by the sensible signs in a sacrament? [*Christ and the benefits of the new covenant.*]

17. Why is the covenant of grace called [*the new covenant*]?

Because it is always to remain in its prime and vigour, without the least change or alteration; for that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away, Heb. 8:13.

18. What are the [*benefits*] of the new covenant?

They are all the blessings contained in the promises thereof, which may be summed up in grace here, and glory hereafter, Psa. 84:11.

19. Are Christ and the benefits of the new covenant separable from one another?

No: for he that hath the Son hath life, 1 John 5:12; whoever hath Christ, hath all things along with him: all are yours, and ye are Christ's, 1 Cor. 3:22–23.

20. What is the intention and design of sensible signs in a sacrament, with reference to Christ and the benefits of the new covenant?

The design of them is, that Christ and his benefits may be [*represented, sealed, and applied*] by them.

21. Why are Christ and his benefits said to be represented by the signs in a sacrament?

Because, as sacramental signs are of divine institution, so there is a resemblance or similitude between the signs and the things signified.

22. Why are Christ and his benefits said to be sealed by these signs?

Because, by the sacramental signs, Christ and his benefits are confirmed to the believer, even as a seal is a confirmation of a bond or deed,

Rom. 4:11.

23. Why said to be applied?

Because, by the right and lawful use of the sacramental signs, Christ and his benefits are really communicated, conveyed, and made over to the worthy receiver: 1 Cor. 11:24 – Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you.

24. To whom do the sacramental signs represent, seal, and apply Christ and his benefits?

Not to all those who use them, but to believers only.

25. Why to believers only?

Because nothing but true faith can discern and apply the spiritual grace, which is represented and exhibited by sensible signs, in the sacraments, Gal. iii. 26, 27.

26. Wherein consists the form of a sacrament?

In “a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified.” [Conf. xxvii. 2.]

27. What is the consequence of this sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified?

The consequence is, “that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other.” [Ibid.] Thus Christ is called our passover, 1 Cor. 5:7; and the bread and the supper is called Christ’s body – This is my body, 1 Cor. 11:24.

28. When are the signs, and the things signified, united, in those who partake of the sacraments?

When, together with the signs (in virtue of Christ’s institution), the blessings signified are received by faith, Gal. 3:27.

29. How may this be illustrated by an example?

A little earth and stone put into a man’s hand at random, signify nothing; but when this is done in a regular manner, according to the forms of law, to give a proprietor seisin and infeftment [seizin and enfeoffment] of his lands, from whence these symbols were taken, it is of great availment to corroborate his right; so bread and wine in the sacrament, are of small value in themselves abstractly considered; yet when received in faith, as the instituted memorials of the death of Christ, whereby his testament was ratified and sealed, the believer’s right to all the blessings of his purchase is thereby most comfortably confirmed, 1 Cor. 11:14, *This is my body which is broken for you.*

30. Are the sacraments necessary for the confirmation of the word?

No; the word being of divine and infallible authority, needs no confirmation without itself: but they are necessary on OUR account, for helping our infirmity, and confirming and strengthening our faith, Rom. 4:11.

31. What is the difference between the word and the sacraments?

The word may be profitable to the *adult*, without the sacraments; but the sacrament cannot profit them without the word, Gal. 5:6.

32. What is the end of the sacraments?

It is “to represent Christ and his benefits; and to confirm our interest in him: as also to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the Church, and to the rest of the world; and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to his word.” [Conf. xxvii.1.]

33. Who are they that have a right unto the sacraments?

They “that are within the covenant of grace, Rom. 15:8.” [Larger Cat., Q. 163.]

34. Who are to be reckoned *within the covenant of grace*, in the sight of men?

They who “profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to him, Acts 2:38”; and “infants descending from parents, either both or but one of them, professing faith in Christ, and obedience to him, are, in that respect, within the covenant, Rom. 11:16.” [Ibid. Q. 166.]

35. What may we learn from the nature of the sacraments in general?

The amazing love of the Lord Jesus, in giving us not only the word as the instrument in the hand of the Spirit for begetting faith, and all other graces, Eph. 1:13, but likewise the sacraments for strengthening and increasing the same; as well as for cherishing our love and communion with one another, 1 Cor. 12:13.

The “Grace” of the Sacraments.

In and of themselves there can be no grace, for that would be to detract from the glory of Christ – to ascribe to the mere mechanical act and deed ordinance that which alone does and can belong to the everliving and Divine Ordainer. With the Word and Prayer, they are it is true the chief outward channels through which Christ by his Spirit communicates Himself to believers; but they are but the scaffolding of the temple of God.

We must not however forget the exalted place which the Lord Jesus Christ has assigned to his Sacraments. They are at once his Signs and his Seals. "Outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace." And in this way they are distinguished from all the other outward means for communicating the benefits of Redemption; inattention to which, we believe, is one main cause of the Church's comparative neglect of Holy Communion. How often have we gazed in wonder and amazement, if not in horror, at hundreds of a congregation turning their backs on the "Sweet Feast of Love Divine!"

Why are its bounties all in vain
 Before unwilling hearts displayed?
Was not for you the Victim slain?
 Are you forbid the Children's Bread?

O let Thy Table honoured be,
 And furnished well with joyful guests!
And may each soul salvation see,
 That here its sacred pledges tastes.

Let crowds approach with hearts prepared,
 With hearts inflamed let all attend;
Nor when we leave our Father's Board,
 The pleasure or the profit end.

Revive Thy dying Churches, Lord,
 And bid our drooping graces live;
And more that energy afford,
 A Saviour's Blood alone can give.

And we have everywhere noticed, since early youth, that the majority of communicants are women. One only exception to this sad state of things have we to record – an English mission church which it was our privilege to found. Here the sexes became after a short time equally represented, and the roll of communicants ultimately reached, from an original 5 per cent., to 70.

But the grace of the Sacraments is most admirably drawn out by Erskine, *Shorter Catechism Explained*: and we believe we should render good service to the Church if only by these quotations we could induce the heads of colleges to adopt this volume as a textbook, in a revised edition;

and this, in addition to its inestimable value as a clear and sound exposition of Scripture, is one of our main objects in introducing it.

How do the Sacraments become Effectual Means of Salvation?

The Sacraments become effectual means of Salvation, not from any virtue in them: or in him that doth administer them; but only by the blessing of Christ, and the working of his Spirit in them that by faith receive them.

1. What is meant by [*effectual means of salvation*]?

Such means as, by the blessing of God, do fully attain the end for which they are appointed, 1 Thess. 2:3.

2. What is the meaning of these words, in the answer [*not from, any virtue in them*]?

The meaning is, that the sacraments have not any virtue or efficacy, in themselves, to confer salvation; being only among the outward and ordinary means of grace, which can have no more efficacy of themselves to confer any saving benefit, than the *rainbow*, of itself, has to prevent a deluge.

3. Who are they who maintain, that the sacraments have a virtue or power in themselves to confer grace?

The Papists, who affirm that the sacraments of the New Testament, are the true, proper, and immediate causes of grace; and that the efficacy of them flows from the sacramental action of *receiving* the eternal elements.

4. How do you prove, that the sacraments have not any innate or intrinsic virtue in themselves, to confer grace, or salvation?

From this one argument, that if the sacraments had any such virtue, then grace, or salvation, would be infallibly connected with the external use of them; but it is obvious from Scripture, that after Simon Magus was baptized, he remained still *in the gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity*, Acts 8:13, 23.

5. Why is it said in the answer, that the sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not from any virtue [*in him that doth administer them*]?

It is said in opposition to the Papists, who maintain, that the efficacy of the sacraments depends upon the *intention* of the *priest*; so that any benefit by them, is conferred, or withheld, according to them, just as the *secret will* of the administrator would have it.

6. How is this error refuted?

If the efficacy of the sacraments depended upon the intention of the administrator, then there could be no *certainty* about the efficacy of them at

all; because, no mortal can be absolutely certain about the intention of another: the secrets of the heart being known to God only, Acts 1:24.

7. From whence, then, have the sacraments their efficacy and virtue?

[*Only*] from [*the blessing of Christ, and the working of his Spirit*].

8. What do you understand by [*the blessing of Christ*]?

That divine power and life wherewith he is pleased to accompany the sacraments and other ordinances; and without which they would be utterly ineffectual, Rom. 1:16.

9. What is [*the working of his Spirit*], which is necessary to make the sacraments effectual means of salvation?

Not only the planting of grace in the soul at first, but the drawing of it out into suitable exercise on all sacramental occasions, Zech. 4:6.

10. Why is the working of the Spirit necessary to the efficacy of the Sacraments?

Because we are utterly impotent of ourselves for anything that is spiritually good, John 15:5.

11. In whom are the sacraments [*by the blessing of Christ, and the working of the Spirit*] effectual means of salvation?

[*In them that by faith receive them.*]

12. What is it to [*receive*] the sacraments [*by faith*]?

It is to apply Christ, and the benefits of his purchase, as represented and exhibited to us in them, Luke 20:19–20.

13. What may we learn, from the necessity of Christ's blessing, and of the Spirit's working, in order to the efficacy of the sacraments?

It teacheth us, that our whole dependence for the blessing, whether upon ourselves, when we partake of the sacrament of the supper, or upon our children, when we are sponsors for them in baptism, should be only on Christ alone, and the saving influences and operations of his Spirit, held forth in the promise, to accompany his own institutions: and therefore the partaking of these solemn ordinances, dispensed by some ministers, to the slighting of them as dispensed by others, equally sound and faithful, though perhaps in our esteem somewhat inferior in outward gifts, says upon the matter, that the efficacy of the sacraments, depends, somehow, upon the administrator and not upon the blessing of Christ alone, quite contrary to the mind of the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. 3:7, *So then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth: but God that giveth the increase.*

The Romish, Doctrine.

Council of Trent, Session 7: –

“Whoever shall affirm that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or fewer than seven; namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or that any of these is not truly and properly a sacrament: Let him be Accursed” (Canon 1).

“Whoever shall affirm that the Sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify, or that they do not confer that grace on those who place no obstacle in its way, as if they were only the external signs of grace or righteousness received by faith, and marks of Christian profession, whereby the faithful are distinguished from unbelievers: Let him be Accursed” (Canon 6).

“Whoever shall affirm that grace is not conferred by these Sacraments of the New Law, by their own power (*ex opere operato*), but that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace: Let him be Accursed” (Canon 8).

“Whoever shall affirm that when Ministers perform and confer a sacrament, it is not necessary that they should, at least, have the intention to do what the Church does: Let him be Accursed” (Canon 11).

Catechism of the Council of Trent: –

“A Sacrament is a thing subject to the senses, and possessing, by divine institution, at once the power of signifying sanctity and justice, and of imparting both to the receiver.”

Council of Trent, Session 22: –

“Canon (1) If anyone shall say, that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the Mass; or that what is to be offered is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat: Let him be Accursed.

“(2) If anyone shall say, that by these words, ‘Do this for a commemoration of me,’ Christ did not appoint his Apostles Priests, or did not ordain that they and other Priests should offer his body and blood: Let him be Accursed.

“(3) If anyone shall say, that the Mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a Propitiatory Offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities: Let him be Accursed.

“(4) If one shall say, that the most holy sacrifice of Christ, made on the cross, is blasphemed by the sacrifice of the Mass; or that the latter derogates from the glory of the former: Let him be Accursed.

“(5) If anyone shall say, that to celebrate masses in honour of the saints, and in order to obtain their intercession with God, according to the intention of the Church, is an imposture: Let him be Accursed.

“(6) If any one shall say, that the Canon of the Mass contains errors, and ought therefore to be abolished: Let him be Accursed.

“(7) If any one shall say, that the ceremonies, vestments, and. External signs, used by the Catholic Church in the celebration of the Mass, are excitements to irreligion rather than helps to piety: Let him be Accursed.

“(8) If any one shall say, that those masses in which the Priest only communicates sacramentally are unlawful, and therefore ought to be abolished: Let him be Accursed.

“(9) If any one shall say, that the practice of the Roman Church, in uttering with a low voice part of the Canon, and the Words of Consecration, is to be condemned; or that the Mass should be celebrated in the vernacular language only; or that water is not to be mixed in the cup with the wine, when the sacrifice is offered, because it is contrary to Christ’s institution: Let him be Accursed.

Catechism of the Council of Trent: –

“We confess that the Sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same Sacrifice with that upon the Cross: the Victim is one and the same, Christ Jesus, who offered himself, once only, a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the cross. *The Bloody and Unbloody Victim* is still one and the same, and the Oblation of the Cross is daily renewed in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, in obedience to the command of our Lord, ‘This do for a commemoration of me.’ The *Priest* is also the *same Christ our Lord*: the Ministers who offer this sacrifice consecrate the holy mysteries not in their own but in the *Person of Christ*. This the words of consecration declare: the Priest does not say, ‘This is the Body of Christ,’ but, ‘This is My Body’; and thus invested with the character of Christ, he changes the substance of the bread and wine, into the substance of his real body and blood. That the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, therefore, is not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross, but also a Sacrifice of Propitiation, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious, the Pastor

will teach as a dogma defined by the unerring authority of a General Council of the Church. As often as the commemoration of this Victim is celebrated, so often is the work of our salvation promoted, and the plenteous fruits of that Bloody Victim flow in upon us abundantly through this Unbloody Sacrifice.”

Ceremonies and Accompaniments of the Mass –

“The vestments or robes used by the Priests at this service are of five different colours – white, red, green, purple, and black. *White* is used on all feasts of our blessed Lord, the Virgin Mary, Bishops, Confessors; *red*, on the vigil of the Pentecost, the feasts of the Holy Cross, Martyrs, and Apostles; *green*, on all Sundays from Trinity Sunday to Advent, and a few other occasions; *purple*, on all Sundays in Advent, and on all Sundays from Septuagesima until Palm Sunday, and occasionally at other times. *Black* is employed on Good Friday, All Souls’ Day, and when Mass is said for the dead. The dress of these performers is, to say the least of it, fantastical, and more becoming itinerant mountebanks, than individuals professing to be Ministers of Christ.

“Popish authorities tell us, that among the vestments, the *amice*, a linen veil which the priest puts on, represents the covering put on Christ’s face in the house of Caiaphas, when they smote him, and at every blow bade him prophesy who it was that struck him. The *albe* is a long white linen garment, representing the robe which, by Herod’s command, was put upon our Saviour in mockery and derision. The *girdle*, used to tie the albe around the body of the Priest, represents the cord with which our Saviour was bound, when seized upon by the Jews. The *maniple* which the Priest puts upon his left arm, represents the cord which bound our Saviour to the pillar when he was scourged: the Priest, before he puts it on, kisses the cross which is in the center of it. The *stole* represents the cord whereby he was led to be crucified: the Priest also uses it to represent his power of binding and loosing which he professes to have received from Christ. And the *chasuble*, which is the last vestment which the Priest uses, represents the seamless coat of our Saviour, and the scarlet or purple robe in which the soldiers scornfully arrayed him. Picture to yourselves, if possible, an officiating Priest decorated in these gaudy and childish habiliments, parading in solemn mockery before an ignorant and superstitious throng, at a service which degrades the Saviour, and stultifies common sense, and you will acknowledge the Mass to be a tragical and blasphemous theatrical

representation of the crucifixion of our adorable Lord, in which the puppet-Priest is the chief actor. He professes to be habited like Christ, and to act like him. His retiring back these steps from the altar, and bowing, or, in other words, humbling himself, before the scene opens, is intended to signify the prostration of Christ in the garden of Gethsemane. ‘There is,’ however, as M’Afee justly observes, ‘confusion and a want of unity in the action of the drama. For if the wafer be Christ himself, he can require no representation, as he is truly present. The very actings of the Priest contradict the Real Presence; and as the one is a mere sham, or show, so is the other’ (*O’Connel and the Wesleyans*). Dr. Chaloner says, ‘There are always lighted candles upon the altar during Mass’ (*Garden of the Soul*). But why? Mass must be celebrated in the forenoon, when there can be no necessity for these tapers: the Priest and people require them not, for it is daylight; the wafer-god wants them not, for it has no eyes. ‘These lights,’ Dr. Chaloner says, ‘betoken our joy, and the glory of Christ, and denote the light of faith.’ Our Saviour, however, declares, ‘God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.’ Again: the Mass is celebrated in Latin, a tongue which the majority of the people do not understand, and consequently the service to them is altogether profitless and incomprehensible. An honest Hibernian being asked why the Mass was celebrated in Latin, with considerable adroitness immediately replied, ‘And faith, how can I tell, unless it is because the devil himself does not understand Latin?’ The whole ceremony is therefore pantomimical, unscriptural, blasphemously wicked, and absurd” (*Delineation of Roman Catholicism*).

We need not dwell long on “these blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits” – degrading in their solemn sham to man, and in their doctrine to Christ, and only fit in their pantomime for barbaric and uncivilized minds. As to Apostolic authority they have none. The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass was not decreed by any General Council, although discussed at that of Lateran and of Florence, until the Council of Trent, 1562. With Bishop Jewel we say (*Discourse at St. Paul’s Cross*, 1560): “If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if any learned men who are alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence, out of any one Catholic Doctor or Father, or out of any old General Council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the Primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved, that there was any private mass, at that time, in the whole world, or

that the people were then taught to believe, that Christ's Body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament, I promise them that I will give over, and subscribe to him. But I am well assured that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence; and because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest you haply should be deceived."

Besides, a sacrifice properly so called, in the economy of redemption, means suffering and death. "It is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Nor is it possible for any mind, unless enfeebled and enthralled by abject slavery to superstition, to imagine that "a bloody and an unbloody sacrifice mean one and the same thing"; or that the "One Offering of Christ, perfecting forever them that are sanctified," can mean that any "wicked, heretical, suspended, excommunicated, degraded" Priests, [Deus: "Hinc valide consecrat omnis Sacerdos quantumvis malus, haereticus, suspensus, excommunicatus, degradatus, etc." (Theol., tom. 5, No. 29.)] if only they have the intention, may offer him thousands of times every day!

Do Romanists ever think? *Can* Romanists really believe? It would seem as if judicial blindness had robbed them of all the characteristics of reasonable creatures.

Sample of Romish Chicanery and Evasion:

"When Papists are pressed in argument on these topics, they are accustomed to deny the authority of individual writers, however great, and even of those Catechisms which are recommended by the Priests, and are in general and daily use. The Douay Catechism does not use the word 'propitiatory,' and therefore a Papist, when assailed by a Protestant, may disavow the doctrine as not in his Catechism. On the other hand, should he be accused, by one of his own brethren, of not holding that fundamental doctrine of his Church, namely, that the Mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice, he will get out of his difficulty by referring to his Catechism, in which the Mass is declared to be the very same sacrifice which Christ offered upon the cross, and which is allowed on all hands to be propitiatory" (*Delineation*, as above).

Money Value of the Mass:

"The sacrifice of the Mass is the most considerable part of the worship of the Romish Church: it is their *juge sacrificium*, their daily and continual offering, and the principal thing in which their religion does consist. It is, they tell us, of the greatest profit and advantage to all persons,

and I am sure the Priests make it so to themselves; for by this alone, a great number of them get their living, by making merchandise of the holy sacrament, and by selling the Blood of Christ at a dearer rate than Judas did. The saying of masses keeps the Church of Rome more Priests in pay, than any Prince in Christendom can maintain soldiers, and it has raised more money by them than the richest bank or exchequer in the world was ever owner of. It is indeed the truest patrimony of their Church, and has enriched it more than anything else. It was that which founded their greatest monasteries, and their richest abbeys; and it had well-nigh brought all the estates of the kingdom into the Church, had not the Statute of Mortmain put a check to it. The donation of Constantine, were it ever so true, and the grants of Charles and Pepin, were they ever so large, and the gifts of all their benefactors put together, are infinitely outdone by it. The gain of it has been so manifestly great, that one cannot but on that account suspect its godliness” (*Prebendary Payne*, quoted by *M’Gavin*, and in the *Delineation*).

But Transubstantiation is the key to Rome’s Sacramental Blasphemies.

Council of Trent, Session 13:

“Canon (1) Whosoever shall deny, that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the Body and the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with his Soul and Divinity, and consequently Christ Entire; but shall affirm that he is present therein only in a sign and figure, or by his power: Let him be Accursed.

“(2) Whosoever shall affirm, that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of the bread and wine, together with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and shall deny that wonderful and peculiar conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his Blood, the species only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most fitly terms ‘transubstantiation’: Let him be Accursed.

“(3) Whosoever shall deny that Christ Entire is contained in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, under each species, and under every part of each species when they are separated: Let him be Accursed.

“(4) Whosoever shall affirm that the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not present in the admirable Eucharist, as soon as the consecration is performed, but only as it is used and received, and neither

before nor after; and that the true Body of our Lord does not remain in the hosts or consecrated morsels which are reserved or left after communion: Let him be Accursed.

“(5) Whosoever shall affirm that remission of sins is the chief fruit of the most holy Eucharist, or that other effects are not produced thereby: Let him be Accursed.

“(6) Whosoever shall affirm that Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy Eucharist with the external signs of that worship which is due to God; and therefore that the Eucharist is not to be honoured with extraordinary festive celebration, nor solemnly carried about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rites and customs of holy Church, nor publicly presented to the people for their adoration; and that those who worship the same are idolaters: Let him be Accursed.

“(7) Whosoever shall affirm that it is not lawful to preserve the holy Eucharist in the sacristy, but that immediately after consecration it must of necessity be distributed to those who are present; or that it is not lawful to carry it in procession to the sick: Let him be Accursed.

“(8) Whosoever shall affirm that Christ, as exhibited in the Eucharist, is eaten in a spiritual manner only, and not also sacramentally and really: Let him be Accursed.

“(9) Whosoever shall deny that all and every one of the faithful in Christ, of both sexes, are bound to communicate every year, at least at Easter according to the injunction of holy Mother Church: Let him be Accursed.

“(10) Whosoever shall affirm that it is not lawful for the officiating Priest to administer the communion to himself: Let him be Accursed.

“(11) Whosoever shall affirm that faith only is a sufficient preparation for the reception of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist: Let him be Accursed.

“And lest so great a sacrament should be taken unworthily, and therefore to death and condemnation, the said holy Council doth decree and declare, that previous sacramental confession is absolutely necessary, if a Confessor is at hand, for those who are conscious of the guilt of mortal sin, however contrite they may think themselves to be. Whoever shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately assert the contrary, or to maintain opposite opinions in public disputation: Let him be *ipso facto* Excommunicated.”

We should not quote all these awful dogmas at such length, were it not that they themselves are the most positive proof and demonstration of their own absurdity and blasphemy. If neither bread nor wine is in reality on the table after consecration, but only the veritable Body and Blood of Christ, how is it that the accidents or species of bread and wine – colour, size, weight, taste, etc. – are there? Where do these accidents exist? They are properties of matter, and no longer exist in the bread or wine, for there is neither bread nor wine; and if they are transferred to Christ, Christ's Body must exhibit them – he must be round like the wafer, same colour, same size, same weight; and the same taste also as the wine. How is it, that these transubstantiated things decay? Do Christ's veritable Body, and Blood, and Soul, and Divinity leave it before or after decay? How is it, according to Romanists, “ Jesus Christ does not leave heaven to come into the Eucharist,” yet that he is bodily and carnally present at the same moment on thousands of altars, in millions of wafers? Yea, above all, how is it that Christ's whole Body, whole Blood, whole Soul, whole Divinity (!) is in each myriadth particle of bread, and also in each myriadth drop of wine? – that the whole perfect God, and whole perfect Man Christ, the same (*ossa et nervos*) that was born of the Virgin, crucified, ascended into heaven, and now sitteth at the right hand of God, is enclosed and contained (albeit “He does not leave heaven to come into the Eucharist!”) in a morsel of bread, instanter at the juggle of a Priest, and swallowed by the worshipper, be he good or bad, or it may be eaten by a mouse or a dog, or burned in the fire!!

It is easy to say, as Romanists in their Catechisms, that all this is done “by the Almighty power of God.” That God shuts himself up by his Almighty power, or rather, that the Priest shuts God up, in a wafer! Just as Cicero remarks, when his opponents could not bring their argument to a right conclusion, they *fly to the power of God*, the “sanctuary of heretics” in all ages. But it is not easy to prove, if we may use the words of a quaint but suggestive preacher we once heard, that God treats his children as *lunatics* – that he has given them *senses* – sight, taste, smell, touch, etc., on all occasions and for all purposes, but that when they come to the mummeries of the Mass, they are utterly to renounce the judgment of their senses and all their human understanding! Nor is it easy to prove that the basis, and Historic truth, and evidences of Christianity are verily and indeed not founded on an appeal to our senses. “That which was from the beginning, which we have *heard*, which we have *seen with our eyes*, which we have

looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us.”

But enough. We shall not trespass on the reader by here pursuing this *Ignis-fatuus* of Rome further. The Scripture argument will follow in its place. Yet two observations may be well to make: –

(1) The Fathers of the primitive Church knew nothing of the doctrine, as we shall see.

(2) Many of the most learned Doctors of the Romish Church, as well as Popes, declare that, John 6:53, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you” – the main Romanist stay of Transubstantiation – does not in any way favour that doctrine. Thus –

Cardinal Cajetan: “To eat the flesh of Christ, and to drink his blood, is faith in the death of Jesus Christ; so that the sense is this: If ye use not the death of the Son of God as meat and drink, ye have not the life of the Spirit in you.”

Pope Innocent III: “The Lord speaks of spiritual manducation, saying, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* In this way the righteous alone eat of the body of Christ.”

Pope Pius II: “That is not the sense of the Gospel of John which you ascribe to it, for there is no injunction given there to drink of the sacrament, but a spiritual manner of drinking is there taught. ... The Lord there makes known by these words the secret mysteries of spiritual drinking, and not of carnal, when he says, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.* And again, *The words that I speak unto you are spirit and life.* Do you wish to know certainly whether the Evangelist speaks of the spiritual manducation which is performed by faith? Consider what the Lord says in these words, *He that eats and drinks;* these words are of the present, and not of the future, tense. Therefore, ever since the Lord spake them, there have been persons who have eaten and drank; and nevertheless the Lord had not yet suffered, nor was the sacrament yet instituted.”

Luther's View.

It is well that God divides his work, so that “every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that.” Had Luther been given to establish the doctrine of the Sacraments as he did that of Justification by Faith, the instrument might have been unduly honoured, and the glory of the Master forgotten. Nor, indeed, humanly speaking, was

it to be expected that a mind so long nursed in transubstantiation could readily get rid of the idea of some sort of Substantial Presence. If the bread and wine being converted into the actual Body and Blood of Christ was too crude a conception, might it not be a reasonable verity that that Body and that Blood were present somewhere, invisible and intangible, *in, with, or under* the sacramental elements? The first and really the most natural remove from the idolatry of the Mass. And poor Luther, baited as he was by the bulldogs of Rome, had but little interval, as we may charitably and with historic faithfulness conclude, for deeper and more solemn reflection.

“He denied Transubstantiation, that is, a transmutation of the substance of the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ; yet he held consubstantiation, that is, a real and corporeal presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in, under, or along with, the bread and wine; so that the sacramental substances after consecration became each of them twofold; namely, the bread became both bread and the flesh of Christ, and the wine became both wine and the blood of Christ. Sometimes, however, he represented the union of the two substances in each element as constituting but one substance, just as the union of the divine and human natures in Christ still constituted but one person. The ubiquity of Christ’s Body was an obvious consequence of his doctrine, and one which he did not hesitate to admit. See *Hospinian’s Historia Sacramentaria*, par. ii. p. 5, etc.” (*Dr. Murdoch’s Note to Mosheim, in loco.*)

The Impanation theory thus differs from that of Rome, in so far as it leaves the elements unchanged, save by the entering into them of the body and blood of Christ; but it localizes our Lord’s presence, by priestly act, on the altar.

Luther also taught that in Baptism our sin is buried, and righteousness rises instead.

Zwingli.

The Swiss Reformer rejected the idea of sacramental grace altogether: “A Sacrament is an external symbol, by which we testify what we are, and what is our duty. Just as one who bears a national costume or badge, testifies that he belongs to a particular nation or society.” “A Sacrament is the sign of a sacred thing; when, therefore, I speak of the Sacrament of Christ’s Body, I understand no more than that bread which is the figure and type of Christ’s Body.” According to this view, Sacraments lose their

distinctive character entirely; become mere religious rites; and in fact cease to be Sacraments altogether.

Calvin.

“Akin to the preaching of the Gospel, we have another help to our faith in the Sacraments, in regard to which, it greatly concerns us that some sure doctrine should be delivered, informing us both of the end for which they were instituted, and of their present use. First, we must attend to what a sacrament is. It seems to me, then, a simple and appropriate definition to say, that it is an external sign, by which the Lord seals on our consciences his promises of goodwill towards us, in order to sustain the weakness of our faith, and we in our turn testify our piety towards him, both before himself, and before angels as well as men. We may also define more briefly by calling it a testimony of the divine favour towards us, confirmed by an external sign, with a corresponding attestation of our faith towards him. ... From the definition which we have given, we perceive that there never is a sacrament without an antecedent promise, the sacrament being added as a kind of appendix, with the view of confirming and sealing the promise, and giving a better attestation, or rather, in a manner, confirming it. ... This is commonly expressed by saying that a sacrament consists of the word and the external sign. By the word we ought to understand not one which, unuttered without meaning and without faith, by its sound merely, as by a magical incantation, has the effect of consecrating the element, but one which, preached, makes us understand what the visible sign means. ... Nor are those to be listened to who oppose this view with a more subtle than solid dilemma. They argue thus: We either know that the word of God which precedes the sacrament is the true will of God, or we do not know it. If we know it, we learn nothing new from the sacrament which succeeds. If we do not know it, we cannot learn it from the sacrament, whose whole efficacy depends on the word. Our brief reply is: The seals which are affixed to diplomas, and other public deeds, are nothing considered in themselves, and would be affixed to no purpose if nothing was written on the parchment, and yet this does not prevent them from sealing and confirming when they are appended to writings. ... Sacraments are exercises which confirm our faith in the word of God; and because we are carnal, they are exhibited under carnal objects, that thus they may train us in accommodation to our sluggish capacity, just as nurses lead children by the

hand. And hence Augustine calls a sacrament a *visible word*, because it represents the promises of God as in a picture, and places them in our view in a graphic bodily form. ... It is irrational to contend that sacraments are not manifestations of divine grace towards us, because they are held forth to the ungodly also, who, however, so far from experiencing God to be more propitious to them, only incur greater condemnation. By the same reasoning, the gospel will be no manifestation of the grace of God, because it is spurned by many who hear it; nor will Christ himself be a manifestation of grace, because of the many by whom he was seen and known, very few received him. ... It is certain, therefore, that the Lord offers us his mercy, and a pledge of his grace, both in his sacred word and in the sacraments; but it is not apprehended save by those who receive the word and sacraments with firm faith: in like manner as Christ, though offered and held forth for salvation to all, is not, however, acknowledged and received by all. ... We conclude, therefore, that the sacraments are truly termed evidences of divine grace, and, as it were, seals of the goodwill which God entertains towards us. They, by sealing it to us, sustain, nourish, confirm, and increase our faith. ... Wherefore, with regard to the increase and confirmation of faith, I would remind the reader, that in assigning this office to the sacraments, it is not as if I thought that there is a kind of secret efficacy perpetually inherent in them, by which they can of themselves promote or strengthen faith, but because our Lord has instituted them for the express purpose of helping to establish and increase our faith. The sacraments duly perform their office only when accompanied by the Spirit, the internal Master, whose energy alone penetrates the heart, stirs up the affections, and procures access for the sacraments into our souls. If he is wanting, the sacraments can avail us no more than the sun shining on the eyeballs of the blind, or sounds uttered in the ears of the deaf “ (*Institutes*).

The Puseyite Doctrine.

Between Rome and the modern Ritualists there is little or no appreciable difference in the doctrine, etc., of the Sacraments, further than what we might expect between an open and implacable enemy to the truth and a somewhat timid and an unmanly traitor within the camp. We have the same vestments and pantomime, so far and so often as they dare be exhibited in a Protestant Church; we have the same localized Presence on the so-called Altar; and we have the same teaching of a Sacrifice, only that

as yet all Ritualists are afraid to be outspoken about its efficacy extending to “the dead”. There is, however, this one shade of distinction: Rome is honest and bold, and is not ashamed to declare the Carnal Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ; Ritualists “mince the sin, and mollify damnation with a phrase” – they would bewilder the Church, if in fact they do not indeed bewilder themselves, between “a glorified presence,” “a spiritual presence,” “the natural Body and Blood,” and last but not least, “a presence supralocal in the Holy Sacrament,” whatever that may mean.

Here is Dr. Pusey, not as we believe the head and front, but the scapegoat, of the offending: –

“On the continued teaching of our Articles, Catechisms, and Liturgy, we believe the doctrine of our Church to be, that in the Communion there is a true, real, actual, though spiritual communication of the Body and Blood of Christ to the believer, through the holy elements; that there is a true, real, spiritual Presence of Christ at the Holy Supper – more real than if we could, with Thomas, feel him with our hands, or thrust our hands into his side; that this is bestowed upon faith and received by faith, as is every other spiritual gift, but that our faith is but a receiver of God’s real, mysterious, precious gift, that faith opens our eyes to see what is really there, and our hearts to receive it: but that it is there independently of our faith” (*Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*).

“This is the full Catholic truth; it is that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper, that they are conveyed by means of the elements, in that the Article says, ‘that the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner’; for the word ‘given’ as opposed to ‘taken and received’ implies, as has been remarked, that it accompanies, in some mysterious way, the distribution of the elements, in which it is ‘given’ by the priest, and ‘taken and received’ by the communicants. ... There is a true, real, actual, though spiritual communication of the Body and Blood of Christ to the believer through the holy elements, which is a true, real *spiritual presence* of Christ at the holy supper. ... Our Church holds, with Rome, the receiving by the communicant of the Body and Blood of Christ through the holy Eucharist, but denies her carnal way of explaining it” (*Idem, ibidem*).

“A real change they (our Articles and great writers) gladly accept; a true, real, substantial, sacramental presence of our Lord and his flesh, the

very flesh which was born of the Virgin Mary, and is now glorified at God's right hand, they reverently confess; they only confess not that carnal, scholastic theory which would explain away the mystery, that the elements, although the Body and Blood of Christ, are also bread and wine" (*Idem*, The Articles treated of in Tract 90).

As Dean Boyd, from whom we take these extracts, remarks: "Whether we may agree with or dissent from the writer, we can at least understand him. He lodges the Presence in the elements, makes the reception of Christ to depend on the reception of the elements, and brings in the provision of faith in the discernment of that which is veiled from sense, and in the acceptance of That which priestly act has conveyed into the bread and wine. And we are bold to affirm, that there is hardly an objection which can be brought against the Tridentine view which does not lie as strongly against this."

Here is the "Little Prayer Book".

"I most firmly believe, O Jesus, that in this holy sacrament Thou art present verily and indeed, that here is Thy Body and Blood, Thy Soul and Thy Godhead. All this I confess that I receive when I receive the Holy Communion with my mouth. O saving Victim, slain to bless, give strength in strife and help in fall." "May this heavenly Sacrifice be unto us salvation and life: let that living bread, now about to come down from heaven to give life to the world, come into my heart and cleanse me from all impurity of flesh and spirit." "O Holy Trinity, let this Sacrifice and communion be pleasing to thee and profitable both to me and all Christian souls, *living or dead*." "Kneel upright at the altar, and when the priest comes to you, hold the palm of your right hand open, and your left hand crossed under it, be most careful to receive into your mouth all, even the smallest portion of the most holy sacrament, since one crumb or drop of it is worth more than the world itself."

Here is the "Prayer Book for the Young":

"In the Sacrifice of the Eucharist we offer, according to Christ's command, his Body and Blood to his Father, which is no New Sacrifice, but the One Sacrifice of the Cross, continued in an unbloody manner, and applied to the members of his Church, as occasion requires. It is of this Christian Sacrifice that St Paul speaks, when he says, 'We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle'; and when he says, 'Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils';

he places in contrast the altars erected to idols, and the Christian altar, whereon is offered the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist. ... The earthly elements are not costly, and are easily procurable, that all may join in the offering of so great a Sacrifice; but after the words of consecration, they become to us the Body and Blood of Christ, and are offered for a remembrance of his death. It is therefore the most sublime Sacrifice that men or angels can offer, and cannot but propitiate the Father and draw down his choicest blessings on those who worthily offer it.” – “Be careful how you assist at the offering of so dread and holy a sacrifice. Remember what you are doing, what the Priest is doing, WHO is come or coming on to his altar, who shall one day judge us for every idle word or thought. When you go to this service, go in the spirit in which you would have gone to Calvary to see Jesus HANGING AND DYING ON THE CROSS.” “Then follows the consecration, in which the Priest, saying and doing what Christ said and did, when he instituted this Sacrifice, offers in Sacrifice the Body and Blood of Christ, *which*, are now present on the Altar.”

Here is “A Book of Worship”:

“At the words, This is my Body, bow down with the deepest reverence and say, Hail, saving Victim, offered for me and all mankind upon the Cross. At the words, This is my Blood, say, Hail, precious Blood, flowing from the wounds of my Crucified Lord Jesus Christ, and washing away the stains of all sins, new and old. Remember that you are close to Jesus Christ. He is resting on the Altar, just as He rested in form of a cloud on the mercy seat in the Jews’ tabernacle.” – “I adore Thee, O Lord Jesus, I adore Thy Body, Thy Soul, and Thy Divinity, Thy Flesh and Thy Blood, truly present in this sacrament.

I worship Thee, Lord Jesus,
Who on this altar laid,
In this most awful service
Our food and drink art made.
I worship Thee, Lord Jesus,
Who in Thy love divine,
Art hiding here Thy Godhead,;
In form of bread and wine.

Oh, merciful Jesus, accept the care of Thy ministers, and when a sinner or an unbeliever looketh upon Thee, or toucheth Thy Body or Thy Blood, do

Thou forgive” – “Should you have occasion to pass in front of the Altar after Consecration, be careful to kneel for a minute, as an act of reverence to our Lord Present in the Blessed Sacrament.”

After citing these passages, Dean Boyd proceeds: “I have been careful, even at the risk of overloading the subject by quotation, to present this teaching within the bosom of the English Church, that there might be no misapprehension regarding the doctrine really held and avowed by modern Ritualists. And I think that no doubt can rest on any intelligent mind, that the doctrine put forward in these popular treatises coincides entirely with that advanced in more scholastic works, and that while there is no difference between it and the Lutheran, there is but a shadow of difference between it and the Tridentine creed. A miracle is wrought by the act and words of consecration Christ is localized in the elements; the Victim, Personally, lies on the Altar; and the service, instead of being a simple Communion, rises to the Mystery of a Mass for Sacrifice.

“Now, it must be our duty to inquire whether this view can fairly be regarded as in harmony with the doctrines of the Church of England. That it is not, may be gathered from this consideration, that there is nothing to warrant it in the Communion Services of our Church. If there be, let the passage be cited which recognizes the Presence of Christ in the Elements, or which regards the Communion as a Sacrifice. A closer examination of the prayers and rubrics, the confessions, and the addresses will, I believe, fail to supply proof of either. There are but two expressions which bear a semblance of sympathy with the opinions we are controverting: one in which we ask God to ‘accept our oblations’ – a word which by no possibility can be considered an equivalent to Sacrificial Offerings; first, because it is united to ‘alms,’ and secondly, because no act of consecration has then taken place: and another, in which the word ‘sacrifice’ is used, but used in reference to communicants, who ‘offer and present to God, themselves, their souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice to him’; words evidently taken from Rom. 12:1, wherein Paul speaks nothing of Expiatory Sacrifices. Passing over these, which as foundations for an argument on the point are too contemptible to be dwelt upon, we ask again for the passage in the Communion Service in the Church of England which declares the belief of that Church, either in Sacrifice or Consubstantiation.

“But we may carry the argument derived from the Service a step further. It is positively the case, not only that that Service knows nothing of these opinions, but that the very alterations by which it was brought to its present state, sprang from a desire to remove from the Service anything which had the appearance of being favourable to them. The two books of Edward VI are easily procurable, and a comparison of them will conclusively show that it was the desire of the liturgical amenders of the second book to cancel the recognitions of superstition and Romanism which disfigured the first. The book of 1552 was the book of 1548–9 expurgated, and by that expurgation showing most emphatically the matured decisions of the Church. For example the first book directed a special dress to be worn at the celebration of the communion by priests and bishops, thereby investing that service with a solemnity which belonged not to the other parts of the service. But in the second book these directions were removed, and the modest surplice enjoined instead. In the first book, the title bestowed on the service was, ‘The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass’; but in the second, ‘The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper, or Holy Communion’. In the first book, ‘The priest standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar, shall say the Lord’s Prayer with the Collect’; but in the second, ‘The priest standing at the north side of the Table’. The first book ordained, that ‘the minister take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion ... putting also into the chalice a little pure and clean water, and resting with the bread and wine upon the Altar’; the second book omitting these directions altogether, and the present Prayer Book merely saying, that ‘when there is a communion, the priest shall then place upon the Table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient.’ In the first book, the post-communion prayer (as it stands in order at present) ran thus: ‘Humbly beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may *worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ*, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction’; but in the second book the clause given in italics utterly disappears. In the first book, the words of the consecration prayer were these: ‘Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.’ In the second book they are,

‘Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood’: thereby affirming an effect, but detaching it from the elements. Surely there is a lesson taught to us in all these significant changes. If the first book were faultless, what need was there of a second? If the first was free of error, why did the second undertake to correct it? But it so happens that all these changes, some affecting the place which a particular prayer or expression occupies in the service; some clinging to the idea of sacramental virtue, but discarding it from the elements; some recognizing the Table of Communion as the ‘Lord’s Board,’ but refusing to acknowledge an Altar; some (as in the matter of vestments) declining to recognize a greater solemnity in the approach to God through the Communion than in the approach to him by Prayer – that all these changes point in the same direction, that of recoil from Popish mystery, and acceptance of Evangelical simplicity. And if that lesson mean anything, it means this, that the views of modern Ritualists are not sustained by the compilers of our amended Liturgy.

“But, in truth, we may consider that point as set at rest by the confession – the plaintive but honest confession – of one who once belonged to this school, but who was too upright to remain in communion with a Church enjoying its dignities and accepting its emoluments, at the expense of betraying the trust which that Church reposed in him. ‘The service,’ says the Archdeacon Wilberforce, ‘was divested of its sacrificial character, and no longer bore witness, as in early times, to the great event that is transacted at the Altar. This was done both by mutilating the Prayer of Oblation, which had been retained in the book of 1548, and by placing it *after*, instead of before the Communion’ (*On the Eucharist*). Just so! the first book was Romish (or, as it would now be called, Catholic), the second book was Protestant; and these very ‘mutilations’ in the oblation prayer, of which the future pervert so sadly complains, are in truth the standing evidence that whatever support Ritualists may obtain from Romish missals, or the Services of an imperfectly reformed Church, they can obtain none from either the present state or the former history of the Communion Service of the Church of England” (*Confession, Absolution, and the Real Presence*).

Where are the Bishops of the Church of England? Where is their Vow: "I am ready, the Lord being my helper, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word; and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same?" Where are the Laity of the Church of England? Time was when these Popish teachings and damnable deceits of the Mass would have roused Englishmen to "remove the high places, and break the images, and cut down the groves." But the painted flowers of ceremonial, the adorned altars, the incessant services, the overmuch earnestness and zeal, the show of humility and neglecting of the body, all these and the other developments of Ritualism have conveyed the poison, in accordance precisely with different conditions and susceptibilities of society. Upon the dreamy and frivolous mind they have acted as a narcotic and a charm; honest minds they have filled with nausea and disgust: so that, as a Church and a nation, we are fast losing sight of the old landmarks, and drifting away from vitality of religion, soundness in the faith, and national independence.

We need scarcely add that the Ritualist and the Romanist are at one upon the doctrine of Baptism, only that the former is forced yet to secrete his Chrism.

The Fathers.

The Romanists are ever fond of appealing to the Fathers in support of their carnal, and the Ritualists in support of their semi-carnal or sublimated manducation of Christ. But they should remember (1) that accusations and recriminations of eating their gods were continually passing backward and forward between the early Christians and the Heathen, but were equally repudiated and abhorred by both.

Cicero: "When we call wine Bacchus, and our fruits Ceres, we use the common mode of speaking. But can you think any person so mad as to imagine that which he eats to be a God?"

Minutius Felix: "Do you not, with the Egyptians, worship and also feed upon an ox, which you call Apis? And is this not as great a folly as the worship of an ass's head, which without reason you object to us!"

Athanasius: "The Egyptians adore a calf, the Syrians worship sheep, both which, in other nations, are sacrificed and fed upon: this is a certain indication of the folly of the Heathen worship."

And when Rome did lay herself open, ye plainly confessed to the awful charge of eating her God. Here is the terrible thrust of the learned Heathen Averroes in the eleventh century: “I have inquired into all religions, and have found none more foolish than the Christians’, because that very God they worship they with their teeth devour. And thus, because the Christians eat what they do worship, let my soul go to the philosophers!”

And they should remember (2) that the Catholic Church of the first five centuries knew nothing of any change whatever in the Sacramental Elements. Julian the Apostate, who had been baptized and initiated. Into all the mysteries of the faith, while he ridicules the Incarnation and Divinity of Christ, never once reproaches the Christians for eating their Incarnate God! One of the most convincing historic proofs that the absurd doctrine of Transubstantiation was utterly unknown in his day.

True, many of the Fathers speak in exalted strains of the Sacraments as well as other blessings of the New Covenant; and passages may be abundantly culled from their writings which when strung together may seem to favour not a few of the modern dogmas of Popery. But we must read these venerable men contextually, interpret them according to the use and custom of their language, render their figurative or florid and hyperbolical style into plain and sober prose, and, above all, bear in mind the mental state and conditions of many of them – men manumitted from Jewish and Gentile thralldom.

But we must quote a few: –

Ignatius: “Wherefore, putting on meekness, renew yourselves in faith, that is, the flesh of the Lord; and in charity, that is, the blood of Jesus Christ” (*ad Trall.*).

Irenaeus: “The bread which is from the earth, receiving the divine invocation, is now no longer common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two things, the one earthly, and the other heavenly” (*adv. Haeres*). “No longer *common bread*,” but set apart for a sacred use, yet still “bread”.

Justin Martyr: “The bread of the eucharist was a figure, which Christ the Lord commanded to be celebrated in remembrance of his passion” (*Dial. eum Tryph.*).

Clemens Alexandrinus: “For be ye sure he also did drink wine, for he also was a man, and he blessed wine when he said, ‘Take, drink; this is my blood,’ the blood of the vine; for this expression (‘shed for many for the

remission of sins') signifies *allegorically* a holy stream of gladness; but that the thing which had been blessed was wine he showed again, saying to his disciples, 'I will not drink of the fruit of this vine till I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom'" (*Paedagog.*).

Tertullian: "The bread which he had taken and distributed to his disciples he made his body, by saying, 'This is my body,' that is, the figure of my body'" (*adv. Marcion*).

Origen: There is in the New Testament a letter which killeth him that does not understand spiritually the things there said. For if you take this according to the letter, 'Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,' this letter killeth" (*Hom. in Levit.*).

Eusebius: "He gave to his disciples the *symbols* of divine economy, commanding the *image* of his own body to be made." "They received a command, according to the constitution of the New Testament, to make a memorial of this sacrifice upon the table, by the *symbols* of his body and healthful blood" (*Demonst. Evan.*).

Athanasius: "When our Lord conversed on the eating of his body, and when he thence beheld many scandalized, he forthwith added: 'Doth offend you? What then, if ye see the Son of Man ascending where he was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I speak unto you, are spirit and are life.' Both these matters, the flesh and the spirit, he said respecting himself; and he distinguished the spirit from the flesh, in order that, believing both the visible and the invisible, they might understand his sayings to be not carnal, but spiritual. For to how many persons could his body have sufficed for food, so that it might become the aliment of the whole world? But, that he might divert their minds from carnal cogitations, and that they might learn the flesh which he would give them to be super-celestial and spiritual food; he, on this account, mentioned the ascent of the Son of Man into heaven. 'The words,' said he, 'which I speak unto you are spirit and life.' As if he had intimated, 'My body shall be exhibited and given as food for the world; so that that food shall be given to each one spiritually, and shall be to all a preservative to the resurrection unto life eternal'" (*In illud Evan. Quicumque dixerit*, etc.).

Augustine: "If a passage forbid something flagitious, or command something good, it is not figurative. But if it seem either to command something flagitious, or to forbid something good, then such passage is *figurative*. Thus, for example, Christ says, 'Unless ye eat,' etc. In these

words he apparently commands something flagitious and horrible. Therefore, according to the rule I have laid down, the passage is a figure. Hence it must only be interpreted as enjoining us to communicate in the passion of our Lord, and as admonishing us to lay it up sweetly and usefully in our *memory*, because for us his flesh was crucified and wounded” (*De Doct. Christ.*). “Christ admitted Judas to that banquet, in which he commended and delivered unto his disciples the figure of his body and blood” (*in Psa. 3.*). “The Lord did not doubt to say, ‘This is my body,’ when he gave the *sign* of his body” (*Contra Adiment.*). “You are not about to eat this body which you see, nor to drink that blood which they shall shed, who shall crucify me. I have recommended to you a certain sacrament, which, if spiritually understood, shall quicken you” (*Eu. In Psa. 98.*).

Theodoret: “Inasmuch as he who called his own natural body wheat and bread, and who farther bestowed upon himself the appellation of a vine; he also honoured the visible *symbols* with the name of his body and blood, *not changing their nature*, but adding grace to nature” (*Dial. i.*). “The mystical symbols, after consecration, *pass not out of their own nature*, inasmuch as they *still remain in their original substance, and form, and appearance*; and they may be seen and touched, just as they were before consecration” (*Dial. ii.*).

Gelasius, Bishop of Rome, fifth century: “Certainly the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, which we receive, are a divine thing, because by these we are made partakers of the divine nature. Nevertheless, *the substance or nature of bread and wine ceases not to exist*; and assuredly the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries” (*de duabus Naturis in Christo, contra Eutyech.*).

Facundus, the learned Bishop of Hermiane, sixth century: “The sacrament of adoption may be called adoption; just as the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, which is in the consecrated bread and wine, we are wont to call his body and blood. Not, indeed, that the bread is properly called his body, or that the wine is properly his blood, but because they contain the mystery of his body and blood within themselves. Hence it was that our Lord denominated the consecrated bread and wine, which he delivered to his disciples, his own body and blood” (*Defens. Trium. capitulor. Conc. Chalced.*).

From all these passages, and others which may be consulted in Elliott, Taylor, Usher, and Faber, it will be clear that by whatsoever terms the

Fathers spoke of the Eucharist, they did not mean any substantial change, but a change only of use and sanctification. Or as Faber well puts it: “ So far as I can understand Gregory (of Nyssa), whose language perfectly accords with that of Cyril and humus, and the ancient author of the Homily in Jerome, he seems to have acknowledged no change in the bread and wine by virtue of consecration, save such a change as that which is wrought in a layman when by virtue of consecration he becomes a Priest. Now, the only change in the layman, as indeed Gregory most carefully informs us, is a MORAL change. Therefore, the only change in the bread and wine, to which this change in the layman is expressly compared, must clearly be a MORAL change also. No person, who held that doctrine of a PHYSICAL change in the elements, could possibly compare the PHYSICAL change to a variety of other changes, every one of which is purely MORAL. Hence it is evident that the primitive Church acknowledged only a MORAL change in the elements; and hence nothing can be more nugatory than the conduct of the Roman controversialists, who perpetually quote the Fathers as speaking of a PHYSICAL change, when they most indubitably speak only of a moral change” (*Difficulties of Romanism*).

And as Dr. Elliott, to whom we are so much indebted, observes: “Whatever the Fathers say of the Eucharist, they affirm of the other Sacrament, and also of the Rituals of the Church.”

Our own Reformers, Apologists, Standards, and late Christian Writers.

Cranmer.

On the Lord's Supper. – “But what availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other like Popery, so long as the two chief roots remain unpulled up? whereof, so long as they remain, will spring again all former impediments of the Lord's harvest, and corruption of his flock. The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest, for the salvation of the quick and the dead” (*Preface*).

“This shall be mine issue: That as no scripture, so no ancient author known and approved, hath in plain terms transubstantiation; nor that the body and blood of Christ be really, corporally, naturally, and carnally under the forms of bread and wine; nor that evil men do eat the very body and drink the very blood of Christ; nor that Christ is offered every day by the priest a sacrifice propitiatory for sin” (*Of the Sacrament*).

“The Papists do teach, that Christ is in the visible signs, and whether they list to call them bread and wine, or the forms of bread and wine, all is one to me; for the truth is, that he is neither corporally in the bread and wine, nor in or under the forms and figures of them, but is corporally in heaven, and spiritually in his lively members, which be his temples where he inhabiteth. ...

“They say, that when any man eateth the bread, and drinketh the cup, Christ goeth into his mouth or stomach with the bread and wine, and no further. But we say, that Christ is in the whole man, both in body and soul of him that worthily eateth the bread, and drinketh the cup, and not in his mouth or stomach only. ...

“They say, that Christ is received in the mouth, and entereth in with the bread and wine. We say that he is received in the heart, and entereth in by faith. ...

“They say, that Christ is really in the sacramental bread, being reserved a whole year, or so long as the form of bread remaineth; but after the receiving thereof he flieth up, say they, from the receiver unto heaven, as soon as the bread is chewed in the mouth, or changed in the stomach: but we say, that Christ remaineth in the man that worthily receiveth it, so long as the man remaineth a member of Christ. ...

“They say, that in the sacrament the corporal members of Christ be not distant in place one from another, but that wheresoever the head is, there be the feet; and wheresoever the arms be, there be the legs: so that in every part of the bread and wine is altogether whole head, whole feet, whole flesh, whole blood, whole heart, whole lungs, whole breast, whole back, and altogether whole, confused and mixed without distinction or diversity. O what a foolish and an abominable invention is this, to make of the most pure and perfect body of Christ such a confused and monstrous body! And yet can the Papists imagine nothing so foolish, but all Christian people must receive the same as an oracle of God, and as a most certain article of their faith, without whispering to the contrary. ...

“Furthermore, the Papists say that a dog or a cat eateth the body of Christ, if they by chance do eat the sacramental bread. We say, that no earthly creature can eat the body of Christ, nor drink his blood, but only man. ...

“They say, that every man, good or evil, eateth the body of Christ. We say, that both do eat the sacramental bread, and drink the wine; but none do eat the very body of Christ, and drink his blood, but only they that be lively members of his body. ...

“They say, that good men eat the body of Christ and drink his blood, only at that time when they receive the sacrament. We say, that they eat, drink, and feed of Christ continually, so long as they be members of his body. ...

“They say, that the body of Christ that is in the sacrament, hath his own proper form and quantity. We say, that Christ is there sacramentally and spiritually, without form or quantity. ...

“They say, that the Fathers and prophets of the Old Testament did not eat the body, nor drink the blood of Christ. We say, that they did eat his body and drink his blood, although he was not yet born nor incarnated. ...

“They say, that the body of Christ is every day many times made, as often as there be masses said, and that then and there he is made of bread and wine. We say, that Christ’s body was never but once made, and then not of the nature and substance of bread and wine, but of the substance of his blessed mother. ...

“That the mass is a sacrifice satisfactory for sin, by the devotion of the priest that offereth, and not by the thing that is offered. But we say, that their saying is a most heinous, yea, and detestable error against the glory of Christ: for the satisfaction for our sins is not the devotion nor offering of the priest, but the only host and satisfaction for all the sins of the world is the death of Christ, and the oblation of his body upon the cross, that is to say, the oblation that Christ himself offered once upon the cross, and never but once, nor never any but he. And therefore that oblation which the priests make daily in their papistical masses, cannot be a satisfaction for other men’s sins by the priest’s devotion: but it is a mere illusion, and subtle craft of the devil, whereby antichrist hath many years blinded and deceived the world. ...

“Lastly. They say, that Christ is corporally in many places at one time, affirming that his body is corporally and really present in as many places as

there be hosts consecrated. We say, that as the sun corporally is ever in heaven, and nowhere else, and yet by his operation and virtue the sun is here in earth, by whose influence and virtue all things in the world be corporally regenerated, increased, and grow to their perfect state; so likewise our Saviour Christ bodily and corporally is in heaven, sitting at the right hand of his Father, although spiritually he hath promised to be present with us upon earth unto the world's end. And whensoever two or three be gathered together in his name, he is there in the midst among them, by whose supernal grace all godly men be first by him spiritually regenerated, and after increase and grow to their spiritual perfection in God, spiritually by faith eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, although the same corporally be in heaven, far distant from our sight" (*Of the Presence of Christ*).

"The gross error of the Papists is, of the carnal eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood with our mouths.

"For they say, that 'whosoever eat and drink the sacraments of bread and wine, do eat and drink also with their mouths Christ's very flesh and blood, be they never so ungodly and wicked persons.' But Christ himself taught clean contrary in the sixth of John, that we eat not him carnally with our mouths, but spiritually with our faith, saying: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth in me hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and died. This is the bread that came from heaven, that whosoever shall eat thereof shall not die. I am the living bread that came from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever. And the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.'

"This is the most true doctrine of our Saviour Christ, that whosoever eateth him shall have everlasting life. And by and by it followeth in the same place of St. John more clearly: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath life everlasting, and I will raise him again at the last day: for my flesh is very meat, and my blood is very drink. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, even so he that eateth me shall live by me. This is the bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth this bread shall live forever.'

“This taught our Saviour Christ as well his disciples as the Jews at Capernaum, that the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood was not like to the eating of manna. For both good and bad did eat manna; but none do eat his flesh and drink his blood, but they have everlasting life. For as his Father dwelleth in him, and he in his Father, and so hath life by his Father; so he that eateth Christ’s flesh and drinketh his blood, dwelleth in Christ, and Christ hi him, and by Christ he hath eternal life.

“What need we any other witness, when Christ himself doth testify the matter so plainly, that whosoever eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood hath everlasting life; and that to eat his flesh and to drink his blood is to believe in him; and whosoever believeth in him hath everlasting life? Wherefore it followeth necessarily, that ungodly persons (being limbs of the devil) do not eat Christ’s flesh nor drink his blood, except the Papists would say that such have everlasting life” (*Of the Eating and Drinking*).

“That bread and wine remain after the words of consecration, and be eaten and drunken in the Lord’s Supper, is most manifest by the plain words of Christ himself, when he ministered the same supper unto his disciples. For, as the evangelists write, ‘Christ took bread, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said: “Take, eat, this is my body.”’

“Here the Papists triumph of these words, when Christ said: ‘This is my body’: which they call the words of consecration. For, say they, as soon as these words be fully ended, there is no bread left, nor none other substance, but only Christ’s body. When Christ said ‘this,’ the bread, say they, remained. And when he said ‘is,’ yet the bread remained. Also, when he added ‘my,’ the bread remained still. And when he said ‘body,’ yet the bread was there still. But when he had finished the whole sentence, ‘This is my body,’ then, say they, the bread was gone, and there remained no substance but Christ’s body; as though the bread could not remain when it is made a sacrament. But this negative, that there is no bread, they make of their own brains, by their unwritten verities, which they most highly esteem.

“Oh, good Lord, how would they have bragged, if Christ had said, ‘This is no bread!’ But Christ spake not that negative, ‘This is no bread’; but said affirmingly, ‘This is my body,’ not denying the bread, but affirming that his body was eaten, meaning spiritually, as the bread was eaten corporally.

“And that this was the meaning of Christ, appeareth plainly by St. Paul, in the tenth chapter to the Corinthians, the first epistle, where he, speaking of the same matter, saith: ‘Is not the bread which we break the communion of the body of Christ?’ Who understood the mind of Christ better than St. Paul, to whom Christ showed his most secret councils? And St. Paul is not afraid, for our better understanding of Christ’s words, somewhat to alter the same, lest we might stand stiffly in the letters and syllables, and err in mistaking the sense and meaning. For whereas our Saviour Christ brake the bread, and said, ‘This is my body’; St. Paul saith, ‘that the bread which we break is the communion of Christ’s body.’ Christ said, ‘his body’; and St. Paul said, ‘the communion of his body’: meaning, nevertheless, both one thing, ‘that they which eat the bread worthily, do eat spiritually Christ’s very body.’ And so Christ calleth the bread his body, as the old authors report, because it representeth his body, and signifieth unto them which eat that bread according to Christ’s ordinance, that they do spiritually eat his body, and be spiritually fed and nourished by him, and yet the bread remaineth still there as a sacrament to signify the same.

“That the bread remaineth, and is eaten in this sacrament, appeareth by the words of Christ, which he spake before the consecration. For that Christ took bread, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, ‘Take eat’; all this was done and spoken before the words of consecration. Wherefore they must needs be understood of the very bread, that Christ took bread, brake bread, gave bread to his disciples, commanding them to take bread and eat bread. But the same is more plain and evident of the wine, that it remaineth, and is drunken at the Lord’s Supper, as well by the words that go before, as by the words that follow after the consecration. For, before the words of consecration, Christ took the cup of wine, and gave it unto his disciples, and said, ‘Drink ye all of this’: and after the words of consecration followeth, ‘They drank all of it.’

“Now I ask all the Papists, what thing it was that Christ commanded his disciples to drink, when he said, ‘Drink ye all of this’? The blood of Christ was not yet there by their own confession, for these words were spoken before the consecration; therefore it could be nothing else but wine that he commanded them to drink.

“Then I ask the Papists once again, whether the disciples drank wine or not? If they say ‘yea,’ then let them recant their error, that there was no wine remaining after the consecration. If they say ‘nay,’ then they condemn

the apostles of disobedience to Christ's commandment, which drank not wine as he commanded them. Or rather they reprove Christ as a juggler, which commanded his apostles to drink wine; and when they came to the drinking thereof, he himself had conveyed it away. Moreover, before Christ delivered the cup of wine to his disciples, he said unto them: 'Divide this among you.'

"Here I would ask the Papists another question, what thing it was that Christ commanded his disciples to divide among them? I am sure they will not say it was the cup, except they be disposed to make men laugh at them. Nor I think they will not say it was the blood of Christ, as well because the words were spoken before the consecration, as because the blood of Christ is not divided, but spiritually given whole in the sacrament. Then could it be understood of nothing else but of wine, which they should divide among them, and drink all together.

"Also, when the communion was ended, Christ said unto his apostles, 'Verily, I say unto you, that I will drink no more henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day that I shall drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.' By these words it is clear, that it was very wine that the apostles drank at that godly supper. For the blood of Christ is not the fruit of the vine, nor the accidents of wine, nor none other thing is the fruit of the vine, but the very wine only.

"How could Christ have expressed more plainly, that bread and wine remain, than by taking the bread in his hands, and breaking it himself, and giving it unto his disciples, commanding them to eat it, and by taking the cup of wine in his hands, and delivering it unto them, commanding them to divide it among them, and to drink it; and calling it 'the fruit of the vine'? These words of Christ be so plain, that if an angel of heaven would tell us the contrary, he ought not to be believed. And then much less may we believe the subtle lying Papists. ...

"If the Papists be demanded, what thing it is that is broken, what is eaten, what is drunken, and what is chewed with the teeth, lips, and mouth in this sacrament, they have nothing to answer, but the accidents. For, as they say, 'bread and wine be not the visible elements in this sacrament, but only their accidents.' And so they be forced to say, that accidents be broken, eaten, drunken, chewed, and swallowed without any substance at all; which is not only against all reason, but also against the doctrine of all ancient authors. ...

“Secondly, these transubstantiators do say contrary to all learning, that the accidents of bread and wine do hang alone in the air, without any substance wherein they may be stayed. And what can be said more foolishly? ...

“Thirdly, that the substance of Christ’s body is there really, corporally, and naturally present, without any accidents of the same. And so the Papists make accidents to be without substances, and substances to be without accidents. ...

“Fourthly, they say, that the place where the accidents of bread and wine be, hath no substance there to fill that place, and so must they needs grant *vacuum*, which nature utterly abhorreth. ...

“Fifthly, they are not ashamed to say, that ‘substance is made of accidents, when the bread moldeth or is turned into worms, or when the wine soureth.’ ...

“Sixthly, that substance is nourished without substance, by accidents only, if it chance any cat, mouse, dog, or other thing, to eat the sacramental bread, or drink the sacramental wine.

“These inconveniences and absurdities do follow of the fond Papistical transubstantiation, with a number of other errors, as evil or worse than these, whereunto they be never able to answer, as many of them have confessed themselves.

“And it is wonder to see, how in many of the foresaid things they vary among themselves: whereas the other doctrine, of the scripture and of the old Catholic Church, but not of the lately corrupted Romish Church, is plain and easy, as well to be understood, as to answer to all the aforesaid questions, without any absurdity or inconvenience following thereof; so that every answer shall agree with God’s word, with the old Church, and also with all reason and true philosophy.

“For as touching the first point, what is broken, what is eaten, what drunken, and what chewed in this sacrament, it is easy to answer. The bread and wine, as St. Paul saith: ‘The bread which we break.’

“And as concerning the second and third points, neither is the substance of bread and wine without their proper accidents, nor their accidents hang alone in the air without any substance; but, according to all learning, the substance of the bread and wine reserve their own accidents, and the accidents do rest in their own substances.

“And also as concerning the fourth point, there is no point left void after consecration, as the Papists dream; but bread and wine fulfill their place, as they did before.

“And as touching the fifth point, whereof the worms or molding is engendered, and whereof the vinegar cometh, the answer is easy to make, according to all learning and experience, that they come according to the course of nature, of the substance of the bread and wine, too long kept, and not of the accidents alone, as the Papists do fondly phantasy.

“And likewise the substances of bread and wine do feed and nourish the body of them that eat the same, and not only the accidents.

“In these answers is no absurdity nor inconvenience, nothing spoken either contrary to holy scripture, or to natural reason, philosophy, or experience, or against any old ancient author, or the primitive or Catholic Church, but only against the malignant and papistical Church of Rome. Whereas on the other side, that cursed synagogue of antichrist hath defined and determined in this matter many things contrary to Christ’s words, contrary to the old Catholic Church, and the holy martyrs and doctors of the same, and contrary to all natural reason, learning, and philosophy.

“And the final end of all this antichrist’s doctrine is none other, but by subtilty and craft to bring Christian people from the true honouring of Christ unto the greatest idolatry that ever was in this world devised” (*Against Transubstantiation*).

“The greatest blasphemy and injury that can be against Christ, and yet universally used through the Popish kingdom, is this, that the priests make their Mass a *Sacrifice Propitiatory*, to remit the sins as well of themselves as of others, both quick and dead, to whom they list to apply the same. Thus under pretense of holiness, the papistical priests have taken upon them to be Christ’s successors, and to make such an oblation and sacrifice as never creature made but Christ alone, neither He made the same any more times than once, and that was by his death upon the cross.

“For as St. Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews witnesseth, ‘Although the high priests of the old law offered many times, at the least every year once, yet Christ offered not himself many times; for then he should many times have died. But now he offered himself but once, to take away sin by that offering of himself. And as men must die once, so was Christ offered once, to take away the sins of many.’

“And furthermore St. Paul saith, that ‘the sacrifices of the old law, although they were continually offered from year to year, yet could they not take away sin, nor make men perfect. For if they could once have quieted men’s consciences by taking away sin, they should have ceased, and no more have been offered. But Christ with once offering hath made perfect for ever them that be sanctified, putting their sins clean out of God’s remembrance. And where remission of sins is, there is no more offering for sin.’ ...

“This is the honour and glory of this our High Priest, wherein he admitteth neither partner nor successor. For by his own oblation he satisfied his Father for all men’s sins, and reconciled mankind unto his grace and favour. And whosoever deprive him of his honour, and go about to take it to themselves, they be very antichrists, and most arrogant blasphemers against God and against his Son Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent. ...

“And although in the Old Testament there were certain sacrifices, called sacrifices for sin, yet they were no such sacrifices that could take away our sins in the sight of God, but they were ceremonies ordained to this intent, that they should be, as it were, shadows and figures, to signify beforehand the excellent sacrifice of Christ that was to come, which should be the very true and perfect sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. ...

“But it is a wondrous thing to see what shifts and cantels the Popish antichrists devise to colour and cloak their wicked errors. And as a chain is so joined together that one link draweth another after it, so the vices and errors knit together, that every one draweth his fellow with him. And so doth it here in this matter.

“For the Papists, to excuse themselves, do say that they make no new sacrifice, nor none other sacrifice than Christ made (for they be not so blind but they see, that then they should add another sacrifice to Christ’s sacrifice, and so make his sacrifice unperfect); but they say that they make the self-same sacrifice for sin that Christ himself made.

“And here they run headlong into the foulest and most heinous error that ever was imagined. For if they make every day the same oblation and sacrifice for sin that Christ himself made, and the oblation that he made was his death, and the effusion of his most precious blood upon the cross, for our redemption and price of our sins; then followeth it of necessity, that they every day slay Christ, and shed his blood, and so be they worse than

the wicked Jews and Pharisees, which slew him and shed his blood but once. ...

“The place of St. Paul unto the Hebrews, which they do cite for their purpose, maketh quite and clean against them. For where St. Paul saith, that ‘every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins,’ he spake not that of the priests of the New Testament, but of the Old, which, as he said, offered calves and goats. And yet they were not such priests that by their offering and sacrifices they could take away the people’s sins; but they were shadows and figures of Christ our everlasting Priest, which only by one oblation of himself taketh away the sins of the world. Wherefore the Popish priests that apply this text unto themselves, do directly contrary to the meaning of St. Paul, to the great injury and prejudice of Christ, by whom only St. Paul saith that the sacrifice and oblation for the sins of the whole world was accomplished and fulfilled.

“And as little serveth for the Papists’ purpose the text of the prophet Malachi, that ‘everywhere should be offered unto God a pure sacrifice and oblation.’ For the prophet in that place spake no word of the Mass, nor of any oblation propitiatory to be made by the priests; but he spake of the oblation of all faithful people, in what place soever they be, which offer unto God, with pure hearts and minds, sacrifices of laud and praise: prophesying of the vocation of the Gentiles, that God would extend his mercy unto them, and not be the God only of the Jews, but of all nations, from east to west, that with pure faith call upon him and glorify his name.

“But the adversaries of Christ gather together a great heap of authors, which, as they say, call the Mass or Holy Communion a sacrifice. But all those authors be answered unto in this one sentence, that they call it not a sacrifice for sin, because that it taketh away our sin, which is taken away only by the death of Christ, but because the Holy Communion was ordained of Christ to put us in remembrance of the sacrifice made by him upon the cross: for that cause it heareth the name of that sacrifice, as St. Augustine declareth plainly in his epistle *ad Bonafacium*. And in his book *De fide ad Petrum Diaconum*, and in his book *De Civitate Dei*, he saith: ‘That which men call a sacrifice is a sign or representation of the true sacrifice.’

“And the Master of the sentence, of whom all the school authors take their occasion to write, judged truly in this point, saying, ‘That which is offered, and consecrated of the priest is called a sacrifice and oblation,

because it is a memory and representation of the true sacrifice and holy oblation made in the altar of the cross.’

“And St. John Chrysostom, after he had said that Christ is our bishop, which offered that sacrifice that made us clean, and that we offer the same now, lest any man might be deceived by his manner of speaking, he openeth his meaning more plainly, saying, ‘That which we do is done for a remembrance of that which was done by Christ; for Christ saith, *Do this in remembrance of me.*’ Also Chrysostom, declaring at length that the priests of the old law offered ever-new sacrifices, and changed them from time to time, and that Christian people do not so, but offer ever one sacrifice of Christ; yet by and by, lest some might be offended with this speech, he maketh as it were a correction of his words, saying, ‘But rather we make a remembrance of Christ’s sacrifice.’ As though he should say, ‘Although in a certain kind of speech we may say that every day we make a sacrifice of Christ, yet in very deed, to speak properly, we make no sacrifice of him, but only a commemoration and remembrance of that sacrifice which he alone made, and none but he. Nor Christ never gave this honour to any creature, that he should make a sacrifice of him, nor did not ordain the sacrament of his Holy Supper to the intent that either the priest or the people should sacrifice Christ again, or that the priest should make a sacrifice of him for the people: but his Holy Supper was ordained for this purpose, that every man eating and drinking thereof should remember that Christ died for him, and so should exercise his faith and comfort himself by the remembrance of Christ’s benefits, and so give unto Christ most hearty thanks, and give himself also clearly unto him. ...

“They therefore which gather of the doctors that the Mass is a sacrifice for remission of sin, and that it is applied by the priest to them for whom he saith or singeth, they which so gather of the doctors do to them most grievous injury and wrong, most falsely belying them.

“For these monstrous things were never seen nor known of the old and primitive Church, nor there was not then in one Church many masses every day; but upon certain days there was a common Table of the Lord’s Supper, where a number of people did together receive the body and blood of the Lord: but there were then no daily private masses, where every priest received alone, like as until tins day there is none in the Greek Churches but one common mass in a day. Nor the holy fathers of the old Church would not have suffered such ungodly and wicked abuses of the Lord’s Supper.

“But these private masses sprang up of late years, partly through the ignorance and superstition of unlearned monks and friars, which knew not what a sacrifice was, but made of the Mass a Sacrifice Propitiatory, to remit both sin and the pain due for the same; but chiefly they sprang of lucre and gain, when priests found the means to sell masses to the people, which caused masses so much to increase that every day was said an infinite number, and that no priest would receive the communion at another priest’s hand, but everyone would receive it alone; neither regarding the godly decree of the most famous and holy Council of Nice, which appointed in what order priests should be placed above deacons at the Communion, nor yet the Canons of the apostles, which command that when any communion is ministered, all the priests together should receive the same, or else be excommunicate. So much the old Fathers misliked that any priest should receive the sacrament alone.

“Therefore, when the old Fathers called the Mass or Supper of the Lord a Sacrifice, they meant that it was a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving (and so as well the people as the priest do sacrifice), or else that it was a remembrance of the very true sacrifice propitiatory of Christ; but they meant in no wise that it is a very true sacrifice for sin, and applicable by the priest to the quick and dead” (*Of the Oblation and Sacrifice of Christ*).

One pithy and scathing paragraph we have reserved for a distinct place here – on the adoration in the sacrament: “Now it is requisite to speak something of the manner and form of worshipping of Christ by them that receive this sacrament, lest that in the stead of Christ himself we worshipped the sacrament. For as his humanity, joined to his divinity, and exalted. To the right hand of his Father, is to be worshipped of all creatures in heaven, earth, and under the earth; even so if in the stead thereof we worship the signs and sacraments, we commit as great idolatry as ever was, or shall be to the world’s end. And yet have the very antichrists (the subtlest enemies that Christ hath) by their fine inventions and crafty scholastic divinity deluded many simple souls, and brought them to this horrible idolatry, to worship things visible, and made with their own hands, persuading them that creatures were their Creator, their God, and their Maker. For else, what made the people to run from their scats to tile altar, and from altar to altar, and from saering (as they called it) to saering, peeping, tooting, and gazing at that thing which the priest held up in his

hands, if they thought not to honour that thing which they saw? What moved the priests to lift up the sacrament so high over their heads; or the people to cry to the priest, 'Hold up! hold up!' and one man to say to another, 'Stoop down before'; or to say, 'This day have I seen my Maker'; and 'I cannot be quiet, except I see my Maker once a day!' What was the cause of all these, and that as well the priest as the people so devoutly did knock and kneel at every sight of the sacrament, but that they worshipped that visible thing which they saw with their eyes, and took it for very God? For if they worshipped in spirit only Christ, sitting in heaven with his Father, what needed they to remove out of their seats to toot and gaze, as the apostles did after Christ, when he was gone up into heaven? If they worshipped nothing that they saw, why did they rise up to see? Doubtless, many of the simple people worshipped that thing which they saw with their eyes. And although the subtle Papists do colour and cloak the matter never so finely, saying that they worship not the sacraments which they see with their eyes, but that thing which they believe with their faith to be really and corporally in the sacraments; yet why do they then run from place to place, to gaze at the things which they see, if they worship them not, giving thereby occasion to them that be ignorant to worship that which they see? Why do they not rather quietly sit still in their seats, and move the people to do the like, worshipping God in heart and in spirit, than to gad about from place to place to see that thing, which they confess themselves is not to be worshipped? And yet to eschew one inconvenience (that is to say, the worshipping of the sacrament), they fall into another as evil, and worship nothing there at all. For they worship that thing (as they say) which is really and corporally, and yet invisibly present under the kinds of bread and wine, which (as before is expressed and proved) is utterly nothing. And so they give unto the ignorant occasion to worship bread and wine, and they themselves worship nothing there at all" (*Of the Eating and Drinking*).

We need scarcely add, that Cranmer's views on Baptism (like the rest of our Reformers) were the same as those on the Lord's Supper – the "spiritual regeneration and apparel" of the one, as the "spiritual meat and drink" of the other, being only conferred on "them that come thereto in such sort as they ought to do."

We have thus been careful at some considerable length to rehearse the good and great Archbishop, and for these reasons: (1) To recall and inculcate, in these days of backsliding, his faithful teaching. (2) He was the

fountainhead of our formularies and Protestant Articles. (3) English Ritualists not only ignore his doctrine altogether, and so hide it from our seminaries and pulpits, but are accustomed of late shamefully and spitefully to vilify the man to whom, under God, we owe our liberties and saving religion. And (4) at best, in many quarters, where we should have expected better things, we have but scanty and garbled extracts not only from Cranmer, but other Reformers; which, when read alone, may not seem anything very distinctive. Alas for intrigue in religion.

The student who has time on his hands would greatly benefit himself by drawing up a clear and thorough synopsis of the Works of our English Reformers, Apologists, etc., so far as they bear on the Romish superstition; and might render good service to the Church and our colleges by publishing the same in a handy volume. We can never be safe until our theology and seats of learning get back to the good old Protestant lines.

Latimer.

“St. John Baptist saith, ‘A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven.’ And St. Paul, ‘No man taketh honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron,’ etc. But to offer Christ is a great and weighty matter; therefore ought no man to take it upon him without a manifest calling and commission. But where have our sacrifices so great an office committed unto them? Let them show their commission, and then sacrifice. Peradventure they will say, ‘do this,’ is all one to say, as ‘offer this.’ Then I ask, what was there done? What was demonstrated by this pronoun, ‘this’? Or, what did they see done, to whom these words, ‘Do this,’ were spoken? If the whole action of Christ, if all that Christ did, be meant by this word, ‘this,’ and ‘do,’ is nothing else but ‘offer’; then the whole action of Christ is to be offered of the priests, neither can they, but in so doing, satisfy the commandment. And so it should appear, that neither was there any sacrament instituted for the lay people, seeing that no such sacrifice hath been done at any time, or is to be done, of the lay people; neither doth it avail much to eat or drink it, but only to offer it. Now the text hath not, that any part of Christ’s action was to offer, forasmuch as the text doth not declare that Christ himself did then offer. And so the action of offering is not contained in this pronoun ‘this’.

“Go through every word. First, ‘to take’ is not to offer; ‘to break’ is not to offer; ‘to give to the disciples’ is not to offer, and so on. Worcester

[Heath, Bishop of Worcester, afterwards Archbishop of York] said once to me, that to offer was contained in '*Benedicere*,' which is not true; for '*Benedicere*' is to give thanks. But he had often given thanks to God before, without any such offering. And if, in giving of thanks, Christ offered his body, seeing after he had given thanks, he said, 'This is my body'; then in speaking those words, he did not change the bread into his body, forasmuch as he had offered, before those words were spoken.

"St. Paul hath these words to the Hebrews, speaking of Christ: 'that he might be merciful and a faithful High Priest in things concerning God, for to purge the people's sins.' So that it may appear, that the purging of our sins doth rather hang hereof, that Christ was the High Priest offering, than that he was offered; saving in that he was of himself willingly offered. Then is it not necessary he should be offered of others; I will not say, a marvelous presumptuous act, that the same should be attempted of any without a manifest vocation; for it is no small matter to make an oblation. And yet I speak nothing, that it tendeth partly to the derogation of Christ's cross; besides also that the offerer ought to be of more excellency than the thing offered.

"The minister of the Gospel hath rather to do for Christ with the people, than for the people with God, except it be in praying and giving of thanks; and so hath the people as well to do with God for the minister. The office of reconciliation standeth in preaching, not in offering. 'We are messengers in the room of Christ,' saith St. Paul; he doth not say, 'We offer unto God for the people.'

"If Christ offered in his Supper, for whom, I pray you I For all. Then his latter oblation made on the cross cannot be thought to be done for all men, for it was not done for them for whom the oblation was made in the Supper; except, peradventure, he offered twice for the self-same, and that should argue the imperfectness of the sacrifice. 'Feed ye, as much as in you lieth, the flock of Christ': nay, sacrifice rather for the flock of Christ, if the matter be as it is pretended; and it is marvel that Peter did forget so high an office, seeing in these days sacrificing is so much esteemed, preaching almost nothing at all. Who art thou if thou ceasest to feed? A good catholic. But who art thou, if thou ceasest to sacrifice and say Mass? At the least, an heretic! From whence came these perverse judgments, except, peradventure, they think that in sacrificing they feed, and then what needeth

a learned pastor? Seeing no man is so foolish, but he can soon learn to sacrifice and say Mass.

“Paul wrote two epistles to Timothy, and one to Titus, two clergymen. He made also a long sermon *ad clerum*, but not one word of this Mass Sacrifice, which could not have been done if there had been such a one, and so highly to be esteemed.

“I have read over of late the New Testament three or four times deliberately; yet can I not find there neither the Popish consecration, nor yet their transubstantiation, nor their oblation, nor their adoration, which be the very sinews and marrow bones of the Mass. Christ could not be offered, but propitiatorily, yet now *Hoc facite*, ‘Do this,’ must be as much as to say, ‘Sacrifice and offer my body under a piece of bread,’ available, but we cannot tell how much. Ah, thieves! Have ye robbed the realm with your sacrifice of lands and goods; and now cannot tell how much your sacrifice is available? As who say, it is so much available, that the value cannot be expressed, nor too dear bought with both lands and goods. ‘The eye hath not seen, and the ear hath not heard,’ etc. This is a fine-spun thread, a cunning piece of work, worthily qualified and blanched, be ye sure. But our nobility will not see: they will not have that religion that hath the cross annexed to it.

“All Popish things (for the most part) are man’s inventions; whereas they ought to have the Holy Scripture for the only rule of faith. When Paul made allegation for himself before Felix, the high deputy, he did not extend his faith beyond the word of God written: ‘Believing all things (saith he) which are written in the law and the prophets’; making no mention of the Rabbins. ... The things, which have not their authority of the Scriptures, may as easily be despised as allowed,’ saith St. Hierome.

“‘Therefore, whether it be of Christ, or of his Church, or of any other manner of thing, which belongeth to our faith and life, I will not say if we,’ saith St. Augustine, ‘which are not worthy to be compared to him that said, “If we,” but that also which forthwith he addeth, “if an angel from heaven shall teach anything, besides that ye have received (in the scriptures of the law and gospel), accursed be he.”’ Our Diotrophes [Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester] with his Papists are under this curse.

“But how are the Scriptures, say they, to be understood? St. Augustine answereth, giving this rule: ‘The circumstances of the Scriptures,’ saith he, ‘lighten the Scriptures; and so one Scripture doth

expound another, to a man that is studious, well willing, and often calling upon God in continual prayer, who giveth his Holy Spirit to them that desire it of him.’ So that the Scripture is not of any private interpretation at any time. For such a one, though he be a layman, fearing God, is much more fit to understand Holy Scripture than any arrogant and proud priest, yea, than the Bishop himself, be he never so great and glistening in all his pontificals.

“But what is to be said of the Fathers? How are they to be esteemed? St. Augustine answereth, giving this rule also; that we should not therefore think it true, because they say so, do they never so much excel in holiness or learning; but if they be able to prove their saying by the canonical Scriptures, or by good probable reason: meaning that to be a probable reason, as I think, which doth orderly follow upon a right collection and gathering out of the Scriptures. ...

“The Fathers have both herbs and weeds; and Papists commonly gather the weed and leave the herbs. And they speak many times more vehemently in sound of words, than they did mean indeed, or than they would have done, if they had foreseen what sophistical wranglers should have succeeded them. Now, the Papists are given to brawl about words, to the maintenance of their own inventions, and rather follow the sound of words, than attain unto the meaning of the Fathers; so that it is dangerous to trust them in citing the Fathers.

“In all ages the devil hath stirred up some light heads to esteem the Sacraments but lightly, as to be empty and bare signs; whom the Fathers have resisted so fiercely, that in their fervour they seem, in sound of words, to run too far the other way, and to give too much to the Sacraments, when they did think more measurably. And therefore they are to be read warily, with sound judgment” (*Conferences between Bishops Ridley and Latimer, during their Imprisonment.*)

Ridley.

“The causes that move me to abstain from the Mass, be these: —

“I. It is done in a strange tongue, which the people doth not understand, contrary to the doctrine of the Apostle: 1 Cor. 14.

“II. There is also wanting the showing of the Lord’s death, contrary to the mind of the Apostle, ‘As often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall show the Lord’s death till he come.’ What showing can be there, whereas no man heareth, that is to say, understandeth what is said?

No man, I mean, of the common people, for whose profit the prayer of the Church ought specially to serve.

“III. There is no communion, but it is made a private table, and indeed ought to be a communion; for St. Paul saith, ‘The bread which we break, is the partaking of the body of Christ.’ And Christ brake, distributed, and said, ‘Take and eat,’ etc. But that they make it a private table, it is open. For where they be many priests which will communicate, they do it not in one table or altar, but every one of them have their altars, masses, and tables.

“IV. The Lord’s commandment of communicating the cup unto the lay people, is not observed according to the word of the Lord, ‘Drink ye all of this.’

[Latimer: “As often as ye shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall show the Lord’s death.’ So that, not the partaking of the one only, but of both, is a showing of the Lord’s death. Because in his death the blood was divided from the body, it is necessary that the same division be represented in the Supper; otherwise the Supper is not a showing of the Lord’s death, etc. ‘Let a man examine himself,’ etc. But this word ‘*homo*’ is of both genders: therefore it is as well commanded to the woman to drink of the cup as the man, etc. But the king’s argument once against me, was this – ‘When ye come together to eat, he saith not, saith he, to drink.’ – I answered, it was not needful, seeing that a little before he had made mention of both in these words: And so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. – *Homo*. – That is to say, as well the woman as the man. Under the name of bread, which betokeneth all sustenance of the body, drink is also understood in the Scripture. Otherwise they would say, that Christ did not drink after his resurrection with his disciples, except Peter had said, we did eat and drink with him after he rose from death” (Response to foregoing.)]

“V. They do servilely serve the holy sign, as St. Augustine speaketh, instead of the thing signified, whilst the sacramental bread (by a solemn or common error) is adored and worshipped for the flesh taken of the Son of God.

“VI. They pluck away the honour from the only sacrifice of Christ, whilst this sacramental and mass-sacrifice is believed to be Propitiatory, and such a one as purgeth the souls, both of the quick and dead. Contrary to that is written to the Hebrews, ‘With one offering hath he made perfect for ever

them that are sanctified.’ And again, ‘Where remission of these things (that is, of sins) is, there is no more offering for sin.’

“VII. There be manifold abuses and superstitions which are done in the Mass and about the Mass. Salt is conjured, that it may be a conjured salt for the salvation of the believers, to be a salvation and health, both of the mind and of the body, unto everlasting life, to all them that receive it. Water is conjured, that it may be made a conjured water, to chase away all the power of the enemy, to chase away devils, etc. Bread also hath this second blessing, that it may be health of mind and body to all them that receive it. If we do think that such strength is to be given to salt, water, and bread; or if we judge that these things are able to receive any such virtue or efficacy, what leave we to Christ, our Saviour? But if we think not so, why then do we pray on this sort; forasmuch as all prayer ought to be done in faith?

“VIII. The priest turneth himself from the altar, and speaketh unto the people in an unknown tongue, saying, *Dominus vobiscum, orate pro me, fratres et sorores*, etc.; that is, The Lord be with you, and pray for me, brothers and sisters: and turning from the people, he saith in Latin, ‘Let us pray, and the peace of the Lord be always with you.’ Also the people, or at least he which supplieth the place of the people, is compelled three times to say, ‘Amen,’ when he hath heard never a word of that the priest hath prayed or spoken, except these few words, *Per omnia secula seculorum*. Whereas to the answering of ‘Amen,’ St. Paul willeth the answerer, not only to hear, but also to understand, the things that were spoken.

“IX. The Priest, when he lifteth up the Sacrament, he murmureth to himself these words: *Haec quotiescunque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis*; that is, ‘As often as ye do these things, ye shall do it in remembrance of me.’ He seemeth by his words to speak unto the people, but he suffereth not his voice to be heard of the people.

“X. ‘Upon the which vouchsafe to look with thy merciful and cheerful countenance.’ What meaneth this prayer for the Sacrament itself, if it be, as they say, the body of Christ, if it be God and Man? How should the Father not look with a cheerful countenance upon his only and well-beloved Son? Why do not we rather pray for ourselves, that we, for his sake, may be looked upon of the Father with a cheerful countenance?

“XI. ‘Command these to be carried by the hands of thy holy angel unto thy high altar,’ etc. If we understand the body and blood of Christ, wherefore do we so soon desire the departure of them, before the receipt of

the same? And wherefore brought we them thither by making of them, to let him go so soon?" (*Conferences* as above).

"First of all, the Real Presence of Christ in the Supper, is contrary to the Word of God, as appeareth thus: – I tell you the truth. It is profitable to you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter shall not come unto you.' 'Whom the heavens must receive .until the time of restoring of all things which God hath spoken.' 'The children of the bridegroom cannot mourn so long as the bridegroom is with them: but now is the time of mourning.' 'But I will see you again, and your hearts shall rejoice.' 'I will come again and take you to myself.' 'If they shall say unto you, Behold, here is Christ, or there is Christ, believe them not: for wheresoever the dead carcass is, thither the eagles will resort.'

"Secondly, it varieth from the Articles of the Faith: 'He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, from whence (and not from any other place, saith St. Augustine) he shall come to judge both the quick and the dead.'

"Thirdly, it destroyeth and taketh away the Institution of the Lord's Supper; which was commanded only to be used and continued until the Lord himself should come. If, therefore, he be now really present in the body of his flesh, then must the Supper cease: for a remembrance is not of a thing present, but of a thing past and absent. And there is a difference between remembrance and presence, and, as one of the Fathers saith, 'A figure is in vain, where the thing figured is present.'

"Fourthly, it maketh precious things common to profane and ungodly persons; for it casteth that which is holy unto dogs, and pearls unto swine, and constraineth men to confess many absurdities. For it affirmeth, that whoremongers and murderers, yea, and (as some of them hold opinion) the wicked and faithless, mice, rats, and dogs also, may receive the very real and corporal body of the Lord, wherein the fulness of the Spirit of light and grace dwelleth: contrary to the manifest words of Christ in six places and sentences of John 6.

"It confirmeth also and maintaineth that beastly kind of cruelty of the *Anthropophagi*, that is, the devourers of man's flesh: for it is a more cruel thing to devour a quick man, than to slay him.'

"Fifthly, it forceth men to maintain many monstrous miracles, without any necessity and authority of God's Word. For at the coming of this Presence of the body and flesh of Christ, they thrust away the substance of

bread, and affirm that the accidents remain without any subject; and, in the stead thereof, they place Christ's body without his qualities and the true manner of a body. And if the sacrament be reserved so long until it mold, and worms breed, some say that the substance of bread miraculously returneth again, and some deny it. Other some affirm, the real body of Christ goeth down into the stomach of the receivers, and doth there abide so long only as they shall continue to be good. But another sort hold, that the body of Christ is carried into heaven, so soon as the forms of bread be bruised with the teeth. O works of miracles! Truly, and most truly, I see that fulfilled in these men, whereof St. Paul prophesied, 'Because they have not received the love of the truth, that they might be saved, God shall send them strong delusions, that they should believe lies, and be all damned which have not believed the truth.' This gross Presence hath brought forth that fond phantasy of concomitance, whereby is broken at this day and abrogated the commandment of the Lord for the distributing of the Lord's cup to the laity.

"Sixthly, it giveth occasion to heretics to maintain and defend their errors; as to Marcion, which said that Christ had but a phantastical body; and to Eutyches, which wickedly confounded the two natures in Christ.

"Finally, it falsifieth the sayings of the godly fathers and the catholic faith of the Church, which Vigilus, a martyr and grave writer, saith was taught of the apostles, confirmed with the blood of martyrs, and was continually maintained by the faithful until his time. By the savings of the fathers, I mean of Justine, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Emissenus, Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine, Vigilus, Fulgentius, Bertram, and other most ancient Fathers. ...

"But now, my brethren, think not because I disallow that presence which I take to be forged, phantastical, and, beside the authority of God's word, perniciously brought into the Church by the Romanists, that I therefore go about to take away the true presence of Christ's body in his supper rightly and duly ministered, which is grounded upon the word of God, and made more plain by the commentaries of the faithful Fathers. ...

"I say and confess with the evangelist Luke, and with the Apostle Paul, that the bread on the which thanks are given is the body of Christ in the Remembrance of him and his death, to be set forth perpetually of the faithful until his coming.

“I say and confess the bread which we break to be the communion and partaking of Christ’s body with the ancient and the faithful Fathers.

“I say and believe, that there is not only a signification of Christ’s body set forth by the sacrament, but also that therewith is given to the godly and faithful the grace of Christ’s body, that is, the food of life and immortality. And this I hold with Cyprian.

“I say also with St. Augustine that we eat life and we drink life; with Emissene, that we feel the Lord to be present in grace; with Athanasius, that we receive celestial food, which cometh from above; the property of natural communion, with Hilary; the nature of flesh and benediction which giveth life in bread and wine, with Cyril; and with the same Cyril, the virtue of the very flesh of Christ, life and grace of his body, the property of the only begotten, that is to say, life, as he himself in plain words expoundeth it.

“I confess also with Basil that we receive the mystical advent and coming of Christ, grace and the virtue of his very nature; the sacrament of his very flesh with Ambrose; the body of grace with Epiphanius; spiritual flesh, but not that which was crucified, with Jerome; grace flowing into a sacrifice, and the grace of the Spirit, with Chrysostom; grace and invisible verity, grace and society of the members of Christ’s body, with Augustine.

“Finally, with Bertram (who was the last of all these), I confess that Christ’s body is in the sacrament in this respect; namely, as he writeth, because there is in it the Spirit of Christ, that is, the power of the word of God, which not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it. Out of these I suppose it may clearly appear unto all men how far we are from that opinion, whereof some go about falsely to slander us to the world, saying, we teach that the godly and faithful should receive nothing else at the Lord’s table but a figure of the body of Christ” (*Disputation at Oxford*).

Jewel.

Challenge Articles; –

“1. If any learned man of our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the Primitive Church, whereby it may clearly and plainly be proved that there was any Private Mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after Christ.

“2. Or that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind.

“3. Or that the people had then common prayer in a strange tongue that they understood not.

“4. Or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an universal bishop, or the head of the universal Church.

“5. Or that the people was then taught to believe that Christ’s body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament.

“6. Or that his body is or may be in a thousand places, or more, at one time.

“7. Or that the priest did then hold up the sacrament over his head.

“8. Or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honour.

“9. Or that the sacrament was then, or now might to be, hanged up under a canopy.

“10. Or that in the sacrament, after the words of consecration, there remain only the accidents and shows, without the substance, of bread and wine.

“11. Or that the priest then divided the sacrament in three parts, and afterwards received himself all alone.

“12. Or that whosoever had said, the sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ’s body, had therefore been judged for an heretic.

“13. Or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten or five masses said in one day.

“14. Or that images then were set up in the churches to the intent the people might worship them.

“15. Or that the lay people was then forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue.

“16. Or that it was then lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely and in silence to himself.

“17. Or that the priest had then authority to offer up Christ unto his Father.

“18. Or to communicate and receive the sacrament for another, as they do.

“19. Or to apply the virtue of Christ’s death and passion to any man by the mean of the Mass.

“20. Or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people that Mass *ex opere operato*, that is, even for that it is said and done, is able to remove any part of our sin.

“21. Or that then any Christian man called the sacrament his Lord and God.

“22. Or that the people was then taught to believe that the body of Christ remaineth in the sacrament as long as the accidents of the bread remain there without corruption.

“23. Or that a mouse, or any other worm or beast, may eat the body of Christ (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught).

“24. Or that when Christ said, *Hoc est corpus meum*, this word *Hoc* pointed not the bread, but *Individuum vagum*, as some of them say.

“25. Or that the accidents, or forms, or shows of bread and wine be the sacraments of Christ’s body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself.

“26. Or that the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ that lieth hidden underneath it.

“27. Or that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion and obedience.

“The Conclusion is this, as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield and subscribe” (*Controversy with M. Harding*).

Hooker.

“It greatly offendeth, that some, when they labour to show the use of the holy Sacraments, assign unto them no end, but only to teach the mind by other senses that which the Word doth teach by hearing. Whereupon, how easily neglect and careless regard of so heavenly mysteries may follow, we see in part by some experience had of those men with whom that opinion is most strong. For where the Word of God may be heard, which teacheth with much more expedition and more full explication anything we have to learn, if all the benefit we reap by Sacraments be instruction, they which at all times have opportunity of using the better mean to that purpose will surely hold the worse in less estimation. And unto infants, which are not capable of instruction, who would not think it a mere superfluity that any Sacrament is administered, if to administer the Sacraments be but to teach receivers what God doth for them? There is of Sacraments therefore, undoubtedly, some other more excellent and heavenly uses. Sacraments, by

reason of their mixed nature, are more diversely interpreted and disputed of than any other parts of religion besides; for that in so great store of properties belonging to the selfsame thing, as every man's wit hath taken hold of some especial consideration above the rest, so they have accordingly seemed one to cross another, as touching their several opinions about the necessity of Sacraments; whereas in truth their disagreement is not great. For, let respect be had to the duty which every communicant doth undertake, and we may well determine concerning the use of Sacraments, that they serve as bonds of obedience to God; strict obligations to the mutual exercise of Christian charity; provocations to godliness; preservations from sin; memorials of the principal benefits of Christ; respect the time of their institution, and it thereby appeareth, that God hath annexed them forever unto the New Testament, as other Rites were before with the Old; regard the weakness which is in us, and they are warrants for the more security of our belief; compare the receivers of them with such as receive them not, and Sacraments are marks of distinction to separate God's own from strangers: so that in all these respects they are found to be most necessary. But their chief force and virtue consisteth not herein, so much as in that they are heavenly ceremonies which God hath sanctified and ordained to be administered in his Church: first, as marks whereby to know when God doth impart the vital or saving grace of Christ unto all that are capable thereof; and, secondly, as means conditional, which God requireth in them unto whom he imparteth grace. For, since God in himself is invisible, and cannot by us be discerned working, therefore when it seemeth good in the eyes of his heavenly wisdom that men for some special intent and purpose should take notice of his glorious presence, he giveth them some plain and sensible token whereby to know what they cannot see. For Moses to see God and live was impossible; yet Moses by fire knew where the glory of God extraordinarily was present. The angel by whom God endued the waters of the pool, called Bethesda, with supernatural virtue to heal, was not seen of any; yet the time of the Angel's presence was known by the troubled motions of the waters themselves. The Apostles, by fiery tongues which they saw, were admonished when the Spirit, which they could not behold, was upon them. In like manner it is with us. Christ and his Holy Spirit with all their blessed effects, though entering into the soul of man, we are not able to apprehend or express how, do notwithstanding give notice of the times when they use to make their access, because it pleaseth

Almighty God to communicate by sensible means those blessings which are incomprehensible. Seeing, therefore, that grace is a consequent of Sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end, a benefit which they have received from God himself, the Author of Sacraments, and not from any other natural or supernatural quality in them; it may be hereby both understood, that Sacraments are necessary, and that the manner of their necessity to life supernatural is not in all respects as food unto natural life, because they contain in themselves no vital force or efficacy; they are not physical, but moral instruments of salvation, duties of service and worship; which unless we perform as the Author of Grace requireth, they are unprofitable: for all receive not the grace of God, which receive the Sacraments of his grace. Neither is it ordinarily his will to bestow the grace of Sacraments on any but by the Sacraments; which grace also, they that receive by Sacraments or with Sacraments, receive it from him, and not from them. For of Sacraments, the very same is true which Solomon's Wisdom observeth in the Brazen Serpent, 'He that turned towards it, was not healed by the thing he saw, but by thee, O Saviour of all.' This is therefore the necessity of Sacraments. That saving grace which Christ originally is, or hath for the general good of his whole Church, by Sacraments he severally driveth into every member thereof. Sacraments serve as the instruments of God, to that end and purpose; moral instruments, the use whereof is in our own hands, the effect in his; for the use we have his express commandment, for the effect his conditional promise: so that without our obedience to the one, there is of the other no apparent assurance; as contrariwise, where the signs and Sacraments of his grace are not either through contempt unreceived, or received with contempt, we are not to doubt, but that they really give what they promise, and are what they signify. For we take not Baptism, nor the Eucharist, for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual, whereby God, when we take the Sacraments, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the Sacraments represent or signify. ...

“The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. ... I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ when and where the Bread is his Body, or the Cup his Blood; but only in the very

heart and soul of him which receiveth them. 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” (*Ecclesiastical Polity*).

Whitgift.

“The grace of God is not necessarily tied to the Sacrament” (*Against Cartwright*).

Ussher.

“The bread and wine are not the true body and blood of Christ, but the sign and token of them” (*Body of Divinity*).

Edward VI’S Catechism.

“The bread represents Christ’s body, the wine is instead and place of the blood.”

The Homilies.

“Three things be requisite in him that would seemly, as becometh such high mysteries, resort to the Lord’s Table. That is, first, a right and worthy estimation and understanding of this mystery. Secondly, to come in a sure faith. And thirdly, to have newness or pureness of life to succeed the receiving of the same. ...

“At the King of kings’ Table thou must carefully search and know what dainties are provided for thy soul, whither thou art come, not to feed thy senses and belly to corruption, but thy inward man to immortality and life; not to consider the earthly creatures which thou seest, but the heavenly graces which thy faith beholdeth. ...

“St. Paul, blaming the Corinthians for the profaning of the Lord’s Supper, concludeth that ignorance both of the thing itself, and the signification thereof, was the cause of their abuse: for they came thither unreverently, *Not discerning the Lord’s body* (1 Cor. 11:29). ... For what hath been the cause of the ruin of God’s religion, but the ignorance hereof? What hath been the cause of this gross idolatry, but the ignorance hereof? “What hath been the cause of this mummish massing, but the ignorance hereof? Yea, what hath been, and what is at this day the cause of this want of love and charity, but the ignorance hereof? Let us therefore so travail to

understand the Lord's Supper, that we be no cause of the decay of God's worship, of no idolatry, of no dumb massing, of no hate and malice; so may we the boldier have access thither to our comfort. ...

“Now it followeth to have with this knowledge [of the true nature of the Supper] a sure and constant faith, not only that the death of Christ is available for the redemption of all the world, for the remission of sins, and reconciliation with God the Father; but also that he hath made upon his cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee, a perfect cleansing of thy sins, so that thou acknowledgest no other Saviour, Redeemer, Mediator, Advocate, Intercessor, but Christ only; and that thou mayest say with the Apostle, that *he loved thee and gave himself for thee* (Gal. 2:20). For this is to stick fast to Christ's promise made in his institution, to make Christ their own, and to apply his merits unto thyself.

“Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other Sacrifice or oblation, no Sacrificing Priest, no Mass, no means established by man's invention. ...

“Thus we see, beloved, that resorting to this table, we must pluck up all the roots of infidelity, all distrust in God's promises, we must make ourselves living members of Christ's body. For the unbelievers and faithless cannot feed upon that precious body; whereas the faithful have their life, their abiding in him, their union, and as it were their incorporation with him. Wherefore let us prove and try ourselves unfeignedly, without flattering ourselves, whether we be the plants of the fruitful olive, living branches of the true vine, members indeed of Christ's mystical body; whether God hath purified our hearts by faith, to the sincere acknowledging of his gospel, and embracing of his mercies in Christ Jesus; that so at this his Table we receive not only the outward Sacrament, but the spiritual thing also; not the figure, but the truth; not the shadow only, but the body; not to death, but to life; not to destruction, but to salvation: which God grant us to do, through the merits of our Lord and Saviour: to whom be all honour and glory forever. Amen” (*Hom. 27, Part First*).

The Articles.

“Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's goodwill towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen

and confirm our faith in him. ... And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation. ...

“Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. ...

“The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ’s death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

“Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

“The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.”

The Prayer Book.

“It is hereby declared, That thereby [kneeling at the Lord’s Supper] no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural Body to be at one time in more places than one” (*Notes after Communion Service*).

Waterland.

“Regeneration (another word for the New Birth of a Christian) is a spiritual change wrought upon any person, by the Holy Spirit, in the use of

Baptism, whereby he is translated from his natural state in Adam to a spiritual state in Christ. This change, translation, or adoption, carries in it many Christian blessings and privileges, but all reducible to two, viz., remission of sins (absolute or conditional, and a covenant claim for the time being to eternal happiness). ...

“Renovation, I understand, is a renewal of heart and mind. Indeed regeneration is itself a kind of renewal; but then it is of the spiritual state, considered at large; whereas renovation seems to mean a more particular kind of renewal; namely, of the inward frame or disposition of the man. – Renovation may be, and should be, with respect to Adults, before, and in, and after Baptism.

“The distinction which I have hitherto insisted upon between Regeneration and Renovation has been carefully kept up by the Lutheran divines generally. And it is what our Church appears to have gone upon in her Offices of Baptism, as likewise in the Catechism. ...

“Infants, being in a state of innocence and incapacity, need no repentance and cannot have faith. They are consecrated in solemn form to God: pardon, mercy, and other covenant privileges, are made over to them; and the Holy Spirit translates them out of their state of nature (to which a curse belongs) to a state of grace, favour, and blessing. This is their Regeneration” (*Regeneration Stated and Explained*).

“It is evident that since the Body broken and Blood shed (of Christ on the Cross) neither do nor can now really exist, they neither can be really present, nor literally eaten or drunk (in the Supper); nor can we really receive them, but only the benefits purchased by them. But the Body which now exists, whereof we partake, and to which we are united, is the glorified Body; which is, therefore, verily and indeed received. ... The Protestants all agree that we spiritually eat Christ’s Body and drink his Blood; that we neither eat nor drink nor receive the dead Body nor the Blood shed, but only the benefits purchased by them; that those benefits are derived to us by virtue of our union and communion with the glorified Body, and that our partaking of it and union with it is effected by the mysterious and ineffable operation of the Holy Spirit” (*Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*).

Boyd.

“Regeneration in the Puritanical sense we (the Church of England) do not predicate of Baptism; Regeneration, in the Reformation sense, we do.

But, we utterly refuse to allow ourselves to be arraigned on a false indictment, and brought in guilty because our accusers descend to equivocation.

“With the same explicitness we would repudiate the calumny, that we hold that ‘Baptism saves.’ Never have we maintained it. That it puts man in the way of salvation (as it puts those ‘whom the Lord added daily to the Church’) by admitting them to covenant mercies, bringing them under Christian culture, and investing them with a right to privileges, we fully confess and without hesitation affirm. And in that sense we but repeat the words of St. Peter when he wrote, ‘The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save.’ But to the supposition that we hold Baptism to be so endowed with an absolute and inherent efficacy, necessarily terminating in a man’s salvation, let the single fact of the ministration of our pastors be the reply. For what, Sunday after Sunday, are the ministers of time Church of England doing, but warning their congregations to ‘flee from the wrath to come,’ – but telling them that the curse of a broken law is hanging over their heads, that unless they repent they must perish, that unless they believe, they cannot appropriate the merits of the Saviour, that there is salvation in no one and nothing but Christ alone, and that, if they expect to be justified, they must close with the offers of mercy made by a loving God through a crucified Redeemer? This is the purport, the character, and the burden of our ministry. ... Nay, we can offer a more solemn refutation still, for we can ask any who entertain the lingering shadow of a doubt as to our opinions, to accompany us to the open grave of some departed brother and bid him listen to these words, ‘We humbly beseech Thee, O Father, to raise us from the death of sin, to the life of righteousness.’ If that be done once and for ever at Baptism, what need is there that up to the last we require the crucifixion of the old nature and the development of the new? (*Baptism and Baptismal Regeneration*).

“If, then, the presence of Christ, whether corporally or spiritually, is not to be found in the elements, we may inquire, where is it to be found? We answer, In the heart of the believer, subjectively not objectively; no more on the table than is the Spirit of God in the font. We deny not that the body and blood, the communication of Christ to the soul, the strengthening and refreshment of our spiritual nature, the ‘remission of sins, and all other benefits of his Passion,’ may come to us in the administration of the Communion, and are ‘verily and indeed received therein by the faithful.’

But we are no more bound to believe that these mercies are wrapped up in the elements than that Jordan was medicinal to Naaman, or mechanical power latent in the blast of Israel's trumpets at Jericho. The Lord made both the means of benefit or of destruction. Outward signs accompanying mysterious force they were, but the signs are not the force. Tokens and pledges they were, grace and power they were not. It is useless to ask how the grace sought and promised in the sacrament is conveyed; only this we are sure of, that it comes through no process mechanical. And that that is the opinion of our Church, we may gather from the Church's usage, and the opinion of her most eminent writers" (*Confession, Absolution, and the Real Presence*).

Mills.

"The sacramental bread is the Lord's body, just as the church is his body, his flesh, and his bones. The metaphor is equally obvious in both instances, and a literal interpretation would be as absurd in one as in the other. ...

"If we eat Christ's flesh, and drink his blood, in his own true sense of the words, that of spirit and life, we by the very act become partakers of his spirit and life. The very essence of that spirit and life enters so fully into our moral nature as to belong to our personal identity. The spirit of Christ becomes embodied in the Christian. It permeates his whole being. It is thus and thus only that we are 'made partakers of the divine nature'; even as we are partakers of the elements of food and drink when, by digestion and assimilation, they are incorporated in the substance of our bodies. Natural assimilation correctly illustrates spiritual assimilation; nor could. Anything else illustrate it so well. The action is not ritual, but vital; and by it, instead of formally observing a rite, we become inwardly holy, and have in us that eternal life, the full fruition of which is in the glorious future. We live forever, not by swallowing a solid or a liquid, even though it be 'Christ entire,' but by so receiving his spirit and life, symbolized by eating his flesh and drinking his blood, that we 'are made partakers of his holiness.' ...

"We are Christ's, if we have the spirit of Christ; and that spirit never magnifies the importance of mere ritual which may be observed without it. Doctrinal teaching may be addressed to the eye as well as to the ear; and erroneous teaching is as objectionable in signs as in words. Disloyalty to 'the truth as it is in Jesus' may be detected in an image, a censer, or an

ornament, in a vestment, a gesture, or a position; and heretical signs or symbols may be as expressive as words. Even the position of a minister in public worship may indicate apostasy; for if he turns his back to the congregation, he shows that his face is turned towards Rome. ...

“Ceremoniousness is foreign to the genius of the Gospel. ... Ritual accessories obscure its meaning and hide and deform its simple beauty. ... The New Testament does not expressly denounce such things, – as it does not denounce Mohammedanism or Mormonism – because they had no existence when it was written; for they were the inventions of the Ritualists of the Middle Ages; when a gorgeous ritual and sensuous devotion were preferred to spiritual worship and obedient love. Not a trace of sacerdotalism can be found in the Apostles, nor a line of ritualism in their writings. ...

“Many expressions in both Testaments are exactly like that of Christ when he said ‘This is my body,’ yet not one is read by anybody as Romanists read this. ‘Judah *is* a lion’s whelp.’ Was he really a leonine cub, under the form of man? ‘Issachar *is* a strong ass.’ Did Jacob, then, by saying this, transubstantiate his son into a donkey? ‘The seven good kine *are* seven full years.’ This would be a very remarkable transubstantiation of seven fat cows into as many years, each one as a ‘full year,’ consisting of three hundred and sixty-five days. ... Our Lord also said that stars were angels, and that candlesticks were churches, etc. Each of these expressions is as explicit and emphatic as that in dispute, ‘This is my body,’ and all must, for the same reason, be interpreted by the same rule. In truth, there is as much reason to say that sacramental water is the Spirit of God as that sacramental bread or wine is the Son of God. In no other instance do Romanists so outrage a figure of speech. When the Lord said ‘This *is*,’ instead of saying this *represents*, he spoke as Orientals were accustomed to speak, as we ourselves always speak, and as all men always did speak and always will. ...

“Is the Lord’s Table an Altar? ... The Lord says it was a table; for he said, *after* he had instituted the rite, and *before* anyone had risen from his seat, ‘The hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the *table*.’ John also states that it was a table; for, referring to what the Lord said to Judas, at the end of the rite, he says that ‘No man at the *table* knew for what intent he spake this to him.’ And Paul states, that it was ‘the Lord’s *table*.’ Had it been an Altar, they would have said so. No New Testament writer calls it an

altar. The Lord Jesus and the two Apostles have determined the question for ever.

“Unhappily there are Protestants who, though they know the Mass and all that belongs to it to be ‘blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,’ are so thoughtless and inconsistent as to apply the Jewish and heathenish word altar’ to the Lord’s table. ‘Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.’ All the blasphemies and deceits of the Mass are comprised in that word. ...

“Such names as Altar, Sacrifice, and Priest are foreigners and intruders in the Church of Christ. Their presence indicates perversion and apostasy. They belonged only to the ‘worldly sanctuary,’ and to ‘the weak and beggarly elements’ of the old Levitical law. The whole germ of Romish error exists in each of the three. ...

“It is alleged that our Lord consecrated the elements when he blessed them. But he did not bless them. Some countenance seems to be given to the mistake by our version, which states that ‘He blessed it’ – the bread. The same thing is not said of the cup. But the ‘*it*’ is not in the Greek, as is shown by italics; nor is there any reason why ‘*it*’ should be in the English. This ‘*it*’ is misleading. Mark uses the same word ‘blessed,’ and in the same sense, in reference to ‘a few small fishes’; yet no one supposes that the Lord consecrated them. As he ‘blessed,’ before distributing the bread, he ‘gave thanks’ before using the cup. The same thing, thanksgiving, is clearly meant in each case. The Lord gave thanks on this occasion, before eating and drinking, as on every other occasion, and as we do before our meals. Luke and Paul state that he *gave thanks* before using the *bread*, as they, and Matthew and Mark, say that he did before he used the cup. It is clear therefore that thanksgiving and nothing more is meant equally in both instances. Giving thanks is certainly not consecrating. ...

“All our senses and our common sense are outraged by the superstition of the Mass as they are by nothing else. No imposture ever was so gross, so profane, or so shocking as that of transubstantiation; for none can be so great as one that purports to make and unmake God and the human temple of God. ...

“How different is the teaching of our Lord on his Real Presence, from that of the Latin Church! Christ in us is a sublime and blessed presence; Christ in a bit of bread is a purely human idea, the offspring of mediaeval superstition; and though it be expressed in high-sounding and

sanctimonious language, it is a most mischievous perversion of divine truth, a sacerdotal conceit, which no ritual, however ornate it may be, can dignify, and which is ineffably degrading and childish.

“The Latin Christian is the only idolater that eats and drinks his idols.

...

“There are many fictions founded on facts, but the Papacy is a fact founded on fictions, an edifice without a foundation, a ‘castle in the air.’ ...

“The sacramental cup is said to contain the blood of Christ. Notwithstanding all this, however, and notwithstanding that the sacrifice of Christ and the pretended sacrifice of the Mass are declared to be identically the same, the Mass is ‘a bloodless sacrifice,’ in which an ‘unbloody victim’ is offered in ‘a bloodless manner’! ...

“The Christians of the ninth century were startled by a little book – still extant – written by one Paschasius Radbertus, Abbot of Old Corby, in France, in which the heresy of transubstantiation was supposed to be taught. Even he, however, denied that the sacred elements were the body and blood of Christ when received by the ungodly; though he would appear to teach that they were his body and blood to the Christian. The heresy, though thus explained, astonished all men. But Radbert did not say, as the Council of Trent said, six hundred years later, that Christ’s soul and divinity were incarnate in the elements, or that we are bound to adore them as we adore the Most High. The errors of the sixteenth century were too egregious for the ninth. Radbert’s book gave rise to the first recorded dispute on transubstantiation. Had the controversy arisen out of his denial of that dogma it would have argued previous belief in it; but it arose out of the novelty of such a doctrine being propounded. Rabanus Manrus, Archbishop of Mentz, a contemporary of the abbot, refuted his book, and taught the doctrine now taught by Protestants. A still clearer refutation was written, at the instance of Charles I of France, by Bertram, a monk of the abbot’s convent, who clearly showed, as Protestants now show, that the new doctrine is false” (*The Romish Mass*).

Candlish.

“God in Christ is the giver and we are receivers of his free sovereign grace and love. Hence the outward rites of Christianity are not performances by which we do something to obtain God’s blessing, or render to him a payment, or accomplish a work of our own, but rather

exercises in which we receive what he freely gives. This is what is meant when they are called means of grace, or, as it is more fully explained in the Shorter Catechism, ‘means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption.’ ...

“The simplest view that can be taken of the Sacraments, is that they are signs representing Christ and the benefits of the New Covenant. This is undoubtedly a true and scriptural view of them. Baptism is called by Peter a figure of our being saved by the resurrection of Jesus Christ; and Paul says, that in observing the Lord’s Supper we show the death of Christ. The very nature of the ordinances also plainly indicates this. The washing of the body in water is a natural figure, and one frequently used throughout the Bible for the cleansing of the soul from sin; and the nourishment of the body by meat and drink is an equally common illustration of the nourishment of the soul by Christ, as the Bread of Life who came down from heaven and gave his flesh for the life of the world. ...

“Besides the name of signs, that of seals has also been generally given by Christian divines to the Sacraments. ...

“The general idea of a seal is a confirmation of a truth or message by a token, more particularly by an unmistakable indication of the personal mind and will of him from whom it comes. ...

“Now, taking this idea of a seal, we find that it applies admirably to the New Testament Sacraments. When our Lord said, at the institution of the Supper, ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ he gave the ordinance such a personal character as to make it not merely a sign but a seal, a token of his love and desire for our loving remembrance of him. ...

“It is to be observed that the sacraments are not said to seal those who receive them; and so the phrase sometimes applied to them, ‘sealing ordinances,’ is not quite correct. They are seals of the righteousness of faith; they seal or confirm to us God’s promises and Christ’s love; but there is no warrant in Scripture for saying that they seal us. ...

“Besides representing and sealing the benefits of the New Covenant in Christ, the ordinances that we call Sacraments, also by doing so, apply or communicate them. This appears from the way in which they are spoken of in various places of Scripture. We read that Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing (more properly, bath) of water by the Word;’ and again, that God saved us ‘by the washing (here, too, properly bath) of regeneration and renewing of

the Holy Ghost.’ In both these passages it is most probable that the reference is to the Sacrament of Baptism, though it is possible that it may be only to the general figure embodied in that Sacrament. But in Col. 2:11 there is an express mention of Baptism as a means of spiritual quickening: ‘Buried with Christ in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.’ In regard to the Lord’s Supper, the most explicit passage is 1 Cor. 10:16: ‘The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion (i.e., joint participation) of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?’ But the belief that the sacraments are means of grace does not rest merely upon a few single texts, but on the general conviction, which to a Christian is most sure, that the Saviour, who has commanded us to observe these ordinances in remembrance of him, does not deceive us with vain and delusive signs, but really gives what he represents; and on the experience of believers in all ages, that in the observance of these ordinances, as of all Christ’s appointments, they have really been blessed with fellowship with the Lord.

“It is necessary, however, to understand aright how these ordinances communicate the blessings that are associated with them, and for that purpose to consider in general how it is that we are made partakers of spiritual blessings at all. Now, the Bible teaches that all spiritual blessings are in Christ – grace and truth, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, in a word, eternal life – and are all freely offered to us and to all men in him; while it is the work of the Holy Spirit to testify of Christ, to convince the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment, to enable us to know the things that are freely given us of God, and to call Jesus Lord – in a word, to make us partakers of Christ and all that is his. This work the Spirit effects by working in us faith in Christ: for by faith we are united to Christ, saved, and made partakers of all spiritual blessings. But in so doing the Spirit uses means, and deals with us as intelligent and voluntary creatures, not moving us by mere supernatural power working as by magic without any exercise of our minds or wills, but by enlightening our understandings by the discovery of the truth, awakening our conscience by convictions of sin and duty, and moving our wills by appropriate motives and persuasions. In a word, the presentation of Christ to the soul, as the Saviour freely offered in the Gospel, is the great means that the Spirit uses for our salvation; and when he does by his divine power persuade and

enable us to receive and rest upon Christ, he begins and carries on our spiritual life. ...

“Now that on which our faith rests, and by which it lays hold of Christ, is the testimony of God in the Gospel, setting forth and offering Christ to sinners. This testimony in the fullest sense embraces not only the Word written and spoken, but the Sacraments. i.e., the signs and seals with which the Word is clothed, and which are, as Augustine and Luther used to say, a *Visible Word*, presenting that to the soul through the eye which the spoken Word presents through the ear. Thus, by the Sacraments as really by the Word, God truly presents Christ to us that we may receive him by faith, and that receiving him we may have life and have it more abundantly.

“So far all Protestants may be said to be agreed as to the efficacy of the Sacraments; and in thus asserting that they are made effectual only by the power of the Spirit, and when there is faith on our part, they differ from the theory that grew up in the Middle Ages, and is maintained by the Church of Rome that the Sacraments bestow spiritual blessings by a power inherent in themselves as mere outward acts. This theory is conveniently described as a magical one, because it asserts an efficacy in them analogous to the supposed power of magic, and because it actually arose in the ages when the belief in magic prevailed. ...

“Baptism teaches, first, that all who are out of Christ are morally and spiritually unclean by reason of sin. ...

“Baptism teaches, second, that just as washing in water cleanses the body, so God in Christ cleanses the soul from sin by the Holy Spirit. ...

“Baptism teaches, third, that this cleansing is only to be attained through fellowship with the death of Christ. ...

“Baptism teaches, fourth, that by this process of death with Christ and new birth, we become his as our Lord and our God. ...

“These are the principal things signified by the rite of Baptism; and it will be observed that they are just the great fundamental truths of the gospel, and that a ceremony which so naturally and simply suggests them is a most appropriate appendage to the Word, as it proclaims to sinners the Saviour, and offers to them in him pardon, purity, and peace through his atoning sacrifice and the renewing work of the Spirit. It is a gospel in miniature, as it were, in outward act visibly presented to the eye. ...

“It is the belief of all Christians, and well founded in the Word of God, that the washing with water in Baptism represents the cleansing of the

soul from sin by fellowship with the death and resurrection of Christ, or as it is sometimes expressed, that Regeneration or renewal is the inward part of this sacrament, i.e., the spiritual grace corresponding to the visible sign. It is also agreed by all that when the Sacrament is rightly used, the inward and spiritual grace is present as well as the outward and visible sign. As Calvin was wont to put it, God does not delude us with vain and empty shows, but really bestows what he signifies and seals in the Sacrament. Both Romanists and Protestants are agreed in this; but they differ as to what is required for the right use of the Sacrament: the former, in accordance with the magical theory of the Middle Ages, hold that it is simply the correct observance of the ceremony, and not putting an obstacle in the way of the efficacy of the Sacrament; the latter, in accordance with the great Reformation principle of Justification by Faith, maintain that the Sacrament is then only rightly used when the receiver exercises faith, and that then and then only it is accompanied with Regeneration. Both Lutherans and Calvinists agree, that where there is no faith, Baptism has no efficacy, and that wherever there is faith, there is Regeneration. ...

“But there is a peculiar difficulty in explaining the efficacy of Baptism in the case of Infants; and the scriptural requirement of faith for the right and profitable reception of the Sacrament is the strongest objection against the practice of Infant Baptism. If we cannot show that Baptism can be a means of grace to those to whom it is administered in infancy, and that in accordance with the general principles of Protestant theology on this subject, it will be very difficult to believe that our Lord or his apostles intended any but adults to be baptized. Accordingly, those who practice the baptism of infants of believers have generally felt it needful to attempt some explanation of the use of baptism to them. There have been various different principles adopted for this purpose, to which it is not needful to refer; but that employed by the Westminster divines is expressed in the following words, Confession of Faith, chap. xxviii., sec. 6 – ‘The efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God’s own will, in his appointed time.’ Two things are here stated. On the one hand, that grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed to the rite of Baptism that no person can be regenerated or saved

without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated; so also, even when both the outward rite and the inward blessing are received, the one is not so tied to the other that they must be received at the same time. The Protestant doctrine of the efficacy of Baptism, as held by the Westminster divines, does not imply that, even in cases in which Baptism is not only valid but effectual, its effect must take place at once. But on the other hand, in such cases the grace is as really connected with the Sacrament, and bestowed by means of it, as if it had been given at the very moment of its administration.

“It is plainly taught in Scripture that the Lord’s Supper is a symbolical ordinance, and that the main thing that it represents is the death of Christ. ‘As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord’s death.’ We announce or declare by significant acts, what is the great theme of the preaching of the gospel, ‘That Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.’ ...

“But in this ordinance we not only look at the symbols of Christ’s death, but we receive and feed upon them, and so it symbolizes further our participation in Christ as crucified for us. ...

“But there is still further a third symbolic aspect of the Lord’s Supper. It represents not only the death of Christ as the object of our faith, and the act of faith itself as uniting us to Christ, but also the effect of this faith as giving life, strength, and happiness to the soul. ...

“Once more, in the fourth place, there is symbolized in this ordinance the union of believers with one another. ‘For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.’ ...

“So truly as the body is nourished and refreshed by bread and wine, so truly will the soul that receives Christ’s body and blood through faith have eternal life, and have it ever more and more abundantly. ...

“That the solemn ordinance which our Lord instituted on the night in which he was betrayed has, when duly observed by his disciples, a power to do good to their souls, might be presumed from the general truth of the goodness and wisdom of our Saviour. ... We have also express Scripture warrant for regarding the Lord’s Supper as a means of spiritual blessing. Paul blames the Corinthian Christians because, in their careless way of observing the ordinances as a mere love feast, they came together not for the better but for the worse (1 Cor. 11:17), thus plainly implying that their observance ought to be for the better, and would be so did they rightly

understand and use it. The same Apostle also teaches how this Sacrament is designed to be for our spiritual good; for in that place he goes on to tell the Corinthian disciples that their error consisted in their not discerning the Lord's body (verse 29). Consequently what he would have them to do, in order that their coming together to the Supper might be for the better, was to discern the Lord's body, i.e., to recognize the bread and wine as being symbols of Christ's body and blood, and receive them as such, after examining themselves as to their state of mind in regard to Christ's death. ...

“It is the death of Christ that we show forth in the Supper. The phrase ‘body and blood’ is in fact equivalent to death. To be guilty of the body and blood of Christ is to be guilty of his death; to be partakers of the body and blood is to be partakers of his death. ... We are not chiefly to think, in the Lord's Supper, of the body of Christ as now raised and glorified in heaven, but rather of that body as it hung upon the cross, when his blood flowed forth and he gave up his life a sacrifice to God: we are to think of his body and blood with reference to his sacrifice offered on the cross. It was there that his flesh and blood became a principle of life for our souls. ...

“Thus we see in what sense it is that Christ's body and blood are really present in the Eucharist: not that his glorified body is present in substance, in, with, or under the elements of bread and wine, but that his death is present to the faith of believers. Christ is evidently set forth crucified among us. He is presented. To our faith by the Word and Sacrament as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, being even now in the midst of the throne a Lamb as it had been slain. ...

“If man can have communion in thought with his fellow mortal who is dead and gone, and only present to the mind by his recorded or remembered words, – who shall doubt that there may be a far more real and intimate communion between our spirit and that Saviour who is not dead but living, and everywhere present? Instead of the mere working of memory, affection, and imagination, we have the agency of the Spirit of God, who has direct access to our spirits, and who takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us. Thus there is a real though spiritual Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and a real fellowship of our souls with him.

“It is true, indeed, that this spiritual communion with Christ by which the life of our souls is nourished is not confined to the Lord's Supper, but is realized by every Christian as often as he exercises faith in Christ as his

Redeemer. This has sometimes been made an objection to the view that the Reformed Churches have taken of the efficacy of the Sacrament; for it has been said that if we only receive in the Sacrament what we can also receive without it, then the Sacrament is superfluous. But a complete answer has been given to this by an old Scottish divine, whose words we may here give, as they serve also to throw light on the subject [Sermons by Mr. Robert Bruce, Edinburgh, 1590.]: –

“We admit the antecedent to be true; we get no other thing nor no new thing in the Sacrament but the same thing which we get in the Word. I will give thee to devise and imagine with thyself what new thing would thou have: Let the heart of man devise, imagine, and wish; he durst never have presumed excogitate to have such a thing as the Son of God: he durst never have presumed to have pierced the clouds, to have gone so high, and to have craved the Son of God, in his flesh, to be the food of his soul. Having the Son of God, thou has him who is the heir of all things, who is the King of heaven and earth, and in him thou has all things: what more then can thou wish? What better thing can thou wish? He is equal with the Father, one in substance with the Father, true God, and true man; what more can thou wish? Then, I say, we get no other thing in the Sacrament nor we get in the Word: content thee with this. But suppose it be so, yet the Sacrament is not superfluous. But would thou understand what new thing thou gets, what other thing thou gets? I will tell thee. Suppose thou get that same thing which thou got in the Word, yet thou gets that same thing better; what is that better? Thou gets a better grip of that same thing in the Sacrament nor thou got by the hearing of the Word. That same thing which thou possessed be the hearing of the Word, thou possessest now more largely; he has a greater bounds in thy swill be the receiving of the Sacrament, nor otherways he could have be the hearing of the Word only. Then speers [*sic*] thou, what new thing we get? I say, we get this new thing, – we get Christ better nor we did before; we get the thing that we got more full, that is, with a surer apprehension nor we had of before; we get a better grip of Christ now: For be the Sacrament my faith is nourished, the bounds of my soul is enlarged, and so, where I had but a little grip of Christ before, as it were betwixt my finger and my thumb, now I get him in my whole hand; and all the more that my faith grows, the better grip I get of Christ Jesus” (*The Christian Sacraments*).

Charles Tinling, Esquire.

“Mark 16:16. ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.’

“It is one of the most successful devices of Satan to get men to look at words rather than things. He will allow them to talk about the doctrine of the cross as much as they please, provided he can keep them from feeling the power of the cross – from being constrained by what it teaches to alter the course of their lives, to renounce the world, and to give themselves heartily to the service of God. So he can witness with the utmost complacency the endless disputings in which men indulge with regard to the meaning of the ordinance of Baptism, the nature of the efficacy which is to be attributed to it, and the class of persons who are properly the subjects of it. The word itself has thus become a synonym for something extremely mysterious, instead of being, as there is reason to believe it was intended to be, a plain definition of one of the plainest rites of our religion. In its strict grammatical signification the word means simply to wash. That it has another and a symbolical sense is quite true. In this respect Baptism differs nothing from many other ceremonies which yet are perfectly intelligible and are accepted without controversy. Joshua said to the children of Israel on one occasion, ‘Come near, put your feet upon the necks of these kings.’ The act was a symbolical act, showing that one party were the conquerors and the other the conquered. Similarly, when men were made to pass under the yoke. The ceremony was simple, the truth it taught unmistakable. The same rule of interpretation will apply to Baptism. We read of the baptism of cup and pots, of brazen vessels and of tables. This I take to mean that they were washed, but not washed merely for the purpose of cleansing, but with a symbolical or figurative reference, in token that they were to be set apart and separated from common uses. It was a mark to distinguish them from other things of the same kind. John preached the Baptism of Repentance. The subjects of the ordinance were changed, the significance was the same. Repentance being an act of the mind, only intelligent beings could receive Baptism in this sense. But here were just the two parts of the service or ceremony, as in the case of the inanimate articles referred to. There was the profession of repentance (in many instances evidently without much if any sincerity), and there was the corresponding mark indicating the separation of those persons who made that profession from those who did not. Our Lord went a step higher, but still carrying out the same idea: ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.’ He would probably have said:

‘The Pharisees set apart certain vessels, and washed or baptized them in token that they were so set apart. Well; there was nothing wrong in that, taken by itself. John baptized all who made a profession of repentance, who would thenceforward be looked upon as individuals pledged to lead a better life. That was good so far as it went. Go ye also and baptize: make use of the same outward ceremony, which I prefer to adopt as being familiar and intelligible to all; but with this difference as regards the principle of separation, *He that believeth.*’ In this view, Baptism is simply the outward sign or mark put upon those who profess to believe in the Lord Jesus. These two things are always recognized as going together in genuine religion. Believing is not enough; there must be also confession. And this was more especially required in the early days of the Christian Church, when the temptation was so strong to avoid the open profession of Christianity, and when submission to one of its leading ordinances afforded a corresponding proof of sincerity and courage. This seems to be the plain common sense view of the matter; and looking at it in this light all mystery vanishes. ‘He that believeth’ – that is towards God’s faith. ‘And is baptized’ – that is towards man, confession, fruits. And these two comprise the sum and substance of all true religion. ‘With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.’”

The Number of the Sacraments.

As the ordinary Sacraments of the Old Testament were only two, Circumcision and the Passover, so hath Christ instituted in His Church only two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, as corresponding ceremonies, both (those of the Old and New Covenant) signifying and exhibiting the same spiritual blessings in Him, with this difference, that the former represented Christ to come, whereas the latter hold Him forth as already come.

To the two Sacraments of the Gospel, Romanists profanely add other five – Confirmation, Penance, Ordination, Marriage, and Extreme Unction.

Erskine (*Shorter Catechism Explained*) admirably shows “in a word, that all these are false and spurious sacraments, in regard that none of them have sacramental signs of divine institution, signifying any inward and spiritual grace; and consequently none of them can be appointed seals of God’s covenant.” We may however further briefly observe that –

Confirmation, the ratification of Baptism, founded on Acts 8:14–17, a rite thus of ancient and still edifying use in the Church, has no express and permanent promise of grace, nor any visible sign attaching to it. Rome, however, has blasphemously instituted a material sign or symbol, with which she administers it – chrism, a mixture of olive oil and opobalsam.

Penance, a scandalous perversion of the former wholesome discipline of the Church, which Rome to enslave souls has made to consist of auricular confession, absolution, and satisfaction; and so elevated into a Sacrament, necessary, *jure divino* according to Trent, to salvation.

Ordination, or the solemn setting apart of men for the work of the ministry, is an appointment of Christ, but without any of the essentials of a Sacrament. In the tenth or eleventh century, Rome saw the want of this, and invented as a material symbol the delivery of the vessels in ordaining priests. But if such be the valid form of Ordination, the Church clearly was without valid orders during all the preceding centuries!

Matrimony, an honourable estate instituted indeed of God, but it is a civil or natural bond. Rather than in any way ecclesiastical; at all events, it has none of the essentials of a Sacrament ascribed to it in the Gospel.

Extreme Unction, or the Sacrament of the Dying, one of the most absurd. And groundless impostures of Rome. The only patristic authority which Romanists can urge is that of Pope Innocent I in the fifth century, who in answer to Decentius asking whether the sick might be anointed with oil, replied that it might be done, arguing from St. James. Clearly therefore there was no such Sacrament then known in the Church as extreme unction. Moreover, the unction enjoined by St. James was for recovery, like that practiced by the other Apostles, and not as Rome applies it, for the soul, when recovery is hopeless.

Scriptural Proof, etc.

As a summary in the main of the doctrine set forth in this Essay on the Sacraments, as well as of the scriptural proof, we feel we cannot do better than quote the Catechism to which we have been so much indebted – at once concise and exhaustive. Treatises not a few abound, but many of them are so discursive and wide of the mark, that you rise from their perusal without any very definite grasp of their meaning – of their teaching on the Articles – on Baptism, or the Supper of the Lord. It is not we think that men must write, and do willingly disguise their sentiments; it is rather, as we

believe, at the present day, that men as a rule are bewildered, by the timid, half-and-half, or bolder utterances of Rome-ward Churchmen; and cannot form any adequate conceptions of the truth. That they have become Daltonists. Or, that they fear the world power. We especially regret that one of our most prominent Expositors, a learned and we are sure a thoroughly good man, reads the Fathers and our Reformers, on one page, as a loyal son of the Church and a Protestant, and on another as a Ritualist, or at best – vacillating. What we want in this age is public writers – bishops as well as laymen – to be *pronounced*. If they are for Rome, be it so; if they are for Protestantism and the truth of God, why not be outspoken Caesar’s wife, and Christ’s spouse, should be above suspicion.

Baptism.

What is Baptism?

Baptism is a Sacrament, wherein the washing with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord’s.

1. What is the proper signification of the word [*baptism*]?

It is of a Greek original, and properly signifies a *washing, sprinkling, or pouring out*, in order to cleansing. Mark 1:8, *I indeed have baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you with the holy Ghost*; that is, he shall pour his Spirit upon you, according to the promise, Isa. 44:3, *I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed*, etc.

2. Who is the author of baptism?

The Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator and Head of the Church.

3. When did he institute and appoint it, *as a Sacrament of the New Testament*?

A little before his ascension into heaven, when he gave his apostles that solemn charge, Matt. 28:19, *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*.

4. Was not baptizing used before that time?

It was used long before by the Jews, in receiving their proselytes, but not by any divine institution.

5. When came baptism to have divine warrant and institution?

When God SENT *John the Baptist to baptize with water*, John 1:33.

6. Was there any difference between the baptism of John and the baptism dispensed by the apostles after Christ's ascension?

There was no essential difference betwixt them; for both of them had the same visible sign, and the same blessings signified thereby. The difference was only circumstantial in respect of time, and the objects of administration.

7. How did they differ in respect of time?

The baptism of John was dispensed before Christ had finished the work which his Father gave him to do; but the baptism of the apostles was mostly after Christ had suffered and had entered into his glory.

8. How did they differ as to the objects of administration?

The baptism of John was confined to Judea only, but the baptism of the apostles extended to all nations to whom the Gospel was preached, Matt. 28:19.

9. Did not Paul rebaptize some disciples at Ephesus who had been before baptized by John? Acts 19:4–5.

No: he only declares that they who had heard John preach the doctrine of repentance, and faith in Christ, were by John baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and so needed not to be rebaptized by any other.

10. Why did Christ, who had no need of it, condescend to be baptized by John?

He gives the reason himself: *It becometh us*, says he, *to fulfill all righteousness*, Matt. 3:15.

11. Did Christ himself baptize any?

No: *Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples*, John 4:2.

12. Why did not Christ baptize any himself?

That he might commend the ministry of men of like passions with ourselves, and to show that the efficacy of the ordinance did not depend upon the administrator, but upon the divine blessing; even as the words spoken by him on earth when they were efficacious; they were so, not merely as spoken or uttered from his lips, but as accompanied with his own almighty power, Luke 5:17.

13. What is the visible *sign* or outward *element* in baptism?

Only [*water*] pure and unmixed, Acts 10:47.

14. How is *water* to be applied to the body in baptism?

“Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary, but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person.”

[Confession of Faith, chap. xxviii. 3.]

15. How doth it appear from Scripture that baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person?

From repeated instances of the administration of baptism by the apostles in this manner; particularly when *three thousand* were baptized by them, Acts 2:41, water behooved to be sprinkled upon them, in regard the apostles could not have time, in a part only of one day, to take them one by one and plunge them into it. Nor is it probable that the jailer, Acts 16:33, had such store of water in the season as was sufficient for himself and whole family to be dipped into, or that they went abroad in quest of some river for that purpose: it is by far more reasonable to think that, in both the above instances, they were baptized by sprinkling. The same may be said of Paul's baptism, Acts 9:18; and of the baptism of Cornelius and his friends, Acts x. 47, 48.

16. Why is it most expedient to sprinkle water upon the *face* in baptism?

Because the *face* is the principal part of the body, and the whole person is represented by it, Exod. 10:29.

17. What is *signified* by water in baptism?

The cleansing virtue of the Blood (Rev. 1:5) and Spirit of Christ (Titus 3:5).

18. What is the difference between cleansing by the *Blood* and cleansing by the *Spirit* of Christ?

The Blood of Christ cleanseth *meritoriously*, 1 John 1:7; the Spirit of Christ *efficaciously*, Ezek. 36:25–27. By the former the guilt of sin is at once taken away in justification; by the latter, the blot and stain thereof is gradually carried off in sanctification.

19. What is signified by *sprinkling* of water upon the body?

The application of the Blood of Christ unto the soul by the Spirit of God, Titus 3:5–6.

20. What is the analogy or resemblance betwixt the sign in baptism and the thing signified?

Water makes clean what before was foul and nasty; so the Blood and Spirit of Christ purify from the guilt and pollution of sin, Zech. 13:1; water is open and free to all; so Christ and his benefits are freely offered to all the hearers of the Gospel, Rev. 22:17.

21. In whose name are we baptized?

[*In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*],
Matt. 28:19.

22. What is it to be baptized *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*?

It is not only to be baptized by the will, command, and authority of the Three-one God, but likewise to be, by baptism, solemnly dedicated and devoted to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as our God and portion forever, Isa. 44:5.

23. What is it to be baptized by the *command* and *authority* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?

It intimates that the Trinity of persons, do not only authorize and appoint baptism to be a Sacrament of the New Testament; but that they become jointly engaged to make good all the blessings of the covenant, signified and sealed by that ordinance, Jer. 31:33, *I will be their God, and they shall be my people.*

24. What is included in our being, by baptism, solemnly *dedicated and devoted* to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as our God and portion forever?

It includes a solemn profession, that these three adorable persons have the sole right to all our religious worship, Psa. 5:7: that all our hope of salvation is from them, Psa. 62:1, 5; and that we should be wholly and forever the Lord's, Psa. 48:14.

25. Is it necessary that baptism be dispensed in these express words, "*In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*?"

Yes; because ministers are peremptorily commanded by Christ to baptize in this very form, Matt. 28:19, *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

26. Did not the apostles baptize in another form, when they baptized *in the name of the Lord Jesus*, Acts 8:16?

It is not to be supposed, that the apostles would alter the *form*, so expressly delivered to them, by their glorious Master; and therefore when any are said to be baptized *in the name of the Lord Jesus*, it is not designed thereby to notify to us, in *what form of words* they were baptized; but only that they were baptized by the authority of Christ, who appointed this sacrament; and unto faith in him, and communion with him.

• • • • •

28. What are the ends and uses of baptism?

They are to [*signify and seal our engrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace.*]

29. What is it to signify and seal [*our engrafting into Christ*]?

It is to signify and seal our union with him, and consequently the imputation of his righteousness to us, Gal. 3:27, *As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.*

30. What are the [*benefits of the covenant of grace*], the partaking whereof is signified and sealed in baptism?

They are “remission of sins by the blood of Christ; regeneration by his Spirit, adoption, and resurrection unto everlasting life.” [Larger Cat., Quest. 163.]

• • • • •

40. What are the extremes about the necessity of baptism?

The Socinians and Quakers deny that it is necessary at all; on the other hand, the Papists, and some others, maintain, that it is so absolutely necessary, that no salvation can be expected without it.

• • • • •

43. How doth it appear that grace and salvation are not inseparably annexed to baptism?

From the instance of Abraham, who had the righteousness of faith before he was circumcised, Rom. 4:11; of Cornelius, who feared God, and was accepted of him, before he was baptized, Acts 10:2, 4; and from the instance of the thief on the cross, who was saved without being baptized at all, Luke 23:43.

44. How doth the scripture evince, that all who are baptized are not regenerated and saved?

From the instance of Simon Magus, who was baptized, and yet after baptism remained *in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity*, Acts 8:13, 23.

45. Whether doth baptism give a right to covenant blessings; or, is it a declarative sign and seal of them, only?

It is only a declarative sign and seal of them, as circumcision was, Rom. 4:11.

46. What then gives a right?

The promise of the covenant, which is endorsed to the children, as well as to the parents, Acts 2:39, *The promise is unto you, and to your*

children.

47. Whether is baptism designed to make the covenant surer, or our faith stronger?

It is designed only to make our faith stronger; for the sureness of the covenant flows from the faithfulness of God, which is inviolable and unchangeable, Psa. 89:33–34; Isa. 54:10.

48. Wherein consists the efficacy of baptism?

It consists in sealing and ratifying the right to covenant blessings, which persons have from the promise, so infallibly, that they shall certainly be put in possession of them, Eph. 5:25–27. For, according to the doctrine of our *Confession*, “The grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God’s own will, in his appointed time.”

49. Is baptism efficacious at the time of its administration?

Not always: “the efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered,” [Confession of Faith.] but may take place afterwards, as God in his sovereignty has fixed it, for the *wind bloweth where it listeth*, John 3:8.

50. What may we learn from the nature of baptism?

The infinite goodness of God, in appointing an initiating ordinance, irreversibly sealing all the blessings of the covenant to the elect seed, Gen. 17:7. – *Shorter Catechism Explained*.

The Lord’s Supper.

What is the Lord’s Supper?

The Lord’s Supper is a Sacrament, wherein, by giving and receiving bread and wine, according to Christ’s appointment, his death is showed forth; and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal or carnal manner, but by faith made partakers of his body and blood, with all his benefits, to their spiritual nourishment, and growth in grace.

3. Why was it highly requisite that the Lord Jesus should be the sole author of this holy ordinance?

Because all the grace that was held forth therein, is treasured up wholly in him; and is conveyed and applied by him unto the soul, John 1:16.

• • • • •

6. What is *implied* in his instituting this sacrament the same night in which he was betrayed?

It implies his infinite goodness, and inviolable attachment to mankind lost, whom he represented; that in the immediate prospect of his greatest sufferings and soul agonies in their stead, he should have their salvation and comfort as much at heart, as to leave this memorial and pledge of his dying love among them, till he come again, Matt. 26:29.

• • • • •

10. What are the outward *elements*, appointed by Christ, in this sacrament?

They are [*bread and wine*], Mark 14:22–23.

11. What *sort* of bread and wine is proper to be used?

Just such as is ordinarily used in entertainments among men.

12. Is the sacrament of the supper to be received, by every partaker, in both elements?

To be sure it ought: for our Lord gave *both* elements to his disciples; and the apostle appoints *both* the elements to be dispensed to communicants, 1 Cor. 11:28, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.* And therefore the withholding of the cup from the people, as is done by the Church of Rome, is a piece of sacrilegious impiety.

13. What is *signified* by the bread and the wine?

The [*body*] and [*blood*] of Christ, 1 Cor. 11:24–25.

14. What is to be understood by Christ's body and blood?

His incarnation and satisfaction, for the complete accomplishment of our redemption, John 6:51, *The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.*

15. What is the analogy, or resemblance, betwixt the bread and wine, and what is signified and represented by these elements?

As bread and wine make a sufficient entertainment for the nourishment of the body; so the righteousness and fulness of Christ, are a full and satisfying feast for the refreshment of the soul, John 6:55, *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.*

• • • • •

24. What is intimated to us by [*giving*] the bread and [*giving*] the cup, Matt. 23:26–27?

It intimates that Christ is the free gift of God to sinners of mankind, for salvation and eternal life, John 3:16.

25. What are the sacramental actions of the partakers in this sacrament, included in their [*receiving*] of bread and wine?

They take the bread and the cup; they eat the bread, and drink a part of the wine in the cup.

26. What is imported in their taking the bread and the cup?

It imports that our receiving of Christ is founded on the gift and grant that is made of him in the word; for, *A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven*, John 3:27.

27. What is included in their *eating* the bread, and *drinking* the wine?

It includes that there ought to be an application of Christ to the soul in particular, in virtue of the particular endorsement of the promise, to everyone that hears the gospel: *For the promise, says the apostle Peter, is unto you* (that is unto every one of you), *and to your children*, Acts 2:39.

28. For what end did Christ institute these sacramental elements and actions?

That thereby [*his death*] might be [*showed forth*], 1 Cor. 11:26, and the remembrance of it kept up, Luke 22:19.

29. What is it to show forth the death of Christ?

It is to profess [by partaking of this sacrament], that we believe in his death, in our room, to have been most acceptable to God, Eph. 5:2; and that we acquiesce therein, together with his obedience, as the sole ground of our hope of salvation, Rom. 4:25.

30. How doth it appear, that his death, in our room, was most acceptable unto God?

By his resurrection from the dead, 1 Thess. 1:10; and his entrance into glory, Luke 24:26.

• • • • •

46. Who are called [*worthy receivers*], in the answer?

None are worthy receivers of this sacrament, but true believers; and even they, in order to their partaking worthily and comfortably, ought to have grace in exercise, as well as in the habit, Song 1:12.

47. Why are true believers called *worthy* receivers?

Not on account of any worthiness in themselves, for they have nothing of their own whereof they can boast; but because they are united to

Christ, and have all that grace from him, which enables them to *partake* in a suitable and becoming manner, 2 Cor 3:5.

48. What are the worthy receivers [*made partakers of*] in this sacrament?

They are [*made partakers of Christ's body and blood, with all his benefits*].

49. What is it to be *partakers of Christ's body and blood*?

It is to be entertained, in this sacrament, upon all that was transacted upon the person of Christ, as God man, Mediator: this being the only proper and suitable food of the soul, John 6:51–53.

50. In what respect is it, that the worthy receivers are NOT made partakers of his body and blood?

They are not made partakers thereof [*after a corporal and carnal manner*].

51. Why are these words inserted in the answer [*not after a corporal and carnal manner*]?

They are inserted in opposition to the Popish doctrine of *transubstantiation*, “which maintains a change of the substance of bread and wine, into the substance of Christ's body and blood, by consecration of a priest.” [Confession of Faith, xxix. 5.]

52. What is the *absurdity* of this doctrine?

It is “repugnant not to scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason; overthroweth the nature of the sacrament; and hath been and is the cause of manifold superstitions, yea, of gross idolatries.” [Confession of Faith, xxix. 5.]

53. How is it repugnant to *scripture*?

The scripture expressly affirms, that Christ gave the *same very* bread and cup to his disciples, *after* consecration, that he had taken into his hands *before*, Matt. 26:26–27. Whereas the doctrine of transubstantiation maintains, that the elements, after consecration, are no more the *same*, having only the form, colour, taste and smell of bread and wine, wanting the substance of either; being turned into the substance of Christ's body and blood; in opposition whereunto the apostle calls the elements, after consecration, by the *same names* they had before it, to intimate, that there was *no change* of their substance, 1 Cor. 11:26–28, *As often as ye eat this BREAD, and drink this CUP*, etc.

54. How is transubstantiation repugnant to *common sense and reason*?

Common sense and reason tells us, that a body occupies but one place, and cannot be at divers places at one and the same time; whereas they who defend transubstantiation must allow, that the body of Christ may be in a thousand places at once, even as many places as there are consecrated wafers.

55. How doth transubstantiation *overthrow the nature of the sacrament*?

By destroying the spiritual or sacramental relation, that is between the sign and the thing signified; for, if the sign be turned into the thing signified, then all relation and similitude betwixt them ceases. Besides, the sacrament being a commemoration of what was done and suffered in the human nature of Christ, it supposes his body to be *absent*, whereas transubstantiation supposes it *present*.

56. How is it the *cause of manifold superstitions and gross idolatries*?

Inasmuch as strange and surprising effects are ascribed to the *host*, or consecrated wafer, even when not used sacramentally: and the alleged change of the bread and wine, into the substance of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, is the very pretense, why they pay religious worship and adoration to the elements themselves; which is gross superstition and idolatry.

57. What is the difference between the *Papists* and *Lutherans* on this head?

The Papists maintain, that the bread and wine lose their own natural substance, and are turned into the substance of Christ's body and blood: but the Lutherans affirm, that the bread and wine retain their own natural substance still, and at the same time that the substance of Christ's body and blood is *in, with, or under* these, elements.

58. Are not both opinions equally absurd?

Yes: for *transubstantiation* supposes, that one body may be in many places at the same time; and *consubstantiation* takes it for granted, that two bodies may be together in the same very place, or that they may both occupy the same individual space at the same time.

59. Is Christ offered up, in this sacrament, as a *sacrifice* for the remission of sins?

No: there is therein “only a commemoration of that one offering up of himself, by himself, upon the cross, once for all; and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same.” [Confession of Faith, xxix. 2.]

60. Why doth our *Confession* say, that Christ’s once offering up of himself was done *by himself*?

In opposition to the *unbloody* sacrifice of the *mass*, which is offered up daily by the Popish priests, for remission of the sins both of the *quick* and *dead*.

61. What doth our *Confession of Faith* affirm concerning this Popish sacrifice of the mass, as they call it?

It affirms, that it is “most abominably injurious to Christ’s one only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sins of the elect, Heb. 7:27.”

62. Is not Christ *really present* in the sacrament of the supper?

He is “as really and spiritually present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses, 1 Cor. 11:29.” [Confession of Faith, xxix. 7.]

63. If Christ be really present in the sacrament only in a spiritual sense and not corporally, why doth he say of the bread, *This is my body*?

The plain obvious meaning is, The bread is the *sign* or *symbol* of my body: so that the words are to be understood in the *figurative*, not in the *literal* sense.

64. How do you prove, that these words, *This is my body*, are to be understood in the *figurative*, and not in the *literal* and *proper* sense?

From this known rule in all languages, That when the strict literal sense involves a manifest absurdity, or contradiction, we must of necessity have recourse to the figurative sense: as when the apostle says, 1 Cor. 10:4, *That rock was Christ*, it cannot be understood literally, as if that rock materially considered, was *really* Christ; but *figuratively*, that rock signified Christ: and so of a great many other scripture expressions.

65. Since the worthy receivers are not made partakers of Christ’s body and blood, after a corporal and carnal manner, how do they partake of the same?

They partake of his body and blood, in this sacrament, only [*by faith*].

66. What is it for the worthy receivers to partake of his body and blood by faith?

It is to apply and appropriate himself and his righteousness [*with all his benefits*] to themselves, Psa. 16:5–6.

67. What are these [*benefits*] which faith, in this sacrament, applies together with Christ himself?

Among many others, there are these three comprehensive ones, namely, an ample indemnity of all sin, Mic. 7:19; an unquestionable security for the progress of sanctification, Job 17:9; and an undoubted title to eternal life, John 10:28.

68. Why are these, and the like, called [*his*] benefits?

Because he is the purchaser, Titus 2:14; proprietor, John 3:35; and dispenser of them, Eph. 14:8.

69. Why are worthy receivers said to be made partakers of [*all*] his benefits?

Because where he himself is received, all good things go along with him, 1 Cor. 3:22–23 – *All are yours; and ye are Christ's.*

70. What is the fruit and effect of their being, by faith, made partakers of Christ, and all his benefits?

The fruit and effect thereof is [*their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace*].

71. What doth [*their spiritual nourishment*] imply in it?

That this sacrament is not a converting, but a nourishing ordinance.

72. What doth their [*growth in grace*] imply?

That the worthy receivers are already in a state of grace.

73. How may spiritual nourishment and growth in grace be discerned?

If there is a more enlarged desire after the sincere milk of the word, 1 Peter 2:2; if there is more living by faith, and not by sense, 2 Cor. 5:7; and if there is more inward opposition to sin, Psa. 66:18, and outward tenderness in the walk, Psa. 39:1 – *Ibid.*

Article XXII.

Purgatory.

Of Purgatory. – The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

De Purgatorio. – Doctrina Romanensium de purgatorio, de indulgentiis, de veneratione et adoratione, tum imaginum tum reliquiarum, nec non de invocatione sanctorum, res est inutilis, inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innitur: immo Verbo Dei contradicit.

In discussing the following blasphemies of Papal doctrine and worship, we shall find it more convenient, as it will perhaps be more profitable for the student, to interweave under each the history, doctrine, and scriptural proof, and with as much brevity as possible, than to treat these in separate or any lengthened sections; and especially so, as we have only to deal with ridiculous fantasies – worth at best but exposure, so far as any thoughtful or fairly balanced mind is concerned.

I. Purgatory.

God and the Bible know of only two states after death – happiness and misery. Rome says she knows of a third – Purgatory! God in the Bible declares, that the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin. Rome declares that *hard cash* especially is the ultimate Saviour. That though we may be justified by the Blood of Christ, yet that the justified sinner is still liable to punishment in the next world, to the shortening or lessening the severity of which the sacrifice of the Mass, to be *paid for* by his friends on earth, is of great efficacy. That if you want your father or mother, or husband, or wife, or child, quick into the beatific vision of God, you must above all things – *pay the piper*. This phrase is not a bit too ludicrous – it covers and contains the whole ludicrous blasphemy.

Of course St. John, or rather the Holy Ghost when He inspired the Apostle, knew nothing about Purgatory, for this is the sure word of testimony – “He that believeth *hath* everlasting life, and *shall not come into condemnation*, but *is passed* from death unto life” (John 5:24). And St. Paul mistook his reckoning – “I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to *depart, and to be with Christ*” (Phil. 1:23). Christ also was egregiously wrong, and held out a false hope, when he said to the penitent thief on the cross, who had no time for acts of penance, “Today shalt thou be with me in *Paradise*” (Luke 23:43).

It is a well-known fact that Purgatory and Plato are twins; and that in the writings of heathen poets and philosophers we may easily limn the main outlines of the ghastly region.

Plato divided the souls of the departed into three classes: those who passed at once into the Elysian Fields; those who passed for ever into Hell; and the curable, who also passed into hell, to be purged from their sins.

Now it would not be human nature, but a miracle, and something too, far beyond what we know of miracles, if this purgation theory did not, in

the upheavings of systems at the birth of Christianity, reproduce itself less or more on the virginal soils. And accordingly we find not only Origen, but Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome and others, inclining to the doctrine of a universal purgation of bodies and souls, of the good and the bad, even of Peter, Paul, and the Virgin. But this very clearly is altogether a different thing from the novel invention of the Popish Purgatory, where *satisfaction* has to be made for sin, in a place of torment, by the *suffrages* of the faithful living – masses, indulgences, and alms given to the Priest.

Even Augustine, who at one time had crude notions about a middle state so far as to say, “Such a matter as a middle state for purgation might be inquired into,” could yet ultimately write, “We read of heaven and of hell; but the third place we are utterly ignorant of; yea, we find it is not in Scripture.” And again, “Nor will anything help thee but what is done while thou art here. As the last day of man’s life finds him, so the last day of the world shall hold him.”

But it remained for Pope Gregory the Great at the end of the sixth century, formally to establish the doctrine, that there is a veritable Purgatory, and so introduce his Canon of the Mass.

Crude and unpolished however as was the dogma, it rapidly bore fruit in replenishing the pockets of the clergy; and though doubted or repudiated by many, ultimately obtained as an article of faith since the Council of Florence, and was still further elaborated by Trent.

Council of Florence, 1439: – “Those were the matters which came under discussion concerning purgatory, on certain days; and the Greeks agreed with the Latin Fathers on these points; namely, that if the truly penitent depart hence in the love of God, before they have made satisfaction for sins of commission and omission by fruits meet for repentance, their souls after death are cleansed by the pains of purgatory; and the suffrages of the faithful still alive, such as sacrifices of the mass, prayers, and alms, and other works of piety, which they have been accustomed to offer in accordance with the institutions of the Church, contribute to the relief of such pains: and that the souls of those who, after receiving holy baptism, have contracted no stain of sin; or, after contracting a stain of sin, have been cleansed, either in their bodies, or apart from them, are forthwith received into heaven, and clearly behold the triune God himself, as he is, although one may behold him more perfectly than another: but that the souls of those who depart in actual mortal sin, or only in original sin, immediately

descend into hell, where they will be visited with different degrees of punishment” (Labbe., Concil. Florent.).

How strange that all the broad features of the Platonic and heathenish origin of Purgatory should thus so plainly develop themselves; as Cardinal Bellarmine confesses: “In the last session of the Council of Florence, it was defined that some souls are presently received into Hell, some into Purgatory, some into Heaven” (Bellarm., De Purgat.).

Council of Trent, Session 6: “If any one shall say that after the reception of the grace of Justification, the guilt is so remitted to the penitent sinner, and the penalty of eternal punishment destroyed, that no penalty of temporal punishment remains to be paid, either in this world, or in the future in Purgatory, before the access to the kingdom of heaven can lie upon. Let him be accursed.”

Session 22: “Wherefore it (the sacrifice of the Mass) is properly offered, according to apostolical tradition, not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of living believers, but also for the dead in Christ, who are not yet thoroughly purified.” Again: “If any one shall affirm that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the cross, and not a propitiatory offering; or that it only benefits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities. Let him be accursed.”

Creed of Pope Pius IV: “I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.”

Catechism of the Council of Trent: “In the fire of Purgatory the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, ‘into which nothing defiled entereth.’ The truth of this doctrine, founded, as holy Councils declare, on Scripture, and confirmed by Apostolical tradition, demands diligent and frequent exposition proportioned to the circumstances of the times in which we live, when men endure not sound doctrine.”

“Douay Catechism: “Quest. Whither go such as die in mortal sin? Ans. To hell to all eternity. Q. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins? A. To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven.”

It must be noted that the records of the proceedings of the Council of Florence from Labbe as above, err in representing the Greeks as agreeing with the Latins on the doctrine of purgatory. It was imposed upon them, under the influence of Pope Eugenius; and an Apology was sent in to the Council of Basil: “We own no purgatory fire, nor any temporary punishment by fire, which shall have an end; for we received no such thing by tradition, nor doth the Eastern Church confess it.”

As to the site of Purgatory, Romish divines, as might of course be expected, have not been able to determine. Some place it in the center of the earth; others in one of the departments of the infernal regions, just above hell; others say that the craters of volcanoes are so many openings to it; others that in extraordinary cases the souls are punished in different places; and even Gregory the Great, inventor of the imposture, held that some have their purgatory in other places than that which has hitherto gone by the name, and produces an example of the soul of Paschasius, which was purged in the baths!

Nor can these infallible doctors agree as to the kind and degree of punishment – whether it is material or otherwise, or exceeding or not anything in this life – whether the wretched purgatorians are broiling upon gridirons, or roasting upon spits, or burning before a fire, or smoked in a chimney, etc. etc. But least of all are the Priests explicit as to the duration of it, inasmuch as it would appear that the time of detention is lengthened or shortened by the Clergy as may best suit the purpose of filling their coffers.

One thing at least they seem pretty soon to have agreed upon, that the highways to Purgatory were discovered: one in Sicily, another in Pazzueto, and a third in Ireland! The latter at all events we may venture to think no fiction, at the present day especially.

Here is Mosheim’s Picture of the Tenth Century: –

The fears of Purgatory were now carried to the greatest height, and exceeded by far the terrifying apprehensions of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter easily, by dying enriched with the prayers of the Clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the saints; while from the pains of purgatory there was no exemption. The Clergy, therefore, finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority, and to promote their interest, used every method to augment them; and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied by monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to establish the doctrine of

Purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region.”

The following paragraph as it stands in Elliott’s *Delineation*, is well worth quoting: –

“It has been estimated that the Neapolitan Clergy extort between five-and-thirty and forty thousand pounds per annum from all classes of their flocks, under pretense of ‘clearing souls from purgatory’. This subject affords a frequent topic for pulpit oratory; and a modern traveler relates a recent instance of the manner in which it is handled. ‘He was one of a crowded auditory, when the drum-ecclesiastic opened his discourse with a deluge of rhetorical bedevilment, admirably calculated to warm his hearers’ imaginations. At last he made an appeal to the souls in purgatory themselves, and they were heard responding with a doleful tale of their sufferings. The Preacher then turned round to the congregation, exclaiming, *That voice which you heard was your brother’s, your mother’s, your son’s, or daughter’s*; but he appeared very wary of saying it was a wife’s or husband’s. It was most edifying to mark the adroitness with which he played upon his hearers’ consciences; nor was it to small purpose, for he gleaned a harvest of alms which made his eyes glisten with delight, and, doubtlessly, effected the release of many a tortured soul from transmundane pains and penalties that very day. On some occasions even dramatic claptraps are played off by the brethren of the cowl and rosary; but this farce is never adventured, excepting before a select audience, and then rockets are let off behind the altar, as a type of the ascent of souls from purgatory into paradise.”

And again: – “Those who are rich may purchase some mitigation of their torments; but those who have nothing to pay must suffer in their own persons all the pains of purgatorial fire until they shall have made full satisfaction to divine justice by paying ‘the uttermost farthing’. It is true, they may comfort themselves with the idea that their surviving friends will probably pay money to have masses said for them; but when they reflect how destitute their friends are, and what a monstrous debt stands against them, no poor sinner can derive much comfort from this reflection.”

But nothing perhaps can show the rapacity and hatefulness of the priestcraft of Rome in setting forth the doctrine of Purgatory more than the following statutes and decrees, as quoted by Dr. Elliott; –

“In regard to mortuary fees, let the best animal be paid over to the Church, whether it be a cow, or an ox, or a horse, if the value thereof be six shillings or less. With respect to clothes, it shall be at the option of the Church to receive them as a mortuary, or three shillings and sixpence. And if the man be poor, and pay no mortuary, let the clothes be taken as they are, and every fifth penny of his personal property” (Statutes of the Synod of Sodor, 1239).

Again: “When a man pays a mortuary, the priest is to have his boots to the value of sixpence, with his hood or cap, be the value more or less, such as he wore it on Christmas Day: also his shirt and girdle, to the value of one penny; purse to the value of one penny, and knife to the value of one penny” (Idem, *ibid.*).

Again: “The Parson or Vicar, upon the death of any landholder, shall receive the best head of cattle next after the heir; and if there should not be much cattle, the executors are bound to satisfy the Parson or Vicar according as means permit from the goods of the deceased before they administer to his will” (Constitutions of Giles de Bridport, Bishop of Sarum, 1256).

Again: “According to the custom of the neighbouring provinces, the Church shall have the option of all the cattle of the deceased except one, with all his clothes, and his bed or couch. But if he have not a couch, let seven pence be given instead; and let *oblations* be made for every dead person according to his means, both in *pence and candles*, in his parish church. And we forbid, under pain of excommunication, that any corpse be carried elsewhere for burial until a Mass shall have been performed for it in the parish church” (Constitutions of the Diocese of Sodor, 1291).

“According to Lindwood, the whole personal estate of the deceased was sometimes assigned. By the Ordinary for the benefit of the soul of the defunct, when there were neither parents, wife, nor children. Sometimes a half when there was a wife surviving, but no children. And when there were both wife and children, a third of the personal property was assigned for funeral expenses and masses.”

No wonder that it was also decreed: “Those who make not their wills in the presence of a Priest shall be looked upon as having died intestate.”

“Indeed, so crafty and avaricious were the priesthood, that, in the year 1539, Sir Henry Guildford declared in Parliament that ‘the great polling and extreme exaction which the spiritual men used in taking corpse-presents, or

mortuaries, was such, that the children of the dead might all die for hunger, and go a-begging, rather than they would, of charity, give to them the silly cow, which the dead man ought, if he had but only one” (Extracts from Fox apud Wilkins’s Concilia).

“Time was when scarcely a will was made without a large portion of the dying man’s estate being left to the Romish Church; so that if the Legislature had not interfered, the whole temporalities of the kingdom would ere long have been alienated from the State, and unduly appropriated by the hierarchy of Rome” (Hall’s Doctrine of Purgatory, and Practice of Praying for the Dead).

Cranmer.

“Your ninth Article is this: ‘We will have every preacher in his sermon, and every priest at the Mass, pray specially by name for the souls in Purgatory, as our forefathers did.’ – To reason with you by learning, which be unlearned, it were but folly; therefore I will convince your article with very reason. First, tell me, I pray, if you can, whether there be a Purgatory or no, and where or what it is. And if you cannot tell, then I may tell you that you ask you wot not what. The Scripture maketh mention of two places where the dead be received after this life, of heaven and of hell; but of purgatory is not one word spoken. Purgatory was wont to be called a fire as hot as hell, but not so long during. But now the defenders of purgatory within this realm be ashamed so to say: nevertheless, they say it is a third place; but where or what it is they confess themselves they cannot tell. And of God’s word they have nothing to show, neither where it is, nor what it is, nor that it is. But all is feigned of their own brains, without authority of Scripture.

“I would ask of them then, wherefore it is, and to what use it serveth? For if it be to no use, then it is a thing frustrate and in vain. Marry, say they, ‘it is a place of punishment, whereby they be purged from their sins, that depart out of this life not fully purged before.’ I cannot tell whether this saying be more foolish, or more contumelious to Christ. For what can be more foolish than to say, that pains can wash sins out of the soul? I do not deny that corrections and punishments in this life are a calling of men to repentance and amendment, and so to be purged by the blood of Christ. But correction without repentance can nothing avail; and they that be dead be past the time of repentance; and so no correction or torments in purgatory

can avail them. And what a contumely and injury is this to Christ, to affirm that all have not full and perfect purgation by his blood, that die in his faith! Is not all our trust in the blood of Christ, that we be cleansed, purged, and washed thereby? And will you have us now to forsake our faith in Christ, and bring us to the Pope's purgatory to be washed therein; thinking that Christ's blood is an imperfect lee or soap that washeth not clean? If he shall die without mercy that treadeth Christ's blood under his feet, what is treading of his blood under our feet, if this be not? But if according to the catholic faith, which the holy Scripture teacheth, and the prophets, apostles, and martyrs confirmed with their blood, all the faithful that die in the Lord be pardoned of all their offences by Christ, and their sins be clearly sponged and washed away by his blood; shall they after be cast into another strong and grievous prison of purgatory, there to be punished again for that which was pardoned before? God hath promised by his word that the souls of the just be in God's hand, and no pain shall touch them: and again he saith, 'Blessed be they that die in the Lord. For the Spirit of God saith, that from henceforth they shall rest from their pains.' And Christ himself saith: 'He that believeth in him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come to judgment, but shall pass from death unto life.' And is God no truer of his promises but to punish that which he promiseth to pardon? Consider the matter by your own cases. If the king's majesty should pardon your offences, and after would cast you into prison, would you think that he had well observed his promise? For what is to pardon your offences, but to pardon the punishment for the same? If the king would punish you, would you take that for a pardon? Would you not allege your pardon, and say that you ought not to be punished? Who can then, that hath but a crumb of reason in his head, imagine of God that he will after our death punish those things that he pardoned in our lifetime?

“Truth it is that Scripture maketh mention of paradise and Abraham's bosom after this life; but those be places of joy and consolation, not of pains and torments. But yet I know what subtle sophisters use to mutter in men's ears to deceive them withal. David, say they, with many other, were pardoned of their offences, and yet were they sore punished after for the same of God; and some of them so long as they lived. Well, be it it were so. Yet after their lives they were not punished in purgatory therefore: but the end of their lives was the end of their punishment. And likewise it is of original sin after baptism, which although it be pardoned, yet afterpains

thereof continue so long as we live. But this punishment in this lifetime is not to revenge our original sin which is pardoned in baptism, but to make us humble, penitent, obedient to God, fearful to offend, to know ourselves, and ever to stand in fear and awe; as, if a father that hath beaten a willful child for his faults should hang the rod continually at the child's girdle, it should be no small pain and grief to the child, ever hanging by his side: and yet the father doth it not to beat the child for that which is past and forgiven; but to make him beware hereafter that he offend not again, and to be gentle, tractable, obedient, and loath to do anything amiss. But after this life there is no such cause of punishment; where no rod nor whip can force any man to go any faster or farther, being already at the end of his journey. Likewise a master that hath an unthrifty servant, which out of his master's sight doth nothing but riot and disorder himself, if he forgive his servant, and for the love he beareth to him, and the desire he hath to see him corrected and reformed, he will command him never to be out of his sight, this command, although indeed it be a great pain to the servant, yet the master doth it not to punish those faults, which before he had pardoned and forgiven, but to keep him in stay, that he fall no more to like disorder. But these examples and cases of punishment here in this life can in no wise be wrested and drawn to the life to come; and so in no wise can serve for purgatory.

“And furthermore, seeing that the Scriptures so often and so diligently teach us, almost in every place, to relieve all them that be in necessity, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to visit the sick and the prisoner, to comfort the sorrowful, and so to all others that have need of our help; and the same in no place make mention either of such pains in purgatory, or what comfort we may do them; it is certain that the same is feigned for lucre, and not grounded upon God's word. For else the Scripture in some place would have told us plainly what case they stood in that be in purgatory, and what relief and help we might do unto them. But forasmuch as God's words speaketh not one word of neither of them both, my counsel shall be, that you keep not the Bishop of Rome's decrees that you may come to purgatory, but keep God's laws that you may come to heaven: or else I promise you assuredly that you shall never escape hell” (Answer to the Fifteen Articles of the Rebels).

Calvin.

“Those passages of Scripture on which it is their wont falsely and iniquitously to fasten, it may be worthwhile to wrench out of their hands. When the Lord declares that the sin against the Holy Ghost will not be forgiven either in this world or the world to come, he thereby intimates (they say) that there is a remission of certain sins hereafter. But who sees not that the Lord there speaks of the guilt of sin? But if this is so, what has it to do with their purgatory, seeing they deny not that the guilt of those sins, the punishment of which is there expiated, is forgiven in the present life? Lest, however, they should still object, we shall give a plainer solution. Since it was the Lord’s intention to cut off all hope of pardon from this flagitious wickedness, he did not consider it enough to say, that it would never be forgiven, but in the way of amplification, employed a division by which he included both the judgment which every man’s conscience pronounces in the present life, and the final judgment which will be publicly pronounced at the resurrection; as if he had said, Beware of this malignant rebellion, as you would of instant destruction; for he who of set purpose endeavours to extinguish the offered light of the Spirit, shall not obtain pardon either in this life, which has been given to sinners for conversion, or on the last day when the angels of God shall separate the sheep from the goats, and the heavenly kingdom shall be purged of all that offends. The next passage they produce is the parable in Matthew: ‘Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily, I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing’ (Matt. 5:25–26). If in this passage the judge means God, the adversary the devil, the officer an angel, and the prison purgatory, I give in at once. But if every man sees that Christ there intended to show to how many perils and evils those expose themselves who obstinately insist on their utmost right, instead of being satisfied with what is fair and equitable, that he might thereby the more strongly exhort his followers to concord, where, I ask, are we to find their purgatory?” The French adds: “Brief, que le passage soit regardé et prius en sa simple intelligence, et il n’y sera rien trouvé de ce qu’ils prétendent” – In short, let the passage be looked at and taken in its simple meaning, and there will be nothing found in it of what they pretend.

“They seek an argument in the passage in which Paul declares, that all things shall bow the knee to Christ, ‘things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth’ (Phil. 2:10). They take it for granted, that by ‘things under the earth’ cannot be meant those who are doomed to eternal damnation, and that the only remaining conclusion is, that they must be souls suffering in purgatory. They would not reason very ill if, by the bending of the knee, the Apostle designated true worship; but since he simply says that Christ has received a dominion to which all creatures are subject, what prevents us from understanding those ‘under the earth’ to mean the devils, who shall certainly be sisted before the judgment seat of God, there to recognize their Judge with fear and trembling? In this way Paul himself elsewhere interprets the same prophecy: “We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God’ (Rom. 14:10–11). But we cannot in this way interpret what is said in the Apocalypse: ‘Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever’ (Rev. 5:13). This I readily admit; but what kinds of creatures do they suppose are here enumerated? It is absolutely certain, that both irrational and inanimate creatures are comprehended. All, then, which is affirmed is, that every part of the universe, from the highest pinnacle of heaven to the very center of the earth, each in its own way proclaims the glory of the Creator.

“To the passage which they produce from the history of the Maccabees (1 Macc. 12:43), I will not deign to reply, lest I should seem to include that work among the canonical books. But Augustine holds it to be canonical. First, with what degree of confidence? ‘The Jews,’ says he, ‘do not hold the book of the Maccabees as they do the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, to which the Lord bears testimony as to his own witnesses, saying, Ought not all things which are written in the Law, and the Psalms, and the Prophets, concerning me be fulfilled? (Luke 24:44). But it has been received by the Church not uselessly, if it be read or heard with soberness.’ Jerome, however, unhesitatingly affirms that it is of no authority in establishing doctrine; and from the ancient little book, *De Expositione Symboli*, which bears the name of Cyprian, it is plain that it was in no estimation in the ancient Church. And why do I here contend in vain? As if

the author himself did not sufficiently show what degree of deference is to be paid to him, when in the end he asks pardon for anything less properly expressed (2 Macc. 15:38). He who confesses that his writings stand in need of pardon, certainly proclaims that they are not oracles of the Holy Spirit. We may add that the piety of Judas is commended for no other reason than for having a firm hope of the final resurrection, in sending his oblation for the dead to Jerusalem. For the writer of the history does not represent what he did as furnishing the price of redemption, but merely that they might be partakers of eternal life, with the other saints who had fallen for their country and religion. The act, indeed, was not free from superstition and misguided zeal; but it is mere fatuity to extend the legal sacrifice to us, seeing we are assured that the sacrifices then in use ceased on the advent of Christ.

“But it seems they find in Paul an invincible support which cannot be so easily overthrown. His words are, ‘Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man’s work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is. If any man’s work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire’ (1 Cor. 12–15). What fire (they ask) can that be but the fire of purgatory, by which the defilements of sin are wiped away in order that we may enter pure into the kingdom of God? But most of the Fathers give it a different meaning, viz., the tribulation or cross by which the Lord tries his people that they may not rest satisfied with the defilement of the flesh. This is much more probable than the fiction of a purgatory. I do not, however, agree with them, for I think I see a much surer and clearer meaning to the passage. But before I produce it, I wish they would answer me whether they think the Apostle and all the saints have to pass through this purgatorial fire? I am aware they will say, no; for it were too absurd to hold that purification is required by those whose superfluous merits they dream of as applicable to all the members of the Church. But this the Apostle affirms, for he says, not that the works of certain persons, but the works of all, will be tried. And this is not my argument, but that of Augustine, who thus impugns that interpretation. And (what makes the thing more absurd) he says, not that they will pass through fire for certain works, but that even if they should have edified the Church with the greatest fidelity, they will receive their reward after their works shall have

been tried by fire. First, we see that the Apostle used a metaphor when he gave the names of wood, hay, and stubble to doctrines of man's device. The ground of the metaphor is obvious, viz., that as wood when it is put into the fire is consumed and destroyed, so neither will those doctrines be able to endure when they come to be tried. Moreover, everyone sees that the trial is made by the Spirit of God. Therefore, in following out the thread of the metaphor, and adapting its parts properly to each other, he gave the name of fire to the examination of the Holy Spirit. For just as silver and gold, the nearer they are brought to the fire, give stronger proof of their genuineness and purity, so the Lord's truth, the more thoroughly it is submitted to spiritual examination, has its authority the better confirmed. As hay, wood, and stubble, when the fire is applied to them, are suddenly consumed, so the inventions of man, not founded on the word of God, cannot stand the trial of the Holy Spirit, but forthwith give way and perish. In fine, if spurious doctrines are compared to wood, hay, and stubble because, like wood, hay, and stubble, they are burned by fire and fitted for destruction, though the actual destruction is only completed by the Spirit of the Lord, it follows that the Spirit is that fire by which they will be proved. This proof Paul calls the *day of the Lord*, using a term common in Scripture. For the day of the Lord is said to take place whenever he in some way manifests his presence to men, his face being specially said to shine when his truth is manifested. It has now been proved that Paul had no idea of any other fire than the trial of the Holy Spirit. But how are those who suffer the loss of their works saved by fire? This it will not be difficult to understand, if we consider of what kind of persons he speaks. For he designates them builders of the Church, who, retaining the proper foundation, build different materials upon it; that is, who, not abandoning the principal and necessary articles of faith, err in minor and less perilous matters, mingling their own fictions with the word of God. Such, I say, must suffer the loss of their work by the destruction of their fictions. They themselves, however, are saved, yet so as by fire, that is, not that their ignorance and delusions are approved by the Lord, but they are purified from them by the grace and power of the Holy Spirit. All those accordingly who have tainted the golden purity of the divine word with the pollution of purgatory must necessarily suffer the loss of their work.

“But the observance of it in the Church is of the highest antiquity. This objection is disposed of by Paul, when, including even his own age in the sentence, he declares that all who in building the Church have laid up

something not conformable to the foundation, must suffer the loss of their work. When, therefore, my opponents object that it has been the practice for thirteen hundred years to offer prayers for the dead, I, in return, ask them by what word of God, by what revelation, by what example, it was done? For here not only are passages of Scripture wanting, but in the examples of all the saints of whom we read nothing of the kind is seen. We have numerous and sometimes long narratives of their mourning and sepulchral rites, but not one word is said of prayers [French; Scripture relates oftentimes and at great length how the faithful lamented the death of their relations, and how they buried them; but that they prayed for them is never hinted at]. But the more important the matter was, the more they ought to have dwelt upon it. Even those who in ancient times offered prayers for the dead saw that they were not supported by the command of God and legitimate example. Why then did they presume to do it? I hold that herein they suffered the common lot of man, and therefore maintain that what they did is not to be imitated. Believers ought not to engage in any work without a firm conviction of its propriety, as Paul enjoins (Rom. 14:23); and this conviction is expressly requisite in prayer. It is to be presumed, however, that they were influenced by some reason; they sought a solace for their sorrow, and it seemed cruel not to give some attestation of their love to the dead when in the presence of God. All know by experience how natural it is for the human mind thus to feel.

“Received custom too was a kind of torch, by which the minds of many were inflamed. We know that among all the Gentiles, and in all ages, certain rites were paid to the dead, and that every year lustrations were performed for their manes. Although Satan deluded foolish mortals by these impostures, yet the means of deceiving were borrowed from a sound principle – viz., that death is not destruction, but a passage from this life to another. And there can be no doubt that superstition itself always left the Gentiles without excuse before the judgment seat of God, because they neglected to prepare for that future life which they professed to believe. Thus, that Christians might not seem worse than heathens, they felt ashamed of paying no office to the dead, as if they had been utterly annihilated. Hence their ill-devised assiduity; because they thought they would expose themselves to great disgrace, if they were slow in providing funeral feasts and oblations. What was thus introduced by perverse rivalry, ever and anon received new additions, until the highest holiness of the

Papacy consisted in giving assistance to the suffering dead. But far better and more solid comfort is furnished by Scripture when it declares, 'Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord'; and adds the reason, 'for they rest from their labours' (Rev. 14:13). We ought not to indulge our love so far as to set up a perverse mode of prayer in the Church. Surely every person possessed of the least prudence easily perceives, that whatever we meet with on this subject in ancient writers, was in deference to public custom, and the ignorance of the vulgar. I admit they were themselves also carried away into error, the usual effect of rash credulity being to destroy the judgment. Meanwhile the passages themselves show, that when they recommended prayer for the dead, it was with hesitation. Augustine relates in his Confessions, that his mother Monica earnestly entreated to be remembered when the solemn rites at the altar were performed; doubtless an old woman's wish, which her son did not bring to the test of Scripture, but from natural affection wished others to approve. His book, *De Cura pro Mortuis Agenda, On showing Care for the Dead*, is so full of doubt, that its coldness may well extinguish the heat of a foolish zeal. Should anyone, in pretending to be a patron of the dead, deal merely in probabilities, the only effect will be to make those indifferent who were formerly solicitous.

"The only support of this dogma is, that as a custom of praying for the dead prevailed, the duty ought not to be despised. But granting that ancient ecclesiastical writers deemed it a pious thing to assist the dead, the rule which can never deceive is always to be observed – viz., that we must not introduce anything of our own into our prayers, but must keep all our wishes in subordination to the word of God, because it belongs to him to prescribe what he wishes us to ask. Now, since the whole Law and Gospel do not contain one syllable which countenances the right of praying for the dead, it is a profanation of prayer to go one step farther than God enjoins. But, lest our opponents boast of sharing their error with the ancient Church, I say that there is wide difference between the two. The latter made a commemoration of the dead, that they might not seem to have cast off all concern for them; but they at the same time acknowledged that they were doubtful as to their state; assuredly they made no such assertion concerning purgatory as implied that they did not hold it to be uncertain. The former insist, that their dream of purgatory shall be received without question as an article of faith. The latter sparingly and in a perfunctory manner only commended their dead to the Lord, in the communion of the holy supper.

The former are constantly urging the care of the dead, and by their importunate preaching of it, make out that it is to be preferred to all the offices of charity. But it would not be difficult for us to produce some passages from ancient writers, which clearly overturn all those prayers for the dead which were then in use. (See August. Hom. in Joann. 49. De Civitate Dei, Lib. 13–24.) Such is the passage of Augustine, in which he shows that the resurrection of the flesh and eternal glory is expected by all, but that rest which follows death is received by everyone who is worthy of it when he dies. Accordingly, he declares that all the righteous, not less than the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, immediately after death enjoy blessed rest. If such is their condition, what, I ask, will our prayers contribute to them? I say nothing of those grosser superstitions by which they have fascinated the minds of the simple; and yet they are innumerable, and most of them so monstrous, that they cannot cover them with any cloak of decency. I say nothing, moreover, of those most shameful traffickings, which they plied as they listed while the world was stupefied. For I would never come to an end; and, without enumerating them, the pious reader will here find enough to establish his conscience” (Institutes, book iii. chap. v. 7–10).

M’Gavin.

“In what a light does Purgatory place the priesthood! They believe, or at least they teach, that the friends of their flock are lying weltering in a lake of fire, from which they could deliver them by saying masses for them, and recommending them to the prayers of the congregation; and yet they will not perform these services, nor even recommend them, unless they be regularly paid for it. How can a man represent himself as such a monster, and yet hold up his head in civilized society? What! shall I believe that a single soul is suffering torments so dreadful; that it may continue to suffer them for ages; that I have the means in my power of relieving it; and yet shall I coolly wait till I be paid, before I use these means? By what process of reasoning can men be brought to believe, that this is the religion given to us for our salvation, by our kind and merciful Father in heaven? By what arguments can the poor be convinced that a system of exhortation, which gives so manifest a preference to the rich, can be that Gospel which was to be preached peculiarly to the poor?”

Elliott.

“Purgatory is viewed as too profitable a source of gain to be easily renounced by the Clergy, who, by this craft, obtain their living; who are as zealous in its defense as Demetrius was for the worship of Diana. Nevertheless many of them believe it no more than a celebrated Cardinal who pleasantly proposed this question to his Chaplain: ‘How many masses would serve to fetch a soul out of purgatory?’ To which, when the subordinate Priest was unable to reply, the Cardinal thus solved the difficulty: ‘Just as many as it would take of snowballs to heat an oven.’”

Alas! How easily are poor Romanists gulled! Robbed of their silver and gold, and of their – souls!

II. Pardons or Indulgences.

As we have just seen that there is no foundation for the figment of Purgatory, and as indulgences are simply checks for the remission of purgatorial punishment upon the fund of Supererogation, which we have fully examined under Article 14, it would seem to be mere waste of time to dwell on this head. We cannot, however, refrain from quoting the scathing words of Calvin: –

“Anyone who throws his pence into the coffer where Pardons are set out for sale, or purchases anything for himself out of that prolific and abundant treasury of Indulgences and Dispensations, enrolls his name as a sharer in those nefarious traffickings, and declares his consent to them as clearly as if he wore their badge! I cannot admit the excuse which is commonly made, that just as wild beasts are calmed by throwing offal to them, so the rage of Priestlings is to be softened by throwing them a few coins, or occasionally bestowing upon them a large sum of money, seeing that where lucre is in question, they gape over their prey and are more ravenous than a hungry lion; always, like the false prophets and false priests of old (as the prophet testifies, Micah 3), sounding the tocsin of war against every man who will not put something into their mouths! This excuse, I say, I cannot accept. For what do those Bulls, the favour of which you make a pretense of desiring, imply? Do they not. With loud voice proclaim that in return for the money you leave, you carry off Indulgences full of anathema, and deserving of the utmost execration? Have not those who understand this (and everybody understands!) and who see you offer money (did you not wish to be seen you would not do it!) an abundantly clear testimony that you are desirous to

have a share in Indulgences? If you thoroughly examine what is concealed under them, you will nowhere find Christ and his cross more systematically insulted.”

III. Worshipping and Adoration of Images and Relics.

We have consulted a goodly number of treatises, ancient and modern, on this subject, but nowhere have we found the history and unscripturalness of the Worship of Images so fully and clearly brought out as in our own Homilies, *Against Peril of Idolatry*; the first part containing the doctrine of the Scripture against images; the second part, testimonies from the Fathers and from history; and the third part confuting the principal arguments in favour of images. As this fourteenth Homily is far too valuable not to suffer from being summarized, and very copious withal, we must be content earnestly to invite the student and general reader carefully to study this renowned “Sermon” from the pen, as it would appear, of Ridley, with additions from Bullinger. An imperishable masterpiece of Protestant theology.

Burnet.

“There was cause given in St. Austin’s time to suspect, that many of the bones which were carried about by monks were none of their [saints’] bones, but impostures, which very much shakes the credit of the miracles [said to be] wrought by them, since we have no reason to think that God would support such impostures with miracles, as, on the other hand, there is no reason to think that false relics would have passed upon the world, if miracles had been believed to accompany true ones, unless they had their miracles likewise to attest their value: so, let this matter be turned which way it may, the credit both of relics and of the miracles wrought by them, is not a little shaken by it. But in the following ages we have more than presumptions that there was much of this false coin that went abroad in the world. It was not possible to distinguish the false from the true. The freshness of colour and smell, so often boasted, might have been easily managed by art; the varieties of those relics, the different methods of discovering them, the shinings that were said to be about their tombs, with the smells that broke out of them, the many apparitions that accompanied them, and the signal cures that were wrought by them, as they grew to fill the world with many volumes of legends, many more lying yet in the

manuscripts in many Churches than have been published; – all these, I say, carry in them such characters of fraud and imposture on the one hand, and of credulity and superstition on the other – so much craft, and so much folly – that they had their full effect upon the world, even in contradiction to the clearest evidence possible; the same saints having more bodies and heads than one in different places, and yet all equally celebrated with miracles. A great profusion of wealth and pomp was laid out in honouring them, new devotions were still invented for them: and though these things are too palpably false to be put upon us now, in ages of more light, where everything will not go down because it is confidently affirmed; yet, as we know how great a part of the devotion of the Latin Church this continued to be for many ages before the Reformation, so the same trade is still carried on, where the same ignorance and the same superstition does still continue.”

IV. The Invocation of Saints.

The student will find this subject sufficiently discussed in the fourteenth Homily to which we have referred him above, read in conjunction with the second part of the nineteenth.

Article XXXV.

The Homilies.

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 subjungimus, continet piam et salutarem doctrinam, et his temporibus necessariam, non minus quam prior Tomus Homiliarum, quae editae sunt tempore Edwardi Sexti. Itaque eas in Ecclesiis per Ministros, diligenter et dare, ut a populo intelligi possint, recitandas esse judicavimus.

De Nominibus Homiliarum: –

De recto Ecclesiae usu.

Adversus Idolatriae pericula.

De reparandis ac purgandis Ecclesiis.

De bonis Operibus.

De Jejunio.

In Gulae atque Ebrietatis vitia.

In nimis sumptuosos Gestium apparatus.

De Oratione sive Precatione.

De Loco et Tempore Orationi destinatis.

De Publicis Precibus ac Sacramentis, idiomate vulgari omnibusque noto, habendis.

De sacrosancta Verbi Divini auctoritate.

De Eleemosina.

De Christi Nativitate.

De Dominica Passione.

De Resurrectione Domini.

De digna Corporis et Sanguinis Dominici in Coena Domini participatione.

De Donis Spiritus Sancti.

In diebus, qui vulgo Rogationum dicti sunt, concio.

De Matrimonii statu.

De Otio sen Socordia.

De Poenitentia.

There is little to detain us under this Article. The word Homily (ομιλία – a familiar, instructive discourse) had been used to designate certain sermons which, as early as the reign of Henry, were set forth to supply ministers who were either unable or unwilling to preach. As to the incompetency of the clergy of those times, it is sufficient to note, that on the restoration under Elizabeth only eighty parish priests declined to conform; that is, the great mass of the clergy were willing to accept any change of religion, and as a matter of fact did accept all the radical changes under Henry, Edward, Mary, Elizabeth! As to their unwillingness, the times were troubled, and discretion, cowardice, was the better part of valour.

We may add that a word of the same import is Postil (*post illa, sc. verba* – originally a note in the margin of the Bible, so called as written after the text), first composed by order of Charlemagne for incompetent clergymen, and also utilized by Luther. Thus Murdoch: “The books of homilies in the English Church were postils under another name.” Homily, too, in a broader and better sense, nearly corresponds in the primitive Church to the Latin *Sermo*. So we find Origen called his popular expositions *Homilitici*, or Homilies – extemporaneous discourses, taken down by persons appointed for the purpose.

Our Homilies consist of two Books. The first was published in 1547, soon after Edward’s accession, and are twelve in number: –

1. A fruitful Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture.
2. Of the Misery of all Mankind.
3. Of the Salvation of all Mankind.
4. Of the true and lively Faith.
5. Of Good Works.
6. Of Christian Love and Charity.
7. Against Swearing and Perjury.
8. Of the Declining from God.
9. An Exhortation against the Fear of Death.
10. An Exhortation to Obedience.
11. Against Whoredom and Adultery.
12. Against Strife and Contention.

The Second Book of Homilies, put forth in Elizabeth’s reign – printed in 1562, and circulated in 1563 (with the exception of the Homily against Rebellion, which was added in 1572) – consists of twenty-one Sermons, the several titles of which have been enumerated above.

As to the object of the Homilies, it has been already stated; or as we may put it in the main in the quaint words of Convocation in 1542, to “stay

such errors as were then by ignorant preachers sparkled among the people.”

As to the authorship of our own Books, it is impossible to determine with certainty. It is however most probable that “The Salvation of Mankind,” “The true and lively Faith,” “Good Works annexed unto Faith,” “An Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture,” were composed by Cranmer; that “The Misery of all Mankind,” “Christian Love and Charity,” are traceable to Bonner; that “Against Whoredom and Adultery,” “Against Swearing and Perjury,” were written by Becon; that “Against Gluttony and Drunkenness,” “Against Excess of Apparel,” “The Right Use of the Church,” “The Repairing of Churches,” are to be assigned to Pilkington; that “The Passion of Christ,” “The Resurrection of Christ,” are drawn from the Postils completed by Taverner; that “Against Peril of Idolatry” is from Ridley, with additions by Bollinger; while not a few (in the Second Book) are to be attributed to Jewel.

As to the lawfulness of publicly *reading* in the Church, any other composition than canonical Scripture – for that was the point carped at – we have sufficient proof. Thus, whatever may be the meaning of “The Epistle from Laodicea” (Col. 4:16) – whether an epistle from the Laodiceans to St. Paul, or an epistle from St. Paul to the Laodiceans – it is clear that the Holy Ghost commanded it to be read in the Colossian Church, and yet it forms no part whatever of canonical Scripture. And this accords with the practice of the primitive Church. Jerome, speaking of Polycarp’s Epistle to the Philippians, says: “He wrote to the Philippians a very useful epistle, which to this day is read in the Asian assemblies.” And Eusebius says of Clement’s Epistle to the Corinthians: “It is a great and an admirable one, which he wrote from the Church of the Romans to that of the Corinthians, there being a sedition then at Corinth. And this epistle we know to be read publicly in the Churches (πλείσταις εκκλησίαις) both long ago and also in our time.” We also find councils ordering to the same effect. For instance, the Council of Vaseus (529): “If the presbyter, some infirmity hindering him, cannot preach himself, let the homilies of the holy fathers be read or recited by the deacons.” And still earlier as well as later decrees might be cited.

Finally, as to the degree of assent here given to our Homilies, it is plain that a general assent is affirmed and demanded. In fact, there are semi-authoritative documents, while some of them – the “Homily of Justification” (Homily of Salvation), with, probably, that which precedes it,

and that which follows – must be held of a yet higher authority, being expressly and closely identified with the Eleventh Article. At the same time we are not bound to endorse every statement contained in them. We cannot quote the Apocrypha as of Divine authority; nor need we urge, for the duty of fasting (or the abstinence from flesh and the eating of fish on certain days), the encouragement of our fisheries, and strengthening of our seaports. All that we are called upon to profess concerning them is, that (in the main) they “contain a godly and wholesome doctrine.” And this they do, in their outspoken and unflinching protest against the idolatry of Rome, and their “true setting forth and pure declaring of God’s Word.” While our Reformers, in drawing them up and “judging them to be read in churches,” evinced their tender care for the people; and not only so, but administered a practical and robust reproof to caviling sectaries, who inveighed against any but extempore preaching.

We cannot but add, it were well if these godly and wholesome Homilies were still read instead of the many weak and barren discourses we hear at the present day. True, we boast of the higher education of our clergy; but, alas! It too frequently happens that education may be “high,” without being either solid or practical, or tending to the soul’s health – having no basis on the Word of God. And hence we believe it is that Ritualism and Infidelity have tainted our universities, and consequent laxity of faith and morals prevails amongst our people. One by one have we removed the ancient barriers and landmarks; and who can wonder that the “enemy has come in like a flood?” May the Spirit of the Lord cause his face to shine upon the darkness, and create another Cranmer or Luther, to “lift up a standard against him”!

Article XXXVII.

Civil Magistrates.

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 Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen doth 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 estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evildoers.

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 Angliae regno, ac caeteris ejus dominiis, summam habet potestatem, ad quam omnium statuum linjus regni, sive illi ecclesiastiei sint, sive civiles, in omnibus causis, suprema gubernatio pertinet, et nulli externae jurisdictioni est subjecta, nec esse debet.

Cum Regiae 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 editiae, apertissime testantur: sed eam tantum praerogativam, quam in Sacris Scripturis a Deo ipso, omnibus piis principibus, videmus semper fuisse attributam; hoc est, ut omnes status atque ordines fidei suae a Deo commissos, sive illi ecclesiastiei sint, sive civiles, in officio contineant, et contumaces ac delinquentes gladio civili coerceant.

Romanus pontifex nullum habet jurisdictionem in hoc regno Angliae.

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

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

In examining this Article, we shall confine ourselves to the two main subjects of which it treats – the Royal Supremacy and the Papal Supremacy. The last two clauses of the Article will be more fitly considered under the two concluding Articles.

The Royal Supremacy.

Following here the lead of Dr. Boulton, we shall not drag the student through those portions of civil and ecclesiastical history which treat of the resistance of the Crown to Rome, till the final Settlement of the Supremacy under Elizabeth; nor of the encroachments on that prerogative by the Tudor and Stuart Princes which ended on the accession of William of Orange and Mary to the throne. As our author well says: “The truth seems to be that the

boundaries of the ecclesiastical, as well as the civil power of the Crown were very ill defined. They only became ascertained and limited after the severe struggles which culminated in the civil wars, and were terminated by the Revolution.”

It rather concerns us to know the exact and true meaning of the Royal Supremacy in our own day. And here we cannot do better than quote the concise words of the learned Professor: –

“In the present day the royal supremacy signifies little more than the supremacy of the civil law and courts over ecclesiastical legislation and jurisdiction. Still this general principle is in several respects brought to bear more closely on the Church of England than on other religious bodies within the realm. The latter are free to make any regulations they please for their own internal government, provided they do not contravene the law. The civil power will only interfere with them for purposes of the common peace and order; or when invoked by a member of any such body who alleges that he has suffered wrong by the violation in his case of the laws and regulations of that body. The civil court will then interpose, and compel such a religious body to give to the aggrieved member all the privileges and rights which he enjoys according to the rules under which that body has constituted itself. Striking instances of this have recently occurred in the history of the Free Church of Scotland, and of the Saurin convent case in the Church of Rome. These two ecclesiastical bodies have advanced claims of independence from the State beyond all others. But the civil courts allowed them no exemption from their jurisdiction.

“The position of the Church of England, as established, gives to the civil power yet more control in her case. The Church of England has no power to change any portion of the Liturgy, or Articles, or to modify any existing canon, or to enact a new one. The Liturgy is sanctioned by Act of Parliament, and can be altered by no other authority. The Convocation has no power to deliberate on a new canon without license from the Crown, nor has such canon, when agreed upon, any force without the royal assent. The patronage of bishoprics and benefices, generally, has perhaps not much to do with this subject, inasmuch as there might be patronage in a Church not established, as for instance in the case of Colonial Sees, or trustees of dissenting chapels. But the use of the royal supremacy, which has attracted most attention, and created most discontent in some quarters, is that the final appeal in ecclesiastical causes has been reserved to the Crown ever

since the Reformation. During the papal usurpation the right of appeal lay to the Pope from the bishop's or archbishop's court. Since the declaration of the royal supremacy that appeal has lain not to any ecclesiastical court, but to the Crown. Subsequently to the accession of Elizabeth the Court of High Commission, usually consisting of bishops and ecclesiastical lawyers, exercised this jurisdiction. The Court of High Commission was abolished just before the civil war, and was not restored with Charles II. Its functions as a court of appeal were transferred to the Court of Delegates appointed by the Sovereign. This was abolished in 1833, and a committee of the Privy Council was specially organized to exercise jurisdiction in all cases in which the appeal lies to the Crown. The chief judges of the several courts are members of this Board, and in ecclesiastical cases it is necessary that at least one bishop shall be present.

“It will be observed that whether in the ecclesiastical court, or in the Privy Council, eminent lawyers are the judges. The difference is chiefly one of form. In the Bishop's Court, or that of Arches, the judge sits under the commission of the bishop or archbishop. In the Privy Council all is transacted in the name of the Sovereign; and the final sentence goes forth as the act of the Crown, and not in any ecclesiastical name. It must further be borne in mind that these courts are not legislative. Their province is to interpret the existing law, and that should be deemed the best tribunal which is most competent to investigate and declare the meaning and obligation of the laws” (Dr. Boulton's Exposition).

We here meet one of the most valuable sections of Bishop Browne's treatise on the Articles; and in accordance with our plan, we gladly invite the student's attention to it. Though somewhat lengthy, it will amply repay careful perusal: –

“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 risible 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. 6:1), and had encouraged them to erect private tribunals among themselves, for the decision of disputes, which would inevitably arise. 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 emperor 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. 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.' 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. Moreover, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of bishops and patriarchs was carefully preserved to them. Patriarchs 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, viz., that as a kind of universal bishop, he assembled councils of the ministers of God.

“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 was 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 themselves 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 as 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' (*Lectures on the History of France*, by the Right Hon. Sir James Stephen).

“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 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.’

“The same may be said of much later times. This 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 center; 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 Romish 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 defense from them against the overwhelming power of Constantinople in the East. The kings of distinct 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 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 center, so Christian Europe looked to Rome as its ecclesiastical center. 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 center, 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. 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 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, or of deposing them from their thrones, and releasing their people from their oaths of allegiance – (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).

“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 ever been derived, to the poor and to the oppressed; and by a transference of a power over their consciences from one, whom they at least respected as a Christian prelate, to an avaricious and bloodstained 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 he 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.’

“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 different signification; but rejoiced in any advance of the lay power to preeminence 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.'

"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 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. 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. 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.' '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 His 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.'

"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 Edward 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 Elizabeth, and 'Supreme Governor' substituted in its place. (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 whatever': – Collier, *Church History*.) 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.'

"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 evildoers.'

"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.'

"In the reign of James I, the Convocation agreed on the Canons of 1603. The 2d 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 Canons speak of the laws, as having restored to the crown of this kingdom the *ancient* jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical. The 36th Canon contains three articles, which are subscribed by all ministers at their ordination. The first is, 1. 'That the king's majesty, 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 bath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, 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 (7), 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 Allwise for the government of His own chosen race. How, 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. 13:8–14; 2 Cor. 19:11, etc.); and we may humbly conclude that what was ordained by heavenly wisdom then, cannot be wholly evil now. 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. 8:15, Dan. 2:21, 37; Rom. 13:1–5; 1 Peter 2:13, 17; 1 Tim. 2:1–2, etc.)

“3. Another objection to the precedence 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 Caesar’s household (Phil. 1:13, 4:22). 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 2:10; Jer. 18:7–10; 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’ (Isa. 49:23); 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.

“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 greatest 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' (Bramhall).

"The sovereign 'assumes not the office of teaching or of explaining the doubtful points of the law, nor of preaching or of ministering 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' (Andrews).

"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 last two the majority are Roman Catholics and Presbyterians. This difficulty existed not at the period of the Reformation, but is steadily increasing on us 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.

“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.”

We have thus quoted, and at full length, Bishop Browne on the Royal Supremacy: for these reasons: (1) Because of the great intrinsic value of the article throughout to the student and general reader; and (2) Inasmuch as we have had occasion so frequently to oppose the learned bishop in the course of this Exposition, we are glad to embrace the present opportunity of thus testifying to the value and research of his lordship’s pen on this common and less debatable ground, all-important though it be to loyal Churchmen and Englishmen.

The Papal Supremacy.

One of the most remarkable and unanswerable treatises which have ever appeared on the subject of the Papal Supremacy, is that of “The Pope and the Council, by Janus”; a modern publication, drawn up by Roman Catholics. Though necessarily surveying much of the ground occupied by Barrow, and already in part included in these pages, we venture, notwithstanding some inevitable repetitions, to place a few of its weightier demonstrations before the student.

The great object of the work is to show the obnoxious development of the Primacy into the Papacy – “to give a history of the hypothesis of Papal Infallibility from its first beginnings to the end of the sixteenth century, when it appears in its complete form.” A wide range, masterly handled, but without prolixity.

The following extracts may be sufficient for our purpose: –

“The Verdict of History.

“Some explanation is imperatively needed of the strange phenomenon, that an opinion according to which Christ has made the Pope of the day the one vehicle of His inspirations, the pillar and exclusive organ of Divine truth, without whom the Church is like a body without a soul, deprived of the power of vision, and unable to determine any point of faith – that such an opinion, which is for the future to be a sort of dogmatic Atlas carrying the whole edifice of faith and morals on its shoulders, should have first been certainly ascertained in the year of grace 1869, but is from henceforth to be placed as a primary article of faith at the head of every catechism.

“For thirteen centuries an incomprehensible silence on this fundamental article reigned throughout the whole Church and her literature. None of the ancient confessions of faith, no catechism, none of the patristic writings composed for the instruction of the people, contain a syllable about the Pope, still less any hint that certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him. For the first thousand years of Church history not one single question of doctrine was finally decided by the Pope. The Roman bishops took no part in the commotions which the numerous Gnostic sects, the Montanists and Chiliasts, produced in the early Church, nor can a single dogmatic decree issued by one of them be found during the first four centuries, nor a trace of the existence of any. Even the controversy about Christ kindled by Paul of Samosata, which occupied the whole Eastern Church for a long time, and necessitated the assembling of several Councils, was terminated without the Pope taking any part in it. So again in the chain of controversies and discussions connected with the names of Theodotus, Artemon, Noetus, Sabellius, Beryllus, and Lucian of Antioch, which troubled the whole Church, and extended over nearly one hundred and fifty years, there is no proof that the Roman bishops acted beyond the limits of their own local Church, or accomplished any dogmatic result. The only exception is the dogmatic treatise of the Roman Bishop Dionysius, following a Synod held at Rome, in 262, denouncing and rejecting Sabellianism and the opposite method of expression of Dionysius of Alexandria. This document, if any authority had been ascribed to it, was well fitted in itself to cut short, or rather strangle at its birth, the long Arian disturbance; but it was not known out of Alexandria, and exercised no influence whatever on the later course of the controversy. It is only known from the fragments quoted afterwards by Athanasius.

“In three controversies during this early period the Roman Church took an active part, – the question about Easter, about heretical baptism, and about the penitential discipline. In all three the Popes were unable to carry out their own will and view and practice, and the other Churches maintained their different usage without its leading to any permanent division. Pope Victor’s attempt to compel the Churches of Asia Minor to adopt the Roman usage, by excluding them from his communion, proved a failure. ...

“During all the fourth century Councils alone decided dogmatic questions. If the Bishop of Rome was ever appealed to for a decision, it was

understood that he was desired to call a Synod to decide the point at issue. At the second Ecumenical Council in 381, which decreed the most important definition of faith since the Nicene, by first formulizing the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, the Church of Rome was not represented at all; only the decrees were communicated to it as to other Churches. Two Roman Synods, under Damascus, about 378, did indeed anathematize certain errors without naming their authors; but Pope Siricius (384–398) declined to pronounce on the false doctrine of a bishop (Bonosus) when requested to do so, on the ground that he had no right, and must await the sentence of the bishops of the province, ‘to make it the rule of his own.’ ...

“Often and earnestly as the Popes exhorted separated bishops and Churches to return to communion with Rome, they never appealed to any peculiar authority or exemption from error in the Roman See. ...

“Up to the time of the Isidorian decretals no serious attempt was made anywhere to introduce the neo-Roman theory of Infallibility. The Popes did not dream of laying claim to such a privilege. Their relation to the Church had to be fundamentally revolutionized, and the idea of the Primacy altered, before there could be any room for this doctrine to grow up; after that it developed itself by a sort of logical sequence, but very slowly, being at issue with notorious historical facts.

“The Ancient Constitution of the Church.

“To get a view of the enormous difference in the position and action of the Primacy, as it was in the Roman Empire, and as it became in the later middle ages, it is enough to point out the following facts: –

“(1) The Popes took no part in convoking Councils. All Great Councils, to which bishops came from different countries, were convoked by the Emperors, nor were the Popes ever consulted about it beforehand. If they thought a General Council necessary, they had to petition the Imperial Court, as Innocent did in the matter of St. Chrysostom, and Leo after the Synod of 449 (the ‘Latrocinium ‘ of Ephesus); and then they did not always prevail, as both the Popes just named learnt by experience.

“(2) They were not always allowed to preside, personally or by deputy, at the Great Councils, though no one denied them the first rank in the Church. At Nice, at the two Councils of Ephesus in 431 and 449, and at the Fifth General Council in 553, others presided; only at Chalcedon in 451, and Constantinople in 680, did the Papal legates preside. And it is clear that

the Popes did not claim this as their exclusive right, from the conduct of Leo I in sending his legates to Ephesus, although he knew that the Emperor had named, not him, but the Bishop of Alexandria, to preside.

“(3) Neither the dogmatic nor the disciplinary decisions of these Councils required Papal confirmation, for their force and authority depended on the consent of the Church, as expressed in the Synod, and afterwards in the fact of its being generally received. The confirmation of the Nicene Council by Pope Silvester was afterwards invented at Rome, because facts would not square with the newly devised theory.

“(4) For the first thousand years no Pope ever issued a doctrinal decision intended for and addressed to the whole Church. Their doctrinal pronouncements, if designed to condemn new heresies, were always submitted to a Synod, or were answers to inquiries from one or more bishops. They only became a standard of faith after being read, examined, and approved at an Ecumenical Council.

“(5) The popes possessed none of the three powers which are the proper attributes of sovereignty, neither the legislation, the administrative, nor the judicial. ...

“(6) Nobody thought of getting dispensations from Church laws from the Roman bishops, nor was a single tax or tribute paid to the Roman See, for no court as yet existed. To make laws which could be dispensed for money would have appeared both a folly and a crime. The power of the keys, or of binding and loosing, was universally held to belong to the other bishops just as much as to the Bishop of Rome.

“(7) The Bishops of Rome could exclude neither individuals nor Churches from the Communion of the Church Universal. ...

“(8) For a long time nothing was known in Rome of definite rights bequeathed by Peter to his successors. Nothing but a care for the weal of the Church, and the duty of watching over the observance of the canons, was ascribed to them. ...

“(9) What was afterwards called the Papal system, when first proclaimed in words only, was repudiated with horror by that best and greatest of popes, Gregory the Great. On this theory the Pope has the plenitude of power, all other bishops are only his servants and auxiliaries; from him all power is derived, and he is concurrent ordinary in every diocese. So Gregory understood the title of ‘Ecumenical Patriarch,’ and

would not endure that so ‘wicked and blasphemous a title’ should be given to himself or anyone else.

“(10) There are many national Churches which were never under Rome, and never even had any intercourse by letter with Rome, without this being considered a defect, or causing any difficulty about Church communion. Such an autonomous Church, always independent of Rome, was the most ancient of those founded beyond the limits of the empire, the Armenian, wherein the primate dignity descended for a long time in the family of the national apostle, Gregory the Illuminator. The great Syro-Persian Church in Mesopotamia, and the western part of the kingdom of the Sassanidae, with its thousands of martyrs, was from the first, and always remained, equally free from any influence of Rome. In its records and its rich literature we find no trace of the arm of Rome having reached there. The same holds good of the Ethiopian or Abyssinian Church, which was indeed united to the See of Alexandria, but wherein nothing, except perhaps a distant echo, was heard of the claims of Rome. In the West, the Irish and the ancient British Church remained for centuries autonomous, and under no sort of influence of Rome.

“If we put into a positive form this negative account of the position of the ancient popes, we get the following picture of the organization of the ancient Church: – Without prejudice to its agreement with the Church Universal in all essential points, every Church manages its own affairs with perfect freedom and independence, and maintains its own traditional usages and discipline, all questions not concerning the whole Church, or of primary importance, being settled on the spot. The Church is organized in dioceses, provinces, patriarchates (National Churches were added afterwards in the West), with the Bishop of Rome at the head as first Patriarch, the Centre and Representative of unity, and, as such, the bond between East and West, between the Churches of the Greek and the Latin tongue, the chief watcher and guardian of the as yet very few common laws of the Church – for a long time only the Nicene; but he does not encroach on the rights of patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops. Laws and articles of faith, of universal obligation, are issued only by the whole Church, concentrated and represented at an Ecumenical Council.

“The Teaching of the Fathers.

“What has now become a rule in dogmatic works – to give a separate ‘treatise’ or ‘locus’ to the Pope – came in with Aquinas, the first theologian who made the doctrine of the Pope a formal part of dogmatic theology, i.e., of the Scholastic, and it thus dates from 1274. ...

“And now compare with this the silence of the ancient Church. In the first three centuries St. Irenaeus is the only writer who connects the superiority of the Roman Church with doctrine; but he places this superiority, rightly understood, only in its antiquity, its double apostolical origin, and in the circumstance of the pure tradition being guarded and maintained there through the constant concourse of the faithful from all countries. Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, know nothing of special Papal prerogatives, or of any higher or supreme right of deciding in matters of faith and doctrine. In the writings of the Greek doctors, Eusebius, St. Athanasius, St. Basil the Great, the two Gregories, and St. Epiphanius, there is not one word of any prerogatives of the Roman bishop. The most copious of the Greek Fathers, St. Chrysostom, is wholly silent on the subject, and so are the two Cyrils; equally silent are the Latins, Hilary, Pacian, Zeno, Lucifer, Sulpicius, and St. Ambrose. Even the Roman writer Ursimus (about 440), in defending the Roman view of rebaptism, avoids, or does not venture upon, any appeal to the authority of the Roman Church as final, or even of especial weight!

“St. Augustine has written more on the Church, its unity and authority, than all the other Fathers put together. Yet from all his numerous works, filling ten folios, only one sentence, in one letter, can be quoted, where he says that the principality of the Apostolic chair has always been in Rome – which could, of course, be said then with equal truth of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria. Any reader of his Pastoral Letter to the separated Donatists on the Unity of the Church, must find it inexplicable, on the Jesuit theory, that in these seventy-five chapters there is not a single word on the necessity of communion with Rome as the center of unity. He urges all sorts of arguments to show that the Donatists are bound to return to the Church, but of the Papal chair, as one of them, he knows nothing. So again with the famous *commonitorium* of St. Vincent of Lerius, composed in 434. If the view of Roman infallibility had existed anywhere in the Church at that time, it could not have been possibly passed over in a book exclusively concerned with the question of the means for ascertaining the genuine Christian doctrine. But the author keeps to the three notes of

universality, permanence, and consent, and to the Ecumenical Councils. Even Pope Pelagius I praises St. Augustine for ‘being mindful of the divine doctrine which places the foundation of the Church in the Apostolical *Sees*’ ... This Pope (555–560), then, knows nothing of any exclusive teaching privilege of Rome, but only of the necessity of adhering in disputed questions of faith to the Apostolical *Churches* – Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, as well as Rome.

“Moreover, we have writings or statements about the ranks of the hierarchy in the ancient Church, and the Papal dignity is never named as one of them, or mentioned as anything existing apart in the Church. In the writings of the Areopagite, composed at the end of the fifth century, on the hierarchy, only bishops, presbyters, and deacons are mentioned. In 631, the famous Spanish theologian, Isidore of Seville, describes all the grades of the hierarchy, and divides bishops into four ranks – Patriarchs, Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Bishops. ...

“There is another fact the infallibilist will find it impossible to explain. We have a copious literature on the Christian sects and heresies of the first six centuries – Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, St. Augustine; and later, Leontius and Timotheus have left us accounts of them to the number of eighty, but not a single one is reproached with rejecting the Pope’s authority in matters of faith, while Adrius, e.g., is reproached with denying the episcopate as a grade of the hierarchy. Had the *mot d’ordre* been given for centuries to observe a dead silence on this, in the Ultramontane view, *articulus stantis vel eadentis Ecclesiae*?

“All this is intelligible enough, if we look at the patristic interpretation of the words of Christ to St. Peter. Of all the Fathers who have exegetically explained these passages in the Gospels (Matt. 16:18, John 21:17), *not a single one applies them to the Roman bishops as Peter’s successors*. How many Fathers have busied themselves with these texts! Yet not one of them whose commentaries we possess – Origen, Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustus, Cyril, Theodoret, and those whose interpretations are collected in catenas – has dropped the faintest hint that the primacy of Rome is the consequence of the commission and promise to Peter! Not one of them has explained the rock or foundation on which Christ would build His Church, of the office given to Peter to be transmitted to his successors, but they understood by it either Christ Himself, or Peter’s confession of faith in Christ; often both together. Or else they thought Peter was the

foundation equally with all the other Apostles, the Twelve being together the foundation stones of the Church (Apoc. 21:14). ...

“Everyone knows that the one classical passage of Scripture on which the edifice of Papal Infallibility has been reared is the saying of Christ to St. Peter, ‘I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted confirm thy brethren’ (Luke 22:32). But these words manifestly refer only to Peter personally, to his denial of Christ and his conversion; he is told that he, whose failure of faith would be only of short duration, is to strengthen the other Apostles, whose faith would likewise waver. It is directly against the sense of the passage, which speaks simply of faith, first wavering, and then to be confirmed. In the Messianic dignity of Christ, to find in it a promise of future infallibility to a succession of Popes, just because they hold the office Peter first held in the Roman Church. No single writer to the end of the seventh century dreamt of such an interpretation; all without exception – and there are eighteen of them – explain it simply as a prayer of Christ that His apostle might not wholly succumb, and lose his faith entirely in his approaching trial. The first to find in it a promise of privileges to the Church of Rome was Pope Agatho in 680, when trying to avert the threatened condemnation of his predecessor, Honorius, through whom the Roman Church had lost its boasted privilege of doctrinal purity.

“Now, the Tridentine profession of faith, imposed by oath on the clergy since Pius IV, binds them never to interpret Holy Scripture otherwise than in accord with the unanimous consent of the Fathers – that is, the great Church doctors of the first six centuries, for Gregory the Great, who died in 604, was the last of the Fathers; every bishop and theologian therefore breaks his oath when he interprets the passage in question of a gift of infallibility promised by Christ to the Popes.

“Forgeries.

“At the beginning of the ninth century no change had taken place in the constitution of the Church as we have described it, and especially none as to the authority for deciding matters of faith. When the Frankish bishops came to Leo III, he assured them that, far from setting himself above the Fathers of the Council in 381, who made the additions to the Nicene Creed, he did not venture to put himself on a par with them, and therefore refused to sanction the interpolation of *Filioque* into the Creed.

“But in the middle of that century – about 845 – arose the huge fabrication of the Isidorian decretals, which had results far beyond what its author contemplated, and gradually, but surely, changed the whole constitution and government of the Church. It would be difficult to find in all history a second instance of so successful, and yet so clumsy, a forgery. For three centuries past it has been exposed, yet the principles it introduced and brought into practice have taken such deep root in the soil of the Church, and have so grown into her life, that the exposure of the fraud has produced no result in shaking the dominant system.

“About a hundred pretended decrees of the earliest Popes, together with certain spurious writings of other Church dignitaries and acts of Synods, were then fabricated in the west of Gaul, and eagerly seized upon by Pope Nicholas I at Rome, to be used as genuine documents in support of the new claims put forward by himself and his successors. It is true that the immediate object of the compiler of this forgery was only to protect bishops against their metropolitans and other authorities, so as to secure absolute impunity, and the exclusion of all influence of the secular power. But this end was to be gained through such an immense extension of the Papal power, that, as his principles gradually penetrated the Church, and were followed out into their consequences, she necessarily assumed the form of an absolute monarchy subjected to the arbitrary power of a single individual, and the foundation of the edifice of Papal Infallibility was already laid – first, by the principle that the decrees of every Council require Papal confirmation; secondly, by the assertion that the fulness of power even in matters of faith resides in the Pope alone, who is bishop of the universal Church, while the other bishops are his servants.”

We have thus followed this incomparable work sufficiently far perhaps to sap the foundation of Papal Supremacy and Infallibility; and induce, we hope, the student to become possessed of the volume itself. The price is moderate; and every page bristles with burnished, home-thrust argument.

We need only add that in Elizabeth’s Injunctions, to which the Article refers us for further explanation of the oath of supremacy, we find the following: “Her Majesty forbiddeth all manner of her subjects to give ear or credit to such perverse and malicious persons, which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to notify to her loving subjects, how, by the words of the same oath (viz., of supremacy), it may be collected, the kings or queens of

this realm, possessors of the crown, may challenge authority and power of ministry of divine offices in the Church, wherein her said subjects are much abused by such evil-disposed persons. For certainly her majesty neither doth nor ever will challenge any other authority than that was challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of famous memory, King Henry the Eighth and King Edward the Sixth, which is and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm, that is, under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them,”

Articles XXXVIII and XXXIX.

Civil Rights and Duties.

Article XXXVIII.

Of Christian men's Goods, which are not common. – The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor according to his ability.

De illicita bonorum communicatione. – Facultates et bona Christianorum non sunt communia, quoad jus et possessionem (ut quidam Anabaptistae falso jactant); debet tamen quisque de his quae possidet, pro facultatum ratione, pauperibus eleemosynas benique distribuere.

Article XXXIX.

Of a Christian man's Oath. – As we confess that vain and rash Swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle, so we judge, that Christian Religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

De Jurejurando. – Quemadmodum juramentum vanum et temerarium a Domino nostro Jesu Christo, et Apostolo ejus Jacobo, Christianis hominibus interdictum esse fatemur; ita Christianorum religionem minime prohibere censemus, quiu jubente magistratu, in causa fidei et charitatis, jurare liceat, modo id fiat juxta Prophetae doctrinam in justitia, in judicio, et veritate.

These two Articles, and the two last clauses of the 37th, define some civil rights and duties called in question at the time. But as happily we are now free in a great measure from turbulent and fanatical sectaries in religion, interfering with civil order, it would seem injudicious to extend the limits of this Exposition by any lengthened disquisition. It may be well, however, to offer a few observations.

The following quotations will perhaps sufficiently illustrate the period.

“They (the Anabaptists, etc.) teach that the Christian must possess nothing, must take no oath, must hold no magistracy, must give effect to no judgment, must slay none, must not defend himself, must desert his wife and children, with other portentous precepts” (Luther).

“Some are of opinion that no man for any offence should be put to death. Such in old time were the Manichees and the Donatists, and such in our days be the Anabaptists” (Rogers, *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*).

“In these days the Anabaptists think it is to be a thing most execrable for Christians to take weapons or to go to war.

“The Family of Love also do so condemn all wars, as the time was when they would not bear or wear a weapon: and they write first of themselves, how all their nature is love and peace, and that they are a people peaceable, concordable, amiable, loving, and living peaceably; but all other men in the world besides, they do wage war, kill, and destroy. ...

“Of another mind (that the goods of Christians are common) were the Esseis, the Manichees, the Pelagians, the Apostolicks, and Fratricellians, and are the Anabaptists and Family of Love.

“Among the Familists, none claimeth anything proper to himself for to possess the same to any own-ness or privateness. For no man, etc., can desire to appropriate or challenge anything to himself, either yet to make any private use to himself from the restward; but what is there is free, and is also left free in his upright form. ...

“Some condemn all swearing, as did the Esseis, who deem all swearing as bad as forswearing, and do the Anabaptists, which will not swear, albeit thereby both the glory of God may be much promoted, and the Church of Christ, or commonweal, furthered.

“Others condemn some kind of oaths, and will not swear, though urged by the magistrate, but when themselves think good; so the Papists. No man, say they, ought to take an oath to accuse a Catholic (a Papist) for his religion, and such as by oaths accuse Catholics (that is, Papists) are damned.

“So the Puritans oftentimes either will take no oath at all when it is ministered unto them by authority, if it may turn to the molestation of their brethren, or if they swear (finding their testimony will be hurtful to their cause) they will not deliver their minds after they be sworn.

“Others, having taken the oath, do foully abuse the same, as the Knights of the Post, like the Turkish Seiti and Chagi, who for a ducat will take a thousand false oaths afore the magistrate; as also the Jesuits, who, in swearing (which is little better than forswearing), do *uti scientia*, that is, cunning and equivocations; as also do they who conscionably and religiously keep not their faith; such are the forenamed Papists. For (say they) ‘An oath taken for the furtherance of false religion’ (as they take the profession of all Protestants to be) ‘bindeth not.’ Again, ‘Faith is not to be kept with heretics.’ Which assertion little differeth from the opinion of some Puritans, who teach that promise (or faith) is not to be kept, when (as perhaps by the not erecting of presbyteries in every parish) God’s honour and preaching of His Word is hindered. ...

“Finally, whatsoever princes be (good or bad), if they be women (say some), oaths of allegiance unto them are not to be kept. Their words be these –

“‘First (as well the states of the kingdom as the common people) they ought to remove from honour and authority that monster in nature (so I call woman in the habit of man, yea, a woman against nature reigning above man). Secondly, if any presume to defend that impiety, they ought not to fear, first to pronounce, and then after to execute against them (that is to say against women governors) the sentence of death. If any man be afraid to violate the oath of obedience which they have made to such monsters, let them be most assuredly persuaded that, as the beginning of their oaths proceeding from ignorance was sin, so is the obstinate purpose to keep the same nothing but plain rebellion against God.’

“Last of all, whereas every minister of the word and sacraments at his ordination doth swear to obey his diocesan in all lawful matters, certain gentlemen of the Puritan faction writ thus unto the bishops of the Church of

England, and printed the same, viz., ‘The canon law is utterly void within the realm; and therefore your oath of canonical obedience is of no force, and all your canonical admonitions not worth a rush’” (Idem, *ibid*).

The Quakers, whose founder, George Fox, probably derived his notions from the Dutch mystics, arose in the time of the Commonwealth, and could not therefore have been contemplated by the framers of our Articles. Nevertheless, their earlier extravagances, adopting much of the fanaticism of the Anabaptists, are here clearly condemned, as it were by anticipation. But thanks to the learned and able pen of Robert Barclay, in 1675, wiser counsels prevail, and even Quakerism, the last remnant of the ferment of the Reformation period, has become a somewhat coherent creed.

True we have now and then an echo of the older fanaticism on the part of decaying politicians, but though we pity, we need not fear the departing throes of decrepitude.

War is a necessary evil, and perhaps must be so till the millennium, when “they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore.”

But why not *prepare* for the millennium? The wholesale butchery of armies, among so-called civilized and Christianized nations, is, we hold, the foulest blot on religion.

Too much stress by far is laid on what belligerents take as the Bible authority for war. In the Old Testament, the wars of the Lord were to root out idolatrous nations, and prepare a place for His people; or to “put away evil from Israel”. The New Testament wars, if we may so speak, are outside the pale of Christianity. It was Heathendom, in its naked and unblushing yearning – the Imperial Eagle thirsting for blood. And although a Christian was allowed to be in the legion, he was just there as a member of the empire, and nothing more, save what lessons of obedience, and contentment, and morality he might carry with him.

We are no inert enthusiasts when we say, Why not have an *International Peace Congress*? That would be the first practical step towards “beating our swords into ploughshares.”

Capital Punishment. If Genesis 9:6 is mandatory, then whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man *should* his blood be shed; inasmuch as the command is primeval and universal, and so far distant from all Jewish policy. But if the words are only prophetic – as many pious and learned

divines hold, and we ourselves for several apparently cogent reasons are disposed to conclude – then why not make the murderer work for the benefit of those whom he may have deprived of any temporal benefit; and, peradventure, for the good of his own soul?

A cold-blooded executioner seems almost as bad as an excited murderer, if not indeed more repugnant. Besides, if A deprives B of the bread-winner, why should he not be compelled to become the bread-winner, or work for the good of society at large which he has injured?

Community of Goods, if carried to its full and logical conclusion, would just mean no goods to give or to withhold. The “all things common,” etc., at the outset of Christianity, can scarcely be quoted even as exceptional cases; they were rather, to all intents and purposes, voluntary benefactions, however great or magnificent, for the spread of the Gospel; and stamped as “thine own” of the giver.

Judicial Oaths have the example of Christ. Who swore before Pilate, and are recognized, apart from the Old Testament, in many passages of St. Paul.

THE END