PART IV.
THE CHURCH.
ITS SACRAMENTS AND ITS MINISTERS

19. Of the Church.
20. Of the Authority of the Church.
21. Of the Authority of General Councils.
22. Of Purgatory.
23. Of Ministering in the Congregation.
24. Of Speaking in the Congregation.
25. Of the Sacraments.
26. Of the Unworthiness of Ministers.
27. Of Baptism.
28. Of the Lord's Supper.
29. Of the Wicked Which Eat Not the Body of Christ.
30. Of Both Kinds.
31. Of Christ's One Oblation.
32. Of the Marriage of Priests.
33. Of Excommunicate Persons.
34. Of the Traditions of the Church.

ARTICLE XIX.

Of the Church.	*De Ecclesia.*
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.	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.

Notes on the Text of Article XIX.

The following Latin equivalents may be noted: – 'Congregation', Latin, *coetus*; 'Duly', Latin, *recte*; 'In their living', Latin, *quoad agenda*; 'Matters of faith', *quae credenda sunt*.

The Article remained unchanged in the revision in Elizabeth's reign.

The Seventh Article of the Confession of Augsburg was manifestly the orign of the first clause now before us. 'The Church is a congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly (*recte*) taught, and the Sacraments are rightly administered.'

The Principal Divisions of Article XIX.

1. The word 'visible,' as it is used here necessarily implies the existence of its opposite, 'invisible'. Otherwise the word 'Church', unqualified by an epithet, would have sufficed. Hence the student must consider in accordance with well-arranged Scripture proofs –

A. The nature and privileges of the Church visible.

B. The nature and privileges of the Church invisible.

2. An assertion historically demonstrable is made that certain ancient Churches have erred. The general Scripture mode of dealing with this will be a consideration of the question whether a promise of inerrancy was left by the Saviour to the Church under any definition of that term. And whether, in point of fact, any Church in the New Testament times, and the Roman Church in particular, proved itself inerrant.

The Definition and Notes of the Church Visible.

The early Christian Fathers often urged the name and authority of the Church Catholic against heretics. The thoughtful student will, however, perceive a very important distinction between our position and theirs which may materially affect, not the truth and point of their assertions, but their application to the changed circumstances of the Church. We have arrayed against us the bulk of the Western Church which has overlaid, added to, and corrupted the

ancient Faith, and abandoned the rule of Faith in Scripture. We are severed by almost as serious differences from the varied sections of the Eastern Church. And there have grown up amongst us communities of Christians, differently organized, and often opposing our action, and yet for the most part readily acknowledging the same creeds and doctrinal articles. There is no parallel to this state of things in antiquity. Hence, in many things the voice of antiquity fails practically to teach us. The dictum of some ancient sage and Father of the Church, wise and true in its first application to the Church, as it was, may fail in point or even in truth, if applied to the Church as it is. Ignatius might truly say, [Ep. ad Trall. 3.] speaking of the three orders of bishop, presbyters, and deacons, 'Apart from these there is no Church.' It was doubtless an unquestionable fact in that age. Apart from them there might be Jew, Heathen, or Gnostic, but not the Church. But to take these sayings of old and to force their application dogmatically to a condition of the Church of which the venerable martyr had not the faintest glimpse must surely be unjust to his memory and untrue to the facts.

Bishop Browne on this Article has collected a series of definitions of the Church from the writers of the first four centuries. They will be found to be very closely in accordance with our present Article, and to have little in them that is hierarchical and sacerdotal. But it was not until the great disruption of the Western Church at the Reformation that the question of the true definition of the Church acquired great importance. The claims of the popes, on the one hand, to universal dominion; and of the reforming bodies, on the other, to an independent constitution of their Churches, raised the question of the true nature of the Church.

The technical phrase in use among divines to express the essential qualities which mark the true Church is *Notes of the Church*.

Hence the *Notes of the Church* have been hotly debated between Romish and Protestant controversialists, and again between the Church of England and rival sects.

In the definition before us in the present Article we have the following notes: –

1. The Church is a society of believers.
2. In it the pure word of God is preached.
3. In it the sacraments are duly ministered in all essentials of Christ's institution. The confession of Augsburg in the clause quoted above contains precisely the same definition.

In pursuance of the plan of this work to introduce the student to recognised English theology, in further illustration of this Article we shall refer to the works of three writers who stand in the foremost rank – Bishop Pearson's *Exposition of the Creed*, Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Field's *Of the Church*.

1. As Pearson's great work on the Creed will always be minutely studied, it is not necessary in this place to notice it at much length. The first part of Article IX in that work contains an exposition of the words, 'The Holy Catholic Church'. The general method and results of that exposition may be thus set forth. There is first a full discussion of the use of the word *Church* in the New Testament which is obviously the prime essential in dealing with this subject and ought thoroughly to be mastered. Next the unity of the Church visible is considered and shown (from Acts 2:41, 42, 44, 47) to consist in believing and baptized persons professing the same faith, receiving the same sacraments, performing the same devotions. The following six particulars are noted as belonging to this unity: Christ as the one foundation, the unity of faith, the reception of the same sacraments, the partaking of one hope, the bond of love, the unity of discipline and government through which Christ rules over all. Bishop Pearson does not further define what he deems essential to such unity of government. But the following remark may be permitted. The divisions among Christians, not separated essentially on any of the five previous points, will be

found to lie, not in their repudiation of this last note of unity; but in their opinion as to what is, or is not, essential to the unity of discipline and government under Christ – whether a universal organisation of the whole Church, whether episcopacy or presbytery, or some less organised and uniform constitution. In the midst of the great dissensions which prevail, and which are so great a stumbling-block to many, it is most desirable thus to define and limit the degree in which unity, as defined by this great divine, has been broken.

The holiness of the Church comes next for consideration. Bishop Pearson shows in what respects it may be attributed to the Church, whether considered in its visible aspect, or with respect to those in it who 'are efficaciously called, justified, and sanctified.' But this, not belonging to our present Article, need not be further noticed here.

A dissertation follows on the origin and early uses of the word Catholic; and it is concluded that Catholicity is an attribute of the Church in regard of these four particulars – its *diffusiveness*, as being spread through the whole world; because it holds the *whole* truth; because it requires the obedience of *all* men to *all* its precepts; and lastly, by reason of *all* saving graces being given in it. The studious moderation of this great divine in dealing with a subject round which so much heat of party zeal has gathered cannot escape notice.

II. The third book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* discusses the nature of the Church and how far *Church polity*, as distinguished from *matters of faith and salvation*, is to be found in Scripture. Some portions which seem most directly to illustrate the present Article are here epitomised.

The Church invisible, or mystical body of Christ, is partly in heaven and partly on earth. 'They who are of this society have such marks and notes of distinction from all others as are not objects unto our sense; only unto God who seeth their hearts; unto Him they are clear and manifest.'

The everlasting promises belong to the mystical Church: the duties belong to a visible body. This also is one from the beginning of the world to the end; but the moiety since the coming of Christ is more properly the Church of Christ.

The unity of this body consists in these three things. Its members own one Lord, profess one faith, and are initiated by one baptism.

'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.'

Hooker proceeds further to insist on the importance of distinguishing between the Church visible and invisible, and the manifold errors arising from confusing them. Among other things, he answers the taunting query, where our Church was before Luther, but the consideration that the Church visible may be overlaid with corruptions. This Church is 'divided into a number of distinct societies, every one of which is termed a Church within itself.' A Christian assembly may be called a Church, but *the Church* 'is not an assembly but a society,' and remains when all assemblies are dispersed. The communion its members enjoy consists in the public exercise of such duties as those mentioned in Acts 2:42: 'Instruction, breaking of bread, and prayer.'

In the subsequent sections of this book Hooker passes to the controversy with his Puritan opponent who contended that no form of church polity was lawful unless it were derived from Holy Scripture. This discussion would seem to lie outside our present Article. The question of Episcopacy will arise under Article XXIII, and is therefore omitted for the present.

III. A work second only to Hooker's as in many respects representing English theology on such questions as that before us is that of Field, *Of the Church*. The author was Dean of

Gloucester in the time of James I. From this learned work some selections are here presented which seem most directly to illustrate the Article now before us.

In book i, chap. 10, the distinction between the visible and invisible Church implied in this Article is thus explained. 'Hence it cometh that we say there is a visible and an invisible Church, not meaning to make two distinct Churches, as our adversaries falsely and maliciously charge us, though the form of words may serve to insinuate some such thing, but to distinguish the divers considerations of the same Church; which, though it be visible in respect of the profession of supernatural verities revealed in Christ, use of holy sacraments, order of ministry, and due obedience yielded thereunto, and they discernible that do communicate therein; yet, in respect of those most precious effects, and happy benefits of saving grace, wherein only the elect do communicate, it is invisible; and they that in so happy, gracious, and desirable things have communion among themselves are not discernible from others to whom this fellowship is denied, but are known only to God.'

The second book bears more directly on this Article. It is a discussion of the 'notes of the Church' which Field states, and maintains in opposition to the Roman controversialists, Stapleton and Bellarmine. It is therefore controversially very valuable on this fundamental question.

Book ii, chap. 2: 'The proper and peculiar' notes which absolutely 'distinguish the true Catholic Church' are stated to be these three: –

1. 'The entire profession of those supernatural verities which God hath revealed in Christ His Son.

2. '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.

3 'An union of connection of men in this profession and use of these sacraments, under lawful pastors and guides, appointed, authorised, and sanctified to direct and lead them in the happy ways of eternal salvation.'

Having stated these *notes*, he proceeds in subsequent chapters to examine the objections of Bellarmine and Stapleton to them.

Book ii, chap. 5: We have these five *notes of the Church* propounded by Bellarmine, 'antiquity, succession, unity, universality, and the very name and title of Catholic expressing the universality.' Field proceeds to sow the uncertainty of these, and their failure as true notes of the Church.

We are now in a position to gather together briefly the statements of these writers, and to show their substantial agreement, and the unity of true English theology on the point now before us. Where it is requisite, the order of the *notes*, as arranged by the authors is transposed to bring them all into the same arrangement which is used in the Article.

Notes of the Church.

Article XIX.	Bishop Pearson.
1. A congregation of faithful men, or coetus fidelium. 2. The preaching of the pure Word of God. 3. The due administration of the sacraments.	1. The unity of discipline and government under appointed pastoral guides. 2. The unity of Christ the foundation – the one faith, the one love, the one hope. 3. The reception of the same sacraments.
Hooker	**Field.**
1. 'The Church is ... a visible society.' 2. 'One Lord and faith.' 3. 'One baptism.' 'Instruction, breaking of bread, and prayers.'	1. A union of Christians under lawful pastors. 2. The profession of all the revealed word. 3. The use of the sacraments.

Before leaving the subject it may be needful to observe that by *notes of the* Church is intended not simply things desirable for the completeness of the Church – gifts, graces, organisations, which may be useful, usual, or even apostolical, but, as Field words it, 'notes which are inseparable, perpetual, and absolutely proper and peculiar, which perpetually distinguish the true Catholic Church from all other societies of men, and professions of religion in the world.'

The absence from these notes of any special mode of organising the Church, or apostolical and necessary form of government, must already have struck the attention. It is obvious that such a necessity may lurk unexpressed in the Article under the words 'those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.' It may equally be supposed to lie concealed in the other authorities under the words, 'lawful pastors,' &c. How far this may be so in recognised English theology will be investigated under the Twenty-third and Thirty-sixth Articles.

The last clause of this Article asserts historically the fact that the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, as well as Rome, have erred not only as to the *agenda*, but also the *credenda*. It is obvious why these are selected. Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria were the three great patriarchates recognised in the sixth canon of the Council of Nice. The seventh canon reserves the next place of precedence to the Bishop of Jerusalem. The patriarchate of Constantinople was not recognised until the second General Council. We need not particularly specify the errors of the Church of Rome. And without going back to the controversies of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries in which the Arian, Nestorian, and Monophysite errors in various degrees affected the Oriental Churches, it is well known that they now have many of the corruptions of the Roman Church, such as worship of saints, transubstantiation, and other erroneous doctrines.

ARTICLES XX AND XXXIV.

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 any thing 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 any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

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 Scripturae locum sic exponere potest, ut alteri contradicat. Quare licet Ecclesia sit divinorum librorum testis et conservatrix, attamen ut adversus eos nihil decernere, ita praeter illos nihil credendum de necessitate salutis debet obtrudere.

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 diversity 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 other 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.

De traditionibus Ecclesiasticis.

Traditiones atque caeremonias easdem, non omnino necessarium est esse 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, arguendus est.

Quaelibet Ecclesia particularis, sive nationalis, auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi caeremonias, aut ritus ecclesiasticos, humana tantum auctoritate institutos, modo omnia ad aedificationem fiant.

Notes on the Text of these Articles.

In Article XX we may observe that the Latin equivalent for '*keeper* of *Holy Writ*' is '*conservatrix divinorum librorum*.' The idea of the *keeper* is, therefore, one who *preserves*, not one who *reserves*, the Scriptures.

In Article XXXIV the text calls for no special comment.

The Twentieth Article is identical with the nineteenth of 1552, excepting the first clause ascribing to the Church authority in controversies of faith, which was an addition in Elizabeth's reign. The history of that clause is singularly obscure. It does not exist in the copy of the Articles preserved among the Parker MSS. in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, which bears the autograph signatures of ten prelates. Archbishop Laud was accused of forging it. However, it appears in some, though not in all, of the printed copies in Elizabeth's reign. Laud defended himself by appealing to four editions of the Articles, printed during the reign of Elizabeth and containing the clause. He further produced an attested copy of the Article from the records of the province of Canterbury which also contained it. Those records have since perished in the great fire of London, 1666. It is thus sufficiently proved that the clause, as it stands, was a part of the Twentieth Article as finally ratified in the reign of Elizabeth. The Parker MS. must therefore be, as Strype suggests [Strype's *Parker*, iv. 5.], an early draught, and not the final record of the Thirty-nine Articles.

The question is now scarcely more than one of literary curiosity, inasmuch as the copy of the Articles enforced by the existing Act of Uniformity (that of 1662) contains the clause in question.

With regard to Article XXXIV the text of the former portion, with a slight exception stands as it did in 1552. The last clause on 'particular or national Churches' was added in Elizabeth's reign.

The Principle Divisions of Articles XX and XXXIV.

1. The Church (i.e. each national Church) has power to decree and alter rites and ceremonies.
2. Those ceremonies need not be uniform in different countries.
3. The willful schismatic should be 'rebuked openly'.
4. The Church is a judge in controversies of faith.
5. The legislative and judicial power of the Church is limited by the word of God.
6. The relation of the Church to the Scriptures is that of a 'witness and keeper.'

In dealing with these points out of Scripture, after alleging such individual passages as may seem to bear upon them, the most convincing method will be to point out that the New Testament contains few express rules on Church Polity. It contains, however, many *principles* which are to guide the Church in all its proceedings. It follows, therefore, that the details of its polity must be more or less variable, and must be worked out by the Church in accordance with those principles. This is susceptible of copious illustration from the Epistles.

Observations on these Articles.

These two Articles are thus grouped because the Twentieth speaks of the power of the Church over both ceremonial and doctrine; and the Thirty-fourth deals more explicitly with its power over ceremonial. It follows that the one must illustrate the meaning of the other.

This will immediately appear when the first question arises which meets us on the face of Article XX. What is the Church to which such power is ascribed? It must be the Church visible. But does it mean that whole Church in its Catholic character, and acting in a corporate manner?

If the Article stood alone, this might be maintained with some show of argument. But the Thirty-fourth Article here comes in to clear up the meaning. There we find '*the Church*' used in the title, and in the first part of the Article in the same general and indeterminate manner.

But the latter part claims for every '*National* Church' authority (the same word as in Article XX) 'to ordain, change, and abolish rites or ceremonies of the Church.' It appears, therefore, that *the Church* and a *National Church* are used convertibly in Article XXXIV. Taking the two Articles together it would, therefore, seem to be intended that every duly constituted and orthodox National Church, being an integral portion of the Church visible, has in itself as such the authority spoken of in the two Articles. Or, in other words, that the Church of England in particular claims that authority. As regards rites and ceremonies, the Thirty-fourth Article asserts this in the plainest manner. A little consideration of a few matters of fact will serve to establish that she means in the Twentieth to claim for herself the like authority in matters of doctrine; and that this Article is not the expression of a belief in General Councils or other conceivable utterance of the Church Catholic.

For, in point of fact, the Reformed Church of England has framed these Thirty-nine Articles, and did by Royal Commissioners and in Convocation mould, remould, and modify them. She also requires the assent of her clergy to them, and in her Ecclesiastical Courts exercises full jurisdiction over any divergence from the standard of doctrine so laid down. To this 'authority' in both these Articles she acknowledges only one limitation – the paramount authority of Holy Scripture. These considerations seem to make clear in what sense the word Church is used in these two Articles. It is the Church considered in the free and independent action of its several parts, but held together in practical and essential uniformity by the common bond of allegiance to Holy Scripture.

These Articles as originally intended pointed two ways – against the Romanists who denied the sole authority of Scripture and the competence of a National Church to act for itself, – and also against the Puritans who, in their zeal against some ceremonies retained at the Reformation, denied the authority of the Church to decree anything which was not explicitly or implicitly laid down in Scripture.

The whole of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* may be appealed to as bearing out the last assertion. One passage only shall be quoted which will substantially cover the ground so far taken under this Article. [Book iii. 1.] 'The several societies of Christian men, unto every of which the name of a Church is given, with addition betokening severalty, as the Church of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, England, and so the rest, must be endued with correspondent general properties belonging unto them as they are public Christian societies. And of such properties common unto all societies Christian, it may not be denied that one of the very chiefest is Ecclesiastical Polity.... To our purpose the name of Church-Polity will better serve, because it containeth both government, and also whatsoever besides belongeth to the ordering of the Church in public.'

The student may be reminded that in the first three centuries there was in many respects a considerable degree of provincial variety and independence in the Churches. There were differences in Creeds and Liturgies; differences about Easter and various other matters. In the following centuries the action of the great Councils and of the Patriarchal jurisdictions was exercised strongly in favour of uniformity; and subsequently the papal despotism almost crushed out the local varieties of rite and discipline. The result may tend to show that probably there is more security for purity of faith in variety than in uniformity.

It need scarcely be observed to those who have read the history of the Church of England under the Tudor Sovereigns that the Thirty-fourth Article was very far from acknowledging the liberty of sects to organise themselves. The liberty which was claimed for the English State to organise the English Church was as freely granted to Scotland, Saxony, or Geneva; but more licence than this was not recognised in that age. Accordingly the *open rebuke*, as interpreted by the practice of the Tudors and Stuarts with regard to schismatics, included certain very severe personal results. Happily the Article itself is no warrant for these proceedings, and without difficulty adapts itself to the usage of a more tolerant age.

The relation of the Church to the Scriptures recognised in the latter part of Article XX is one of the great importance, whether considered with reference to the Roman Catholic controversy or to recent discussions among ourselves. Extreme views have been put forth to the following effect. The Church possesses the authentic Catholic tradition, and by this interprets Scripture. A part of this tradition is the authenticity of Holy Scripture, which is therefore received at the hands of the Church and because we believe the Church. Further, private persons may not search Scripture independently of external help. [On this see Goode's *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*, chap. ii.]

We have already dealt with this question under Article VI. But we may observe in addition that the office of the Church in relation to the Scriptures in Article XX will not permit such a comment as the one noticed above. The Church is 'testis et conservatrix' of Holy Scripture. From age to age she has witnessed to each successive generation, 'these are the books which I have received, and these I have sedulously preserved.' The proof of the Canon consists, in fact, chiefly of the witness of members of the Church to the Canonical books and of their reception by the Church from the first ages until now – chiefly, but not only; for heathen and heretic too bear weighty testimony, and are also compelled to be witnesses of Holy Writ.

ARTICLE XXI.

Of the Authority of General Councils	*De auctoritate Conciliorum Generalium.*
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.	Generalia Concilia sine jussu et voluntate Principum congregari non possunt; et ubi convenerint, quia ex 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.

Observations on Article XXI.

The text of the Article remains as it stood in 1552, with the exception of a verbal omission of no great consequence. The Latin and English versions are in close agreement and require no special comment.

The first clause on the legality of assembling General Councils would seem to us to represent a mere matter of fact. A Council must be held in the territory of some State, and must consist of the subjects of some States. It must, therefore, be dependent on the civil laws permitting such meetings and the movements of individual subjects. The clause, however, was really directed against the claim of the Pope to have the power of summoning and dismissing Councils.

In dealing with this subject we shall first follow the guidance of Dr. Barrow in his *Treatise on the Papal Supremacy* for the historical facts as to the summoning General Councils. Then we shall point out the basis on which the popes have founded their claim.

Dr. Barrow [Supposition VI.] thus writes, 'There was 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.'

Dr. Barrow proceeds to establish this by the express statements of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and the other ecclesiastical historians of the fourth and fifth centuries, setting forth the facts as to the actual mode of summoning the first Councils. It will be seen on examining those statements that it is impossible for historical facts to be more clearly ascertained than these are.

Dr. Barrow next shows that the popes themselves, when they desired the settlement of an important point of doctrine or discipline, petitioned the emperors again and again for the assembling of a General Council. Such Councils were generally held in the East. Pope Leo I was exceedingly anxious that one should be held in Italy, and addressed the Emperor Theodosius in these words: 'All the Churches of our parts, all bishops, with groans and tears, do supplicate your grace, that you would command a general synod to be held in Italy.'

This entreaty is not an exceptional instance, but a specimen of the ordinary course of proceeding.

Not only so, but it is next shown that the popes did not preside in the early Councils: St. James presided at Jerusalem; Constantine at Nice; Nectarius and Gregory Nazianzen at Constantinople; Cyril of Alexandria at Ephesus.

At Chalcedon it is said that Pope Leo's legates presided, though Dr. Barrow shows from the record of the transactions that the Emperor's commissioners really controlled and conducted the proceedings.

In the fifth General Council the Patriarch of Constantinople presided; and in the sixth 'the Emperor in each act is expressly said to preside, in person or by his deputies; although Pope Agatho had his legates there.'

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 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.

Some account of these forgeries (especially of the Isidorian decretals) will be found in the ordinary Church histories; but the most complete summary is contained in the recent work entitled *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus.

The next point arising under this Article is to what extent the authority of General Councils is recognised by the Church of England. The student will be reminded that so far [Art. vi.] Holy Scripture has been laid down as the sole rule of faith. The creeds themselves [Art. viii.] are received, not as the definitions of Councils, but as being in accordance with Holy Scritpure. National Churches [Art. xxxiv.] may 'ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies, or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority;' the only restraints and limits assigned to this power being God's word and the condition of edifying. It appears, therefore, that there is scarcely any place left for the superior restraining power of a General Council. Accordingly, the Article before us simply asserts the fallibility of all such Councils, and the actual failure of some in their definitions of Divine truth. It refuses to recognise any authority in their dogmatic decrees apart from that of Holy Scripture from which they must be derived. The ground upon which the fallibility of such Councils is argued is peculiarly important. If admitted, it utterly destroys the theory on which their infallibility has been based. The general argument for their infallibility has been to this effect. Christ left to His Church the promise that 'the gates of hell should not prevail against it.' This is assumed to imply that the Church visible (as a whole) shall be preserved from error in doctrine. It is further assumed that the whole visible Church may be represented in a General Council, and in point of fact has been so represented. From these premises it is deduced that a genuine General Council has the promise of inerrancy from Christ. It must be readily seen how weak every step of the argument is – that the exposition of the text is doubtful – that the possibility of a really General Council has hitherto been a very questionable thing – and that the (so called) General Councils have been summoned in a very arbitrary and partial manner; some of them indeed with the most indecent partisanship. But assuming the supposed fact of the Council being really General, and under the express guidance of the Holy Ghost, its decrees are further assumed to be infallible, whatever may be the individual characters of the members of the Council.

It will be seen from these considerations how entirely the Church of England repudiates the *inherent* authority of the Councils; for she takes into account the characters of the members

composing them, instead of regarding any supposed sacred inspiration of the assembly as a whole.

Thus the Article declares that they 'may err and sometimes have erred,' because 'they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God.'

A question of considerable importance remains. Although the *inherent* authority of the councils has been thus rejected by the Church of England, it may be asked whether she has not acknowledged the validity of some of their decisions. In other words, whether she has not exercised her independent and coordinate authority [Arts. xx and xxxiv.] and decided that the dogmatic decrees of certain Councils are in accordance with the word of God and therefore binding upon herself. To this it must be replied that there is no ecclesiastical formula of the Church of England, now in force, containing such a decision. The first Article of Henry VIII (1536) recognised 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 OEcumenical 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 general 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 mater 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 organisation 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 edition 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 organisation of the Church of England.

It will be manifest from what has been said, that we must look later than those four, for the General Councils which 'have erred in things pertaining to God.' If we include those of the middle ages which have been commonly so styled, there will be no lack of unscriptural doctrine in their decrees. The second Council of Nice decreed the veneration of images; the Papal

Councils (as those of the Lateran and others) sanctioned transubstantiation and other errors condemned by our Church.

For further information on the subject of General Councils reference may be made to Field *Of the Church*. [Book v. 48–53.] According to Bishop Browne, the Greek Church acknowledges eight General Councils including the second Council of Nice, 787, and the fourth of Constantinople, 869. To these the Roman Church has added many more. But the answer of the Patriarch of Constantinople to the pope's invitation to the Vatican Council of 1869 admits only seven General Councils. The Patriarch is reported to have spoken thus: 'According to an OEcumenical Council, the OEcumenical Church and true Catholicity is, and is defined to be, that holy, undefiled body, in which (independently of its material extent) the sum of the pure teaching of the Apostles is held, and the faith of the whole Church on earth, as it was established and thoroughly tried for the first eight centuries after the foundation of the Church, during which period the Fathers both of the East and West, and the seven and only OEcumenical and most holy and inspired Councils speak one and the same heavenly utterance of the Gospel.'

In the midst of this uncertainty about the true constitution, lawful assembly, and validity of the Acts of Councils assuming to be *general*, we may hail with gladness the wisdom of our Church, the most free upon earth as touching things not essentials to the Gospel. The difficulty of the subject is acknowledged in a document of 1536, signed by Archbishop Cranmer and many other bishops and clergy in the name of convocation. [Burnet's *Hist. Reform.*, App. iii. 5.] In this paper Gregory Nazianzen, who had seen more of Synods than most men, is quoted as writing thus: 'I think this, if I should write truly, that all assemblies of bishops should be eschewed; for I have seen a good result of no Synod, but an increase rather than a solution of evils; for love of controversy and ambition overcome reason (think not that I write maliciously).'

ARTICLE XXII.

Of Purgatory.	*De Purgatorio.*
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.	Doctrina Romanensium de purgatorio, de indulgentiis, de veneratione, et adoratione, tum imaginum tum reliquiarum nec non de invocatione sanctorum, res est futilis, inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innititur: immo verbo Dei contradicit.

Notes on the Text of Article XXII.

The following equivalents may be noticed. Romish doctrine, Latin, *Doctrina Romanensium*. Pardons, Latin, *Indulgentiae*. In Chaucer the seller of indulgences is called *the Pardoner*. Worshipping and adoration, Latin, *veneratio*. A fond thing, Latin, *res futilis*. *Fond* in the sense of *foolish* is familiar to every reader of Shakespeare. Vainly invented, Latin, *inaniter conficta*.

The Article of 1552 read 'the doctrine of school authors' instead of 'the Romish doctrine' which was substituted in 1562. The latter phrase is more popularly intelligible.

Observations on Article XXII.

As the *Romish* doctrine is here specifically condemned, it becomes necessary to obtain distinct statements of that doctrine; and this the more, because the celebrated Tract XC played upon this distinction. It urged, first, that doctrine on these subjects which might be shown to be not simply *Romish*, but also prevalent for many ages through the greater part of Christendom and from early times, could not be styled distinctly 'Romish' and might therefore be held; and secondly that doctrines which might differ some shades from the received Romish view were not inconsistent with this Article.

That Tract also argued that by 'the Romish doctrine' is not meant the Tridentine statement because this Article was drawn up before the decree of the Council of Trent. This is true to the letter, whatever it may be in the spirit, for the date of the decree on these subjects in the Council of Trent is December 4, 1563, whilst the word *Romanensium* was placed in this Article in the previous January. The Tract then quotes some of the mythical stories of Purgatory which were rife in the middle ages, and intimates that these, with the abuses connected with them, constitute the '*Romish doctrine*' of purgatory condemned in this Article, and that the Tridentine doctrine is left untouched by it.

It is very important that the theological student should understand the ground taken by the active and conspicuous party in our Church, whose mode of dealing with our formularies has been for some years guided by the principles just described. Nothing but a court of law can decide whether special pleading of this sort might avail on a strictly legal interpretation of the words. But there can be no difficulty in ascertaining whether our Church has or has not wholly cast out, not this or that notion of Purgatory, but the very idea of Purgatory in every shape, from her formularies and her system.

In dealing further with the phrase 'Romish doctrine' in this Article, we shall now assume that we shall find it most fully represented in its binding form in the decrees of the Council of Trent on these grounds. It is true that the particular decree on the matters contained in this Article was passed nearly a year after the word '*Romanensium*' was inserted in it, and that, therefore, the *ipsissima verba* of that decree were not before the writers of our Article.

But it is notorious that if there ever was a Council under Roman influence and reflecting as far as was possible, in the then state of parties, Roman views as distinguished from French, Spanish, or German, the Council of Trent is that one. It was recognised at the time – it has been recognised ever since – as distinctly and truly Romish.

Such writers as Field and others in our Church have always written of the Council of Trent as the great agent in severing the Papal Communion formally and specifically from that which was Catholic and stamping it as Papal and Roman. It cannot be seriously argued that such a Council which had been sitting at intervals for seventeen years when our present Article was written, and had already enacted the larger part of its decrees, was not in the mind of the writers of our present Article when they altered the word '*Scholasticorum*' to '*Romanensium*'. Nor can it be reasonably doubted that when a year later the decree of the Council of Trent on the subjects now under consideration did appear, its statement was recognised as an enunciation of the doctrine already called '*Romish*' in this Article. Further, we must remember that the Thirty-nine Articles have subsequently obtained parliamentary sanction in 1571 and again in 1662 when there can be no question whether or no the word '*Romish*' would be fully understood as implying Tridentine. For these reasons we shall not hesitate in alleging the definitions of Trent as properly describing the '*Romish doctrines*' stigmatised in the Article now before us.

Our task, therefore, will be a simple one. We have merely to cite the portions of the Tridentine decrees bearing on the matters indicated in this Article. We shall then have before us what is unquestionable *Romish doctrine*, and what no one acquainted even moderately with the writings of our Reformers can doubt was meant by them in this place.

1. *Purgatory*.

Our space will not allow us to sketch in any detail the history of this doctrine. It is traced from the fanciful interpretations of Origen in the third century, who thought that *at the day of judgment* there would be a purgatorial fire by which all should be tested. From his time this idea may be followed in numerous varieties of expression in the subsequent Christian writers. In the dark ages monkish visions and legends laid open the strange and ghastly arrangements of a land of purgatory from which Dante afterwards derived the horrible pictures of his great poem. The schoolmen fashioned all this into a system and defined the position, arrangements, and pains of purgatory.

The Council of Trent passed its decree on the subjects named in this Article in the hurry of its final session which the anticipation of the pope's death brought to a hasty conclusion. The decree on Purgatory [Session xxv.] is as follows: – 'Since the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit out of the sacred writings, and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, hath taught in Holy Councils, and lastly in this OEcumenical Synod that there is a Purgatory; and that the souls detained there are aided by the suffrages of the faithful, but most of all by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; this Holy Synod enjoins all bishops diligently to endeavour that the wholesome doctrine of purgatory, handed down by Holy Fathers and Sacred Councils be believed by Christ's faithful, held, taught, and everywhere preached. But let the more difficult and subtle questions, and those which do not conduce to edification and from which often there is no increase of piety, be banished from popular discourses before the uneducated people. Moreover, they should not permit uncertain matters, or those which have the appearance of falsity, to be published or handled. But those which tend to curiosity or superstition, or savour of base gain, let them prohibit, as the scandals and offence of the faithful. Let bishops take care that the suffrages of the living faithful, viz., sacrifices of masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety which have been customably performed by the faithful, for other faithful persons departed, be piously and religiously performed according to the institutions of the Church; and let them take care that the services which are due on behalf of the departed by the foundations of testators or in any other manner be performed, not in a perfunctory way, but diligently and exactly by the priests and ministers of the Church and others who are under obligation to perform this duty.'

It will be observed that though this decree includes the whole belief, yet that it is cautiously worded, and avoids pronouncing on matters on which Romish divines were divided, and on which, when not writing for Protestant readers, they have often written very positively. But it follows from this that the prohibition of our Church is the more absolute against *the whole system* and not against some if its *details*. We may observe that even so acute a controversialist as Bellarmine follows the schoolmen in placing purgatory in the centre of the earth. He describes its four divisions and appeals to visions and appearances in volcanic eruptions in proof of his assertions.

2. *Pardons or Indulgences*.

The history of these may be traced in Ecclesiastical history from the relaxations of penitential discipline in the restoration of offenders to Church communion. These indulgences became more common as the Church was gradually more and more identified with the world after Constantine's days. And when the notion of purgatory became developed, and the limits of Church authority transcended the bounds of the visible, the indulgence found further place for its exercise in abridging purgatorial pains.

The satirist might not unfairly say that the realm of purgatory, which was so absolutely a mediaeval creation, must surely be under the control of its creators. The pains of purgatory, together with Church censures, constitute the *temporal*, as distinguished from the eternal, punishment of sin. Over these temporal penalties the Roman Church claims full and absolute dispensing power. The results of the audacious sale of indulgences in Switzerland and Germany in the sixteenth century will be fresh in the reader's mind. Tetzel and Sampson had no small share in setting Luther and Zwingle free. Yet the Church of Rome was pledged to the system, and the Council of Trent touched it with a light hand in the following decree:

'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 anathematises those who either assert that they are useless or deny that the Church hath the power of granting them; yet in granting them the Council desires moderation to be used in accordance with the old and approved custom in the Church, lest by too great facility ecclesiastical discipline should be weakened. But the Council desiring the abuses to be corrected which have crept into them, and by occasion of which this illustrious name of indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, by this present decree orders in general terms that all base profits for their purchase, whence very many causes of abuses have spread among Christian people, be altogether abolished. But with regard to the rest of the abuses proceeding from ignorance, superstition, irreverence, or any other cause whatever, since they cannot be severally prohibited on account of the multiplicity of corruptions of divers places and provinces, the Council commands each bishop diligently to collect abuses of this sort existing in his own Church and refer them to the first provincial Synod in order that, having been recognised by the opinion of other bishops also, they may forthwith be laid before the Supreme Roman Pontiff by whose authority and prudence such regulations may be made as shall be expedient for the universal Church, so that the gift of sacred indulgences may be dispensed to the faithful in a pious, holy, and incorrupt manner.'

When we remember that there was a very strong party in the Roman Church demanding considerable reforms after the recent scandals of Tetxel and his brethren, and when we further bear in mind that the pope would not suffer any part of his prerogative to be even called in question by the Council, we shall the better understand this vague, ineffectual decree which defines nothing and enacts indefinite reforms of which the pope was to be the final judge.

Practically, the question remains as it did in Luther's day. The open market has been spoiled, but profuse grants of indulgences for visits to certain shrines and localities, and in return for other considerations, are still the opprobrium of the Roman Church, and in the highest degree of the city of Rome itself.

3. *The Veneration of Images and Relics*.

If there are germs of these practices traceable within the first three centuries, they are of the most inoffensive character, and concentrated with the natural affectionate celebrations of martyrs' anniversaries. But in the fourth century the concessions to heathenish customs recommended by Constantine at the Council of Nice rapidly bore fruit. There were still vigorous protests even to the end of the fourth century. Epiphanius, Augustine, and others raised their voice against such corruptions of the faith. But the heathen came in crowds into the Church and brought their heathenism, scarcely disguised, with them. Monasticism in its most fanatical form spread within less than a century over the Church. The history of Martin of Tours, written by a contemporary, presents us with the full ideal of a mediaeval saint within the latter half of the fourth century. Uncleanliness and squalor of person and of dress, strange visions and questionable miracles make the reader hesitate how fairly to apportion the share of responsibility between fanaticism, imposture, and insanity. But, indeed, in our day what reasonable person moderately acquainted with human physiology would expect results of sanity from a brain physically unnourished by proper food, worn out by unnatural vigils, and kept in constant excitement by superstitious notions and the visits of admiring devotees?

The history of Paulinus, a wealthy and learned Roman Gaul in the same half-century illustrates the special subject now before us. His own poems show him to be distinctly a saint worshipper. He placed pictures in his church at Nola, and attributed extraordinary power to the relics of Felix, his patron saint. For further information on the struggle carried on in the Church during this century with regard to the veneration of relics and images, reference may be made to Neander. [*Ecc. Hist.* vol. iii. pp. 386–398 and 448–461.] *Vigilantius and his Times*, by the late Dr. Gilly, is an interesting monograph on the same subject.

During the fifth and sixth centuries the practice in question became almost universal. In the seventh there was a reaction, and the iconoclastic controversy distracted the Eastern Empire. In 784 the second Council of Nice made a decree in favour of the use of images. This decree was received by Rome but rejected by 300 bishops from France, Germany, and Italy at the Council of Frankfort under Charlemagne. From that time, however, the use of pictures and images prevailed more and more.

The Council of Trent dealt with this subject in somewhat general terms. It follows that the testimony of our Church against the *Romish doctrine* becomes more absolutely directed against the whole system, rather than against some supposed Romish excesses or details. The decree is as follows:

'Let them also diligently teach the faithful that the holy bodies of the holy martyrs and of others living with Christ, which were living members of Christ and the temple of the Holy Ghost, and are by Him to be raised to eternal life and glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, for through them many benefits are bestowed upon men by God. So that they are to be altogether condemned, as the Church has long ago condemned and now condemns them, who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of saints, or that these and other sacred monuments are unprofitably honoured by the faithful, or that the memorials of the saints are in vain frequented in order to obtain their aid.

'Moreover, let them teach that the images of Christ, of the God-bearing Virgin, and of other saints are to be had and retained especially in Churches; and that due honour and veneration be paid to them; not that any divinity or power is believed to be in them on account of which they are to be worshipped; or that anything is to be sought from them, or that confidence is to be reposed in the images, as formerly was done by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in idols; but

the honour which is shown to them is referred to the persons whom they represent, so that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ, and venerate the saints whose similitude they bear. This is that which has been sanctioned by the decrees of Councils, and in particular by the second Synod of Nice against those who oppugn images.' The decree then expatiates on the use of pictures and images for purposes of instruction, for keeping the miracles of the saints in mind, and to incite the faithful to pious deeds. Finally it urges the bishops to guard against abuses, e.g. to teach the unlearned that when the Deity is represented, they are not to suppose that a likeness of God can be delineated. Base gain and indecent or unseemly pictures of the saints are prohibited as also licentious festivals in their honour. New images and claims of new miracles are to be approved by the bishop or ultimately by the pope.

Such is the decree of those who would be wiser than God, and attempt to use images for worship, and yet stop short of idolatry. It is obvious to remark that all educated Pagans would give precisely the same account of their use of images, as merely highly honoured symbols of those who, under those memorials, were worshipped. In accordance with the second commandment, the Church of England in this Article prohibits the above plausible *Romish doctrine*, and not merely the popular excesses in the use of images, which are allowed to be flagrant idolatry.

4. *The Invocation of Saints*.

This practice grew up *pari passu* with the use of images, and we may at once quote the decree of the Council of Trent on the subject. 'The saints who reign with Christ offer their prayers to God for men: it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, help and assistance, because of the benefits to be obtained from God through his Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour. There are impious opinions who deny that the saints enjoying eternal felicity in heaven are to be invoked – or who affirm that they do not pray for men; or that to invoke them to pray for us individually is idolatry; or that it is contrary to the word of God and opposed to the honour of Jesus Christ, the One Mediator between God and man; or that it is folly to supplicate verbally or mentally those who reign in heaven.'

Here again the Church of England protests not merely against such frantic excesses as the votaries of the Virgin Mary commit, but against the whole system of invocation of saints. We may note here the distinction by which the scholastic divines evaded the consequence of idolatry in allowing image worship and invocation of saints. In the second Council of Nice, the Greeks asserted that λατρεία was due to none but God himself, whilst τιμητικη προσκύνησις was due to images. Peter Lombard, following this, ascribed Latria to God alone, and asserted that there are two species of Dulia, one of which belongs to every creature, and the other to the human nature of Christ only. Thomas Aquinas called this latter hyperdulia, and ascribed it to the Virgin Mary also. [Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctrine*, § 188.] If anything further need be added, it is that the Church of England has interpreted her own meaning of this Article by the absolute exclusion from her services of every vestige of the practices stigmatised in it. Judicial decisions have further confirmed this, prohibiting so much as a cross upon the communion table, while permitting sculpture for the purpose of architectural ornament. The Homily *against peril of idolatry* ought to be read. It treats the whole subject copiously both from Scripture and history. The second part contains a very complete abstract of the history of the rise and growth of image worship in

the Church. On the Invocation of Saints the second part of the brief Homily *concerning prayer* may be consulted, and on Purgatory and Prayer for the Dead the third part of the same Homily.

Suggestions as to the Scripture Proof of Article XXII.

I. In the very first rank may be placed the *negative* argument from Scripture in dealing with these subjects. When we come to details of ecclesiastical arrangements, and of the administration of the Sacraments, the silence of Scripture proves little simply because they do not come under review. But when such questions as those noted in the present Article are raised, the silence of Scripture is conclusive. It would be simply impossible for the writers of the Epistles to have omitted directions about prayers for the dead, notices of purgatory, and invocation of saints, if these had been any part of their system. No theory of 'economy' or 'reserve' can account for so extraordinary an omission. The Epistles often touch on the state of the departed, and are above measure copious on the subjects and nature of prayer; yet these things are omitted precisely where no Romish divine could avoid giving them the foremost place. The inference is as strong as it is obvious. The student will see that the force of this argument lies not in the mere fact of omission (for many things are omitted in Scripture), but in the peculiar relation of what is omitted to what is mentioned and enjoined. In urging this negative argument, passages may be selected in which the nature of the subject brings out into strong relief the absence of the dogmas controverted here. This argument applies in a very high degree to the modern Roman worship of the Virgin Mary, the extravagances of which will be more or less familiar to the reader. The passages in the New Testament in which she is mentioned are so few as to be easily collected and remembered; and the conclusion to be drawn from them, and yet more from the absolute silence of the Epistles with regard even to her name, is of the most decisive character.

II. The second mode of dealing with these subjects will be to select passages in which the state of the departed, prayer, etc., are spoken in terms absolutely inconsistent with the *Romish doctrines* in question.

III. With regard to image worship, absolute prohibitions of Scripture are not wanting.

IV. The true nature of justification, and the completeness of the satisfaction made by Christ for our sins, may be shown to exclude the notion of purgatory, indulgences, and whatever else belongs to that system.

V. The mediatorial relation of Christ to His Church, and the close communion which the believer enjoys with Him, will exclude secondary mediators.

VI. The passages chiefly alleged by Romanists as favouring their views may be found discussed in Bishop Browne on this Article.

ARTICLES XXIII. AND XXXVI.

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 missos 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 aforenamed 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 Edwardi 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 impium; itaque quicunque juxta ritus illius libri consecrati aut ordinati sunt, ab anno secundo praedicti regis Edwardi, usque ad hoc tempus, aut in posterum juxta eosdem ritus consecrabuntur, aut ordinabuntur, rite atque ordine, atque legitime statuimus esse et fore consecratos et ordinatos.

Notes of the Text of Articles XXIII and XXXVI.

In Article XXIII the following equivalents may be noted. "In the congregation'; Latin *in ecclesia* (as in Article XIX). 'Lawfully called'; Latin, *legitime vocatos*. 'Authority'; Latin, *potestas*.

In Article XXXVI we may note the phrase 'rightly, orderly, and lawfully'; Latin, *rite, atque ordine, atque legitime*.' The word 'rightly', therefore, in this place signifies *correctly in respect of form and manner*.

Article XXIII is identical with the twenty-fourth of 1552. It is partly taken from the Confession of Augsburg which declares [Art. XIV.], 'No one ought to teach publicly in the congregation (ecclesia), or to administer the Sacraments, *nisi rite vocatus*'. Article XXXVI was entirely recast in 1562. It takes the place of Art. XXXV or 1552 which asserted that the second Prayer book of King Edward (*Liber nuperrime traditus, &*c), together with the Ordinal, was in accordance with the Gospel, and to be received by the people.

Observations on Articles XXIII and XXXVI.

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 enquiry 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 espiscopally 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 art 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. [Strype's *Annals*, B. I. c. 7.]

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*. [Vol. ii. p. 293, 2nd ed.] '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 reordain 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.'

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 any one 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 1562 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.

We may now endeavour to describe the position of different parties in relation to the subject before us. The Episcopalian (as such) usually asserts, with the preface to our Ordinal, the historico-ecclesiastical fact of the primitive antiquity of the three orders of the ministry. He also asserts either that he can trace them in the New Testament, or at least that nothing in the New Testament is inconsistent with their early existence. But he can scarcely fail to acknowledge that there no scheme of Church government definitely drawn out in the New Testament; nor any command enforcing any particular form of order or discipline on the Church at large. Many would add to this that such a precept would be inconsistent with the genius of Christianity as a universal religion, flexible and adaptable as regards its outer organisation.

Agreeing in the above general statement, Episcopalians vary much in their deductions and resulting opinions.

I. The most extreme school sees in the historical fact the equivalent of an apostolical precept binding for ever on the Church. It thus refuses to recognise the existence of a church where regular episcopal organisation is not found.

II. The general tone of English divinity as represented from the first by men of different schools has been more moderate than this. It has accepted the historical fact, and grounded upon it a satisfactory confidence in the apostolicity and regularity of the constitution of the English Church. But it has refused to admit anything into the category of the *essentials* of a Christian church which is not positively laid down in the New Testament or derived from it by direct inference. For this moderation the student will have been prepared already by the discussion of the *Notes of the Church* under Article XIX. With these views most of our leading divines have admitted the validity of foreign non-episcopal ordination, some sparingly and grudgingly, others fully and cheerfully.

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: '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.... 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 necessary 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 authorise them.... 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 hath, 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.' The reader who examines this passage in the original will see that it appears to contemplate and defend the case of Beza, ordained by Calvin.

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 [Book III. c. 39.] 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 into 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 indefensible 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*, [Section 39, vii.] 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 anyone 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 [*Divine Rule of Faith*, vol. ii. p. 293, 2nd ed.], 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. For a further copious treatment of this subject, reference may be made to Dean Goode. [*Divine Rule of Faith*, vol. ii. pp. 247–348, 2nd ed.]

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 our recognised divines forsaken for the 'Notes of the Church,' maintained by Bellarmine or other Roman controversialists.

III. Having so far attempted to give the student information on the views of *Succession* which have been held by various members of our Church, we may now add some notice of the varying opinions as to the precise status of the bishop as distinguished from the presbyter.

Omitting minor variations, there have been two principal classes of opinion. First, that of those who hold that the office of a bishop is in itself, and always has been, absolutely distinct from that of the presbyter, and can only be given by the laying on of hands by other bishops, themselves lawfully consecrated. It need scarcely be added that very various consequences are deduced from this opinion by men of different schools, some holding very strong notions of indefectible episcopal grace, and connecting absolutely with such a *succession* the grace of the sacraments and the transmission of the powers of the Christian ministry; others being content to view this as the ordinary organisation of the Church, apostolical in its origin, but like all *positive* institutions, yielding either to necessity, or the higher claims of the *moral* obligation.

The class of opinions which we have placed second has been held by many divines, including (it is asserted) early Fathers and schoolmen, as well as Anglican bishops. This class of opinion regards the primitive bishop as little more than a kind of president among the presbyters, but not of a different order, strictly speaking. It will be seen under Article XXV that among the seven orders reckoned by the Church of Rome as sacraments, the priesthood is the highest, and episcopacy is not named. And it is natural that those who exalt the powers of the priesthood as the official instrument of accomplishing a corporal presence of our Lord in, with, or under, the elements in the Eucharist and, as the depositary of the sacramental power of remitting sin and absolution, may be slow to acknowledge an episcopal virtue and efficacy yet greater than this, saving for the general purposes of government. It is equally natural, on the other hand, that this identification of the episcopal status with that of a presbyter, so far as regards the essential powers of the Christian ministry, should be used by persons desirous of establishing new Christian communities. Accordingly, Wesley, in his later years maintained this view, and in accordance with it gave organisation to the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, and ordination to the Wesleyan ministers in England.

This theory of Church government must not be confused with Presbyterianism. It holds that the Church is governed monarchically by a presbyter set apart for that purpose, and usually and properly (but not necessarily) consecrated by other bishops; though the designation and appointment of an ordained presbyter to that office by the Church will suffice to constitute him bishop. Presbyterianism, on the other hand, treats all presbyters on the same level, and governs the Church in a republican manner by representative bodies of presbyters and lay deputies. For further information on this view of the rightful position of a bishop, together with a copious discussion of authorities, reference may be made to Dean Goode's *Divine Rule of Faith* [*Divine Rule of Faith*,' vol. ii. p. 259, 2nd ed.], also to Field *Of the Church*. [Book III. c. 39, and Book V. c. 27.] A

dissertation by Professor Lightfoot in his recent commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians discusses a branch of the same subject.

A final caution may be added. The distinction is very important between what is irregular and what is invalid. An act may be irregular, and yet may be valid if done. Nay, in some cases of necessity, it may be an absolute duty to act irregularly. Lay baptism is undoubtedly irregular, and yet it is acknowledged to be valid if duly administered as to essentials.

The Three Orders of the Ministry Traced in the New Testament.

Acts. I–V. – The history of the Church is confined to Jerusalem, and the Apostles are the only order of ministers named.

Acts VI. – 'The Seven' are ordained to a distinct office, bearing no name in Scripture, but subsequently identified with the Diaconate.

Acts XVI. 23 – Presbyters are everywhere ordained by Paul and Barnabas.

Acts XV. 6, 22 – Presbyters are spoken of as existing in the Church at Jerusalem, and meeting in council with the apostles.

Acts XX. 17 – There were presbyters (plural) in the Church of Ephesus; the same men are called in v. 28 επίσκοποι.

Acts XXI. 18 – The presbyters of Jerusalem, with St. James, receive St. Paul.

There were therefore, in the Church at Jerusalem, apostles, presbyters, and deacons. And towards the close of the history of the Acts of the Apostles (i.e. about A.D. 58) there was a president, St. James (probably not an apostle, see dissertation in Professor Lightfoot on the Galatians), presbyters, and (we presume) still deacons.

Philippians I. 1 – There were επίσκοποι and deacons at Philippi. Some hold that Epaphroditus, then at Rome, (II. 25) and styled the απόστολος of the Philippians, was (in modern language) their bishop.

1 Tim. III. 1 – The due qualifications of an επίσκοπος.

1 Tim. III. 8 – The qualifications of a deacon.

1 Tim. V. 19 – Timothy may judge the presbyters.

1 Tim. V. 22 – Timothy has the power of ordination.

1 Tim. I. 3 – Timothy is to be watchful over the doctrine of the teachers.

Titus I. 5 – Titus is to ordain presbyters who are called also επίσκοποι in v. 7.

Titus III. 10 – Titus is to reject heretics after due admonition.

It is maintained that the two epistles last named contain the three orders, viz. that of Timothy and Titus corresponding to what has been since named a bishop, presbyters or επίσκοποι, and deacons.

Rev. II. 1, &c. – St. John is directed to write to the 'Angels' of the Seven Churches of Asia. These have been very generally interpreted as the presiding ministers of the Churches, and that not only by Episcopal divines, but by many others, as Beza, Bullinger, Grotius, &c.

ARTICLE XXIV.

Of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth.	*De loquendo in Ecclesia lingua quam populus intelligit.*
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 understanded of the people.	Lingua populo non intellecta, publicas in Ecclesia preces perangere aut Sacramenta administrare, verbo Dei, et primitivae Ecclesiae consuetudini plane repugnat.

Notes on the Text of Article XXIV.

No special comment is needed on either the Latin or English text of the Article. The twenty-fifth Article of 1552 was in the same effect but less strongly worded. 'It is most seemly and most agreeable to the word of God that in the congregation nothing be openly read or spoken in a tongue unknown to the people, the which thing St. Paul did forbid, except some were resent that should declare the same.'

Observation on Article XXIV.

The strangely irrational and unscriptural custom against which this Article protests belongs not only to the Roman Church. Several sections of the Christian Church persist in the use of service-books or of translations of the Scriptures in dialects long obsolete. But the use of Latin in the services of the Roman Church was the occasion of this Article. Little more can be needed than to show how this usage arose.

When the Western Roman Empire was broken up, Latin had superseded the native dialects throughout Italy, Gaul, Spain, and probably Britain, excepting in the more remote and mountainous or less civilized provinces. The Church, therefore, through these regions was a Latin Church. In Italy, Gaul, and Spain the invading barbarians either professed or adopted Christianity and merged their own language in the provincial Latin. Thus, throughout those countries the Church as well as the people continued to use Latin. It is not necessary to go into the question how far the provincial Latin was already a corrupt patois. Hallam [*History of Middle Ages*, chap. ix. Pt. I.] shows that Latin was still spoken in France in the sixth and seventh centuries; faulty in point of grammar but still Latin and intelligible to the people. In the eighth and ninth centuries we read of the 'rustic Roman' and find that vulgar patois of broken Latin prevailed, out of which in course of time modern French arose. In Italy and Spain similar changes and developments of dialects were proceeding. But Hallam says that he does not find any express evidence of a vulgar Italian dialect different from the Latin earlier than the close of the tenth century.

From this sketch it will be manifest that the change of language was so very gradual that it was only by little and little that the Church services became unintelligible to the people. By the time that the new dialects had assumed a definite type and had received some little literary culture, there was not sufficient enlightenment in the people to make them desire vernacular services.

This explanation will not apply to Germany nor to England after the Saxon conquest. In both these countries Teutonic dialects prevailed. But they received Christianity so late, and chiefly through Latin sources, that the Latin service-books were everywhere introduced. The priesthood cherished Latin as the language of books, and of such learning and divinity as they possessed. It was also the instrument of intercourse with Rome and their foreign brethren. It was, therefore, prized as at once a pledge and means of learning, and a matter of ecclesiastical convenience. Subsequently it was found to be too valuable an instrument of ecclesiastical domination to be abandoned by the Church of Rome, even in the face of the fourteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Accordingly the Council of Trent [Session XXII. chap. viii.] decreed that it was 'not expedient that the mass should be everywhere celebrated in the vernacular tongue.' The mode of defending this practice usually employed by Romanist writers appear to be of the following nature: 1. The canon of the mass is peculiarly sacred and perfect, and translations would naturally vary and risk imperfections which might vitiate the whole. 2. Priests could only officiate in their own country if accustomed to the vernacular only. 3. The mass is a sacrifice, a thing done, which the worshipper is to contemplate and adore with all the powers of his heart. The words used do not, therefore, concern him. 4. In fact, the priest utters the canon of the mass in a low voice *to God*, and not to the people. Hence the language used is to them a matter of no consequence. It is, however, customary now in England, and probably in other countries of similar enlightenment, to place in the hands of the people vernacular books of devotion, explaining the nature of the services and containing translations of some portions of them, and meditations and prayers in harmony with other parts.

It will be scarcely needful to point out that the Scriptural made of dealing with the subject of this Article may be thus classified: –

I. Direct Scripture examples.
II. The nature of prayer, and its true requisites.
III. Direct Scripture precepts.

ARTICLE XXV.

Of the Sacraments.

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

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

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

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

De Sacramentis.

Sacramenta, a Christo instituta, non tantum sunt 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 circumferentur, 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.

Notes on the Text of Article XXV.

The following equivalents may be noted: 'Badges or tokens,' Latin, *notae*; 'effectual signs,' Latin, *efficacia signa*; 'penance,' Latin, *poenitentia*; 'nature,' Latin, *rationem* as in Article IX &c. 'Quicken,' Latin, *excitat*; not applied, therefore, to the *first* quickening or bring to life.

'Duly,' Latin, *rite*, not *recte*: – that is in due *manner* and order as opposed to gazing upon them, &c. 'In such only,' Latin, *in his duntaxat*.

The word *Sacrament* not being found in the Scripture, and being of Latin origin, owes its theological meaning to ecclesiastical writers. It is disputed whether this use arose from *sacramentum* in its sense of a military oath, or of a thing sacred. The word was very loosely used by early Christian writers, instances of which may be seen in Bingham. [Antiq. xii. i. 4.]

There is a very clear explanation of this absence of precision in the use of the word in the Homily on Common Prayer and the sacraments: 'In a general acceptation the name of a sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby a holy thing is signified. In which understanding of the word, the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five, common of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven sacraments; but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby to repute them as sacraments, in the same signification that the two forenamed sacraments are.' The Homily proceeds to refer to passages in St. Augustine speaking expressly of the sacraments of the Gospel as only two in number. The Homily moderately says of other things that 'no man ought to take them for sacraments, in such signification and meaning as the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are.' The danger of confusing ideas in the popular mind by using the same name for religious ceremonies of different origin and degrees of obligation is obvious.

For this reason our Church has avoided giving the name of sacrament to any ordinance excepting the two instituted by Christ. The Homily has noticed the absence of precision in the early use of the word. It is in the Catechism that our Church gives the definition of the word sacrament.

'*Q*. How many sacraments has Christ ordained in His Church?

'*A*. Two only as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

'*Q*. What meanest thou by this word sacrament?

'*A*. I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we may receive the same, and a pledge to secure us thereof.'

According to these statements there are three essential constituents of a sacrament, which are these: –

1. It has an outward sign.
2. It has an inward grace of which it is the pledge and means.
3. It was ordained by Christ.

The Article gives no definition, but its statements are in perfect harmony with that obtained from the Catechism, and presupposes the above three essential parts of a sacrament.

The effect of the above definition is not only positive, but also negative and exclusive; for by necessary consequence it denies the name of *sacrament* to every rite excepting the two. This is obviously the safer course, as tending to perspicuity, and excluding the confusion of ideas which follows on the confusion of terms.

The corresponding Article of 1552 (the Twenty-sixth) differed considerably from the present form. It ran thus: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit together a company of new people with sacraments, most few in number, most easy to be kept, most excellent in signification, as is Baptism and the Lord's Supper. 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 and operation, and yet not that of the work wrought, as some men speak, which word, as it is strange, and unknown to Holy Scripture, so it engendereth no godly, but a very superstitious sense. But they that receive the sacraments unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith.' To this is appended what is now the first clause of the Article, and which is, therefore, not transcribed here.

There are sufficient verbal coincidences between this Article and the Thirteenth of the Augsburg Confession to prove that the latter formula was before the compilers of our Articles but not sufficient to justify an assertion of the one being to any great extent taken from the other. For instance, we have the expressions *notae professionis – signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos – proposita ad excitandum et confirmandum fidem* – which are common with slight differences to both documents.

The Five Rejected Romish Sacraments

That the word *sacrament* was loosely used in the early ages has been seen. It is said that Peter Lombard in the twelfth century was the first who precisely enumerated the mystic number of seven sacraments. His *Book of Sentences* was a text book in theology until the Reformation, and his enumeration became regarded as Catholic. [See Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*; Clark's edit., § 189. Also Hey on this Article.]

It is a material point for consideration whether in our difference with the Church of Rome on this subject we are contending about words or facts and doctrines. The following passage will illustrate this. [*Council of Trent*. Session vii. Canon i.]

'If any one shall say that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; or are more or fewer than seven, viz.: Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony; or that any of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament; let him be anathema.' Here it is plain that the third note of a sacrament in our own definition, Institution by Christ, is claimed for the five in question. The other two notes in our definition are contained in this extract from the Catechism of the Council of Trent. [Pt. ii. chap. i. Q. 3.] 'A sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, instituted for our justification.'

This makes it abundantly clear that we are not engaged in a strife of words, but that, meaning the same thing, the Church of Rome asserts that there are seven sacraments; the Church of England asserts that there are '*two only*.'

To one who admits the supremacy of Holy Scripture and is even moderately acquainted with what is genuine in Christian antiquity, it will suffice in justification of our Article to state plainly what the Romish Teachers are able to allege in support of their theory of seven sacraments. For this purpose the Catechism of the Council of Trent is taken in which clear, simple, and absolute statements of doctrine for the instruction of the people are everywhere to be found.

In order to understand what follows, the definition [Ibid. Q. 10.] must be first considered. There it is explained that the outer or '*sensible thing*' in the sacrament 'consists of two things, one of which has the nature of *matter*, and is called *the Element*: the other has the force of *form*, and is designated by a common appellation, *the word*.' It will be seen, therefore, that to bear out its own definitions, the Catechism is constrained to discover an Institution by Christ of *matter* and *form of words* for each sacrament. How boldly but hopelessly it labours at such a task, even with the aid of the forged decretals, [See under Article XXI above.] will be seen in the sequel.

The five Romish sacraments are taken in the order in which they occur in our Article.

I. Confirmation.

Q. 6. 'Pastors must explain that not only was it instituted by Christ our Lord; but that by Him were also ordained, [*Catechism of Trent*, Pt. ii. chap. iii.] as St. Fabian, pontiff of Rome, testifieth, the rite of Chrism, ad the words which the Catholic Church uses in its administration.'

Q. 7. The '*matter*' of this sacrament is defined to be '*the Chrism*, or that ointment only which is compounded of oil and balsam, with the solemn consecration of the bishop.' It is further asserted that this is 'handed down to us by St. Dionysius and by many other Fathers of the gravest authority, particularly by Pope Fabian who testifies that the Apostles received the composition of chrism from our Lord and transmitted it to us.'

Q. 11. The *form* in this sacrament is said to be as follows. 'I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' According to the exigencies of the Tridentine definition, it ought to be proved that Christ appointed these words. Unable to advance anything on this head beyond what was alleged under Question 6, the point is thus evaded. *Q*. 12. 'Were we even unable to prove by reason that this is the true and absolute form of this sacrament, the authority of the Catholic Church, under whose mastership we have always been thus taught, suffers us not to entertain the least doubt on the subject.'

II. Penance.

[Ibid. chap. v.]

Q. 10. 'Christ the Lord was pleased to give it a place among the sacraments.'

Q. 13. 'Penance differs from the other sacraments principally in this, that the *matter* of the others is some production of nature or art, but the "*quaisi materia*" of the sacrament of Penance consists, as has been defined by the Council of Trent, of the acts of the penitent, that is of contrition, confession, and satisfaction.'

Q. 14. 'The *form* is, *I absolve thee* as not only may be inferred from these words, *Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven*; but as we have also learned from the same doctrine of Christ our Lord, handed down to us by apostolic tradition.'

III. Extreme Unction.

[*Trent Catechism*, Pt. ii. chap. vi.]

Q. 2. 'Of all the other sacred unctions prescribed by our Lord and Saviour to His Church, this is the last to be administered.'

Q. 3. 'That extreme unction possesses the true nature of a sacrament can be clearly established from the words in which the Apostle St. James has promulgated the law of this sacrament. [Ibid. chap. vii.]

Q. 5. 'The *matter* is oil consecrated by the bishop, that is to say, oil of olive berries, and not that expressed from any rich or fatty matter.'

Q. 6. 'The form of this sacrament is the word and that solemn prayer used by the priest at each anointing: *By this holy unction may God indulge thee, whatever sins thou hast committed by sight, smell, touch,' &c*.

Q. 8. 'It having been shown that extreme unction is truly and properly to be numbered among the sacraments, it also follows that it derives its institution from Christ out Lord, having been subsequently proposed and promulgated to the faithful by the Apostle St. James.'

IV. Orders.

[Ibid. chap. vii.]

Q. 9. 'Comprising as the ministry does, many gradations and various functions, and disposed as all these gradations and functions are, with regularity, it is appropriately and suitably called the sacrament of *Order*.'

Q. 10. 'The bishop, handing to him, who is being ordained priest, a cup containing wine and water, and a paten with bread, says: *Receive the power of offering sacrifice &c. &c;* by which words the Church hath always taught that, whilst the matter is presented, the power of consecrating this Eucharist is conferred.' There is not, either in the Canons or Catechism of Trent, any more exact definition of the *institution*, *matter*, or *form* of this rite.

Q. 12. 'According to the uniform tradition of the Catholic Church, the number of these orders are seven; and they are called porter, reader, exorcist, acolyte, sub-deacon, deacon, priest. ...of these some are greater which are also called holy, some lesser, called minor orders. The greater, or holy, are sub-deaconship, deaconship, and priesthood; the lesser orders are porter, reader, exorcist, and acolyte.'

It will be observed that the episcopate is not reckoned as a separate order. *Q*. 25 speaks of it as a priesthood having a different degree of dignity and power. [See Article XXIII.]

V. Matrimony.

[*Trent Catechism*, Pt. ii. chap. viii.]

Q. 15. Asserts that Matrimony received the dignity of a sacrament from Christ.

Q. 16. Asserts that Matrimony is a sacrament because the words (Eph. 5:32) *sacramentum hoc magnum est* are the Latin rendering of the Greek το μυστήριον τουτο μέγα εστί.

Neither the Catechism nor the Canons of Trent explain the *institution*, *form*, or *matter* of Matrimony considered as a sacrament. As it will be an instructive example to the student, we follow this somewhat further to illustrate the *force* of assumption and assertion with which Romish Theologians *break their way* through difficulties of this nature.

Few theological works have a more extensive use and authority in Romanist Colleges for the education of priests than the *Theologia Moralis et Dogmatica* of Peter Dens. In the '*Tractatus de Matrimonio*' N. 26 we are told, 'so far as Matrimony is a sacrament, it was instituted by Christ our Lord, as the Council of Trent hath laid down, but when this was does not appear certain.' Different opinions are then given. Some say this was done at the marriage in Cana; some, when Christ said 'What God hath joined together let no man put asunder;' some, that it must have been done during the forty days after the resurrection; some, that the time is uncertain, and that the time of the institution of Baptism is equally uncertain.

N. 28. The proof that Matrimony is a sacrament is thus arranged. 1. By the decrees of the Councils of Trent and Florence. 2. From tradition and prescription. 3. From Eph. 5:32.

N. 30 treats of the matter and form of the sacrament of Matrimony. This is said to depend on the question, Who is the minister of this sacrament? Some say that the contracting parties themselves are the actual ministers. Those who maintain this opinion are not agreed, but they most commonly hold the signs of consent, by which the parties mutually surrender to each other the right over their own body, to constitute the *matter*, and the words of such surrender to be the *form*.

The more approved opinion seems to make the *priest* the minister of this sacrament. According to this opinion the *matter* is the matrimonial contract of surrender of bodily rights to

each other, and the *form* is the sentence of the priest, *I join you in matrimony in the name of the Father, &c*.

It is no exaggeration thus to sum up this treatment of the subject. Marriage is a sacrament because it has been so defined by Councils and long received. Therefore Christ must have instituted it, though when He did so cannot be shown. Therefore, also, He must have instituted both *matter* and *form*, although both are so uncertain that the Council of Trent did not venture to define them.

It is important to add another mediaeval theory of the effect of some sacraments, inasmuch as it has left some traces on our own usages. Three of the sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders, have been said to impress on the soul what is called '*a character*'. The Catechism of the Council of Trent explains this to mean 'a certain distinctive mark impressed on the soul, which inhering perpetually can never be blotted out.' This is a necessary part of a system which holds that sacraments contain and give grace *ex opere operato* when dealing with those which from their nature cannot be repeated. The distinction between this and the earlier statements on the subject is clearly given by Bingham. [*Antiq*. b. iv. chap. vii. 8.]

The Efficacy of the Sacraments.

It will suffice here to note the two assertions made by this Article on the efficacy of the two sacraments:

1. They are not bare 'tokens,' but are effectual signs (*efficacia signa*) of grace through which God works.

2. This is not to be taken absolutely and invariably (*ex opere operato*), but is conditional on the worthy receiving. 'In such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation.'

As these two statements will accompany us in the separate treatment of the two sacraments, it is only necessary here to call the student's attention to the preliminary fact that our Church asserts the necessity of 'the worthy reception' to the 'wholesome effect' of both sacraments equally. This must, therefore, be understood as underlying and qualifying the subsequent statements about Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The doctrine of our Church will be sufficiently illustrated for our present purpose by contrasting the Tridentine statements with those of the illustrious Hooker. [Council of Trent. Sess. vii. De Sacramento.]

Canon 6. 'If any one shall say that the sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they *signify*, or do not confer the grace itself on those not placing a bar (*non ponentibus obicem*) &c., let him be anathema.'

Canon 8. 'If any one shall say that grace is not conferred by these sacraments of the New Law, *ex opere operato*, but that faith in the Divine promise alone suffices to obtain grace, let him be anathema.'

It may be observed that the idea of sacraments *containing* grace and *conveying* grace involves a philosophical or metaphysical theory. According to this, grace is a sort of spiritual substantiality capable of this kind of residence in matter, and of a transfer into the soul apart from the soul's own action or consciousness. Thus when the body is in contact with the sacramental matter, the grace contained is conveyed into the soul. This is really a product of the scholastic subtleties of the middle ages.

The following passage from Hooker [*Ecc. Pol.* v. 57.] will fully illustrate this Article, and is a true type of the English doctrine:

'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 hereby both be understood that sacraments are necessary, and that the manner of their necessity 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 sacrament 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 .... Sacraments serve as the instrument of God to that end and purpose; moral instruments, the use whereof is in our 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.'

It may excite some surprise that a practice, obviously possible with regard to one of the sacraments only, should be referred to both. 'The sacraments' (not the elements of the Lord's Supper only) 'were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about.'

There was undoubtedly a reason for this form of expression. Carelessness of diction finds no place in the Articles. That reason seems to be an intention more emphatically to deny the superstitious practices in question. The two sacraments are treated in this Article precisely on the same footing. They are spoken of, not in respect of their essential differences, but in respect of their essential similarities, by virtue of which they are properly sacraments, and by virtue of which grace is received 'by or with' both of them on precisely the same terms. Hence if the water in baptism is not to be carried about and elevated, neither are the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. The only purpose of the elements in either sacrament is 'that we should duly use them.' Thus the use of the plural word 'sacraments' illustrates and enforces, more strongly than the singular number would, the denial of a practice which in fact has only been carried out with regard to the Eucharistic elements.

ARTICLE XXVI.

Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinder not the Effect of the Sacrament.

Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in 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 he 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 visibili, bonis mali semper sunt admixti, atque interdum ministerio verbi et Sacramentorum administrationi praesint; tamen cum non suo, sed Christi nomine agant, ejusque mandato et auctoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in verbo Dei audiendo, tum in Sacramentis percipiendis. Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipiunt, 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 judicio deponantur.

Notes on the Text of Article XXVI.

The comparison of the Latin with the English suggests scarcely any illustrative matter. The student will, however, note that the Latin for 'rightly' is *rite*, which will refer to the essentials of *administration*, the manner of *reception* being qualified by the word *fide*, 'by faith'.

It will be also observed that the distinction between the Church visible and invisible is implied in the wording of this Article as well as in the Nineteenth.

The Eighth Article of the Confession of Augsburg was evidently before the compilers of the present Article. It remains, with only a verbal change, as it stood in the formulary of King Edward.

Observations on Article XXVI.

In the parallel Article of the Augsburg Confession the Donatists *et similes* are condemned as having deemed the ministration of evil ministers ineffectual. But this Article no doubt chiefly regarded some of the Anabaptists of the day who held extreme views on this point. But in addition to this the reformed Church of England had special difficulties in this respect. The

changes introduced into doctrine in the days of Edward and Elizabeth were ostensibly accepted by the mass of the existing clergy. The consequence was that the reformed ritual was performed in the first instance by men, the majority of whom were Romanists at heart, and too many of whom were grossly ignorant or even immoral.

This may be freely illustrated from any history of the English Reformation, and, indeed, is scarcely denied by any one. Protestants of earnest convictions, little open to consider and allow for the political or ecclesiastical exigencies from which such a state of the Church resulted, often gave vent to strong manifestations of their abhorrence of the ministrations of such persons.

This revulsion, perhaps more than anything else, prepared the ground in which the seeds of the Puritan schism flourished so luxuriantly. To this was added in Elizabeth's reign the unhappy objection raised by a section of the English Reformers to the cap and surplice, and a few of the minor ceremonies of the Prayer Book. In the conflict with the royal supremacy administered through the bishops which followed, not a few clergymen of piety, learning, and great personal influence were silenced for nonconformity in these respects. The scandal was great in the eyes of many to find the law depriving them of the ministers they trusted, and commanding them to attend the Parish Church, served perhaps by a man who had conformed to every change of Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, and whose morals and learning they equally held cheap. The Zurich Letters, published by the Parker Society, or the lives of Archbishops Parker and Grindal, will fully illustrate the intensity of this feeling. [See *Examination of Certain Londoners.* Grindal's *Remains*. Parker Soc.] To such feelings the present Article might offer an answer theoretically and theologically true; but it could not control those instincts and sympathies which really govern the majority of mankind in such matters.

All who are in earnest about religion know that the life of the pastor setting forth the life of Christ which he preaches is the most eloquent and persuasive illustration of the truth. And comparatively few of such persons have been held in allegiance to the Church when the appointed minister has stood in discreditable contrast to a less regularly appointed rival simply on account of a theological truth such as the one before us.

Practically speaking, therefore, it would appear that while on the one hand this Article maintains a doctrine of great importance, namely: that the efficacy of Christ's ordinances flows directly from the Lord Himself through His Spirit – yet, on the other hand, no Church can long maintain the loyalty and affection of its members excepting by the personal character and influence of an enlightened and pious clergy.

On another matter of vast importance this Article is altogether silent. God may honour His own sacraments and word in spite of man's guilt; but it is contrary to reason, to experience, to history, to Scripture, to suppose that an ungodly, still less a vicious, ministry can issue in anything but an ungodly and corrupt state of the people. No conspicuous work of grace has shown itself apart from a faithful, devoted, prayerful administration of the word and ordinances of Christ.

One other subject is usually treated under this Article: '*the Roman doctrine of Intention*.' The Council of Trent [Sess. vii. De Sac. Canon xii.] agrees with us that a minister living in sin may confer a valid sacrament. But it requires (Canon II.) 'the intention,' on the part of the administrator, '*to do that which the Church does*.' The student desirous of further information on the meaning of this may find what the priests of the Roman Church are actually taught on the subject in *Dens' Theology*. [*De Sacramentis*, N. 39, 40, 41, 43.] It appears from the elaborate classification there made of different kinds of *intention*, that it implies of necessity an *act of the will* on the part of the minister to do what the Church requires. Minor acts of mental

carelessness, forgetfulness, and wandering during the service will not invalidate the sacrament; but a mere habitual state of the will which *could be*, but *is not*, aroused to intend the administration at the time will not suffice. It must follow *a fortiori* that the administration by an infidel priest who in his heart rejects the whole sacramental doctrine must be absolutely invalid. Those who know from history what the state of the Roman clergy has been at some periods will see what disastrous consequences must follow from such a theory to those who rely for the perpetuation of the Church on the valid administration of the sacraments.

All these extreme views on either hand disappear before the true Scriptural ground maintained by the Church of England. Christ is received, whether in His word, or through His sacraments, *by faith* [Arts. XXVI, XXVII.] – the faith *of the recipient*. Christ, therefore, cannot be debarred from '*coming* to him' (John 14:23) by the neglect, wickedness, or unbelief of any other, whether official of the Church or not. Nothing can keep Christ from the heart but *our own* impenitence and unbelief.

Finally, Hooker remarks that 'what every man's private mind is, we cannot know, and are not bound to examine, therefore always in these cases the known intent of the Church generally doth suffice; and where the contrary is not manifest, we may presume that he which outwardly doth the work hath inwardly the purpose of the Church of God.' [*Ecc. Pol.* v. 58.]

ARTICLE XXVII.

Of Baptism.	*De Baptismo.*
Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened: but 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 Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.	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 baptismum suscipientes, Ecclesiae inseruntur, promissiones de remissione peccatorum, atque adoptione nostra in filios Dei per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et vi divinae invocationis gratia augetur. Baptismus parvulorum omnino in Ecclesia retinendus est, ut qui cum Christi institutione optime congruat.

Notes on the Text of Article XXVII.

In comparing the Latin with the English we may observe these equivalents: – (1) As by an instrument: Latin, *tanquam per instrumentum*. Some have given the legal meaning of *title-deed* to the word *instrument*, but the metaphor used requires that of a *grafting-tool*. (2) 'They that

receive baptism rightly': Latin *recte*, not 'rite,' for *ritual* defect (if not touching the essence of the Sacrament) does not invalidate it. Lay and other irregular baptisms are admitted to be valid.

Omitting one or two verbal changes, the present Article is distinguished from the 28th of 1552 by containing a stronger statement on the subject of Infant Baptism. For in King Edward's Article it was simply asserted that 'the custom of the Church to christen young children is to be commended, and in any wise to be retained in the Church.'

In the wording of this Article our Reformers seem to have borrowed little or nothing from other sources. [Hardwick, *History of the Arts*., p. 393.]

The Roman Doctrine of Baptism.

The Roman doctrine as to the spiritual result of the Sacrament of Baptism has already received some elucidation under Article IX on Original Sin. For the most distinct and perhaps the most authoritative doctrinal statements we may further refer to the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*. [Part II. chap. ii.] The ordinary administration of this Sacrament has been loaded by the Roman Church with many ceremonies; but it holds the simplest possible form to be *valid*, and encourages 'all from among the laity, whether men or women,' and 'even Jews, infidels, and heretics,' in case of necessity, to baptize. [Question xxiii.] This laxity seems to arise of necessity from the extreme view held as to the importance of this Sacrament. The faithful are to be taught [Question xxx.] that 'unless they be regenerated unto God through the grace of Baptism, whether their parents be Christian or infidel, they are born to eternal misery and perdition.' Further [Question xxxiii.], 'No other means of salvation remains for infant children except Baptism.' This will explain the otherwise unintelligible anxiety of zealous Roman missionaries to baptize (even surreptitiously) the infant children of heathen parents, where there is no prospect of an opportunity of imparting subsequent Christian instruction. [To this must also be referred a most revolting chapter of Dens, *Theologia Moralis et Dogmatica*, a work much used, and of high authority in training the Roman priesthood; *Tractatus de Baptismo*, 23, 24, 25; *An infantes baptizentur in utero materno*; *De sectione Caesarea*; *De foetu abortivo*.]

The degree of suffering to be endured by infants dying unbaptized is much disputed, but 'parents may be consoled by the assurance that it is not certain that they endure the penalty of fire, but that it is certain that their penalty will be the lightest of all.' [Dens, *Theol. Tract. de quatuor novissimis*, 19.]

The chief effects of Baptism are defined [*Catec. Trent*, Part II, chap. ii. Q. 41–57.] thus: 'Sin is remitted and pardoned, whether originally contracted from our first parents or actually committed by ourselves, however great its enormity' – 'The remaining concupiscence or innate predisposition to sin does not really possess the nature of sin' – 'Why a state of uncorrupt nature is not straightway restored by Baptism' is said to be 'because we are not to be more honoured than Christ, our Head, who did not lay aside the fragility of human nature,' and because what we have to struggle with gives us 'the germs and materials of virtue, from which we may afterwards obtain more abundant fruit of glory and more ample rewards.' For the further results of Baptism it is asserted that 'the soul is replenished with divine grace. But grace is (as the Council of Trent has decreed under pain of anathema) not only that whereby sin is remitted, but is also a divine quality inherent in the soul, and as it were a certain splendour and light that efface all the stains of our souls, and render the souls themselves brighter and more beautiful. To this is added a most noble train of all virtues, which are divinely infused into the soul with grace.' The question why the baptized, nevertheless, are so slow to practice piety is answered from the consideration of 'the severe conflict of the flesh against the spirit. But it is finally 'confessed that all do not participate in an equal degree of its heavenly graces and fruits.'

The Doctrine of the English Church on Article XXVII.

It is a difficult task to attempt to lay before the student a succinct and clear, and at the same sufficiently accurate and satisfactory, account of English theology on the subject of Baptism. And this must be so, if Dean Goode's account of the matter be (as it undoubtedly is) correct. He thus writes in his learned work on *The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the effects of Baptism in the case of infants* [Chap. i.]: 'The matter is often spoken of as if the Church of England must of necessity have laid down, and had in fact laid down, a certain definite, precise view upon this subject, and peremptorily enjoined it upon all her ministers for their acceptance and belief. .... It appears to me, after long and anxious consideration, that all which our Church has done upon this question is to lay down certain *limits* on both sides, within which the views of her ministers are to be confined.' Those limits he thus traces. In the early days of the Reformation on the Continent, crude and imperfect views on the Sacraments arose in some quarters out of the revulsion from the gross materialism of the Romish dogma. Such views have been generally identified (perhaps not altogether justly) with the name of Zwingle, and are conveniently, at least, and commonly known as *Zwinglian*. According to them the Sacraments were regarded as *mere* signs without any special promise of grace. But the leading divines of the various sections of the Reformed Churches unanimously rejected this imperfect teaching, and came to a practical agreement, thus far at least, that the Sacraments are not empty figures or mere signs, but that God through them efficaciously works that which they represent. [See this copiously illustrated from the foreign Reformed Confessions, and the works of Luther, Bullinger, Calvin, &c, by Dean Goode on Infant Baptism, chap. iii.] This leads us to the limit imposed by the Church of England on the one hand, that the Sacraments in general, and (as in this article) Baptism in particular, are 'not only badges and tokens,' but rather effectual signs of grace by which God doth work invisibly in us.' 'Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference.' As this limitation fronts and excludes what may be briefly called Zwinglian opinions, so the other faces in the opposite direction, and excludes the Roman doctrine of grace given *ex opere operato*, and *contained* as if it were (so to speak) a certain matter deposited in the matter of the Sacrament and conveyed along with it. We have already seen (above, Art. XXV, The Efficacy of the Sacraments) how this Roman view of the Sacrament stands contrasted with English theology. These, then, are the limits which our Church has laid down in the Articles as those within which the opinions of her ministers are to be confined. How far the formularies admit of all the variations of doctrine which lie between those limits is another and very difficult question.

But having thus stated the extreme within which, according to our Articles, variation is not forbidden, it will be needful to attempt to lay before the student some classification which may, with sufficient accuracy, group together the leading shades of doctrine which have prevailed within the borders of the English Church.

The differences in question have been based mainly on expressions in the Catechism and the Baptismal service. The following may be taken as the most marked of those expressions: –

'Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.'

'A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.

'Seeing now that this child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits.'

'We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for Thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into Thy holy Church.'

The opinions resulting from a consideration of these passages, together with the Articles and Scriptural and other sources of theological system, may be first broadly classified into these two:—

A. Those which understand the above expressions as literally and absolutely fulfilled in every case of Baptism. Obviously these will differ according to the scope and comprehensiveness of meaning given to the words *Regeneration*, *Adoption*, *Child of God*, &c.

B. Those which understand the expressions in question to be used not absolutely but conditionally: as conveying not a known certainty, resulting from known and ascertained spiritual conditions, but hypothetically in the language of faith, which assumes the implied conditions to be present, and thereupon pronounces the fulfillment of the Gospel covenant of grace to the person baptized. In this view, however, that fulfillment (at least in its complete and absolute sense) still remains a contingency depending on spiritual conditions, the presence or absence of which will hereafter become manifest in the life.

The class A may be broken into these three principal sections: –

A1. Those who more or less closely approximate to the Tridentine view of the Sacrament containing grace and giving it *ex opere operato*, the soul being absolutely and invariably restored to primeval purity in Baptism. [See above, Art. IX, under heading The History of the Doctrine of Original Sin.] Opinions of this class seem to have altogether exceeded the limits of comprehensiveness allowed by the Church of England and described above.

A2. Those who hold the class of doctrine to be included in our second section usually belong to those who are generally and popularly known as moderate High Churchmen. These generally hold that, in the case of an infant, its inability to oppose any barrier of unbelief and impenitence to the entrance of grace assures us that the covenanted grace has been certainly conferred in Baptism. For they allege that unbelief and impenitence alone can bar the flow of covenant grace. Accordingly an impenitent adult is able to resist (the technical mediaeval phrase is *ponere obicem*) the reception of grace; but an unconscious infant cannot do so, and in such an one Baptism fulfills its entire purpose.

Divines of a purely English school must, by virtue of their national character, have a respect for *facts*, which they are not permitted to override altogether by any theory. Hence in claiming the *spiritual regeneration* of all infants in Baptism in a sense which shall reach the moral nature within, this class of divines conceives that 'a seed' of goodness is invariably planted at Baptism which may or may not afterwards become developed and bear fruit. Or the doctrine may be otherwise stated at the bringing of the soul into direct and covenanted connection with the Holy Spirit, whose help is thenceforth positively assured. The grace of the Spirit will plead with the soul as the reason opens, and will ultimately sanctify it if 'that grace be not stifled, disregarded, or abused.'

A3. Another school of divines reconciles the observed facts as to the moral condition of the mass of the baptized with the literal interpretation of our formularies by excluding the moral element from the definition of the word *regeneration*, which is explained solely in an ecclesiastical sense. In Baptism, say they, the child is admitted to all the privileges of the Church and is brought into a covenant relation to God. It is claimed that such a change of condition is so great and signal as to deserve the name of *regeneration*, and even of *spiritual regeneration*, inasmuch as it is the admission to great spiritual privileges. Some would take this as one of

many senses in which regeneration may be used. Others would limit the theological use of the word to this sense, and apply the words *conversion*, *renovation*, and the like to the moral and spiritual transformation of the soul.

It will be readily understood that different writers on this subject have used varied language, and have not always sharply defined their opinions. Still it is believed that the above forms a fairly approximate classification of English opinion. It need scarcely be added that A2 and A3, with their legitimate variations, are universally held to be fairly within the limits allowed by the English Church.

B. We come next to the classes of interpreters who understand the disputed expressions in the Catechism and baptismal services, not as the assertion of an ascertained and universal fact, but as the language of faith and charity, which *presumes* the presence of the grace signified by the Sacrament until the contrary shall have been manifested by the life of the person baptized. These understand the word *regeneration* in its full spiritual signification, reaching the moral nature within. Their view at least has the merit of reconciling fully the observed facts in the conduct of the baptized with the doctrinal theory of the effect of Baptism.

It is urged by the supporters of this view of the subject that both in the Articles and in the Catechism the Sacraments are dealt with in their ideal completeness. All that is requisite to their efficacy is presumed to be present, both as respects the administration and the spiritual qualities of the recipient. [See Art. XXV.] The two Sacraments are treated alike in this respect. The Catechism definitely requires repentance and faith for the complete result of either Sacrament. It assumes with respect to infants that these graces will in due time be manifested. In this event, and not till then, the Sacrament will be spiritually complete. Strictly speaking, our Church has not defined the result of Infant Baptism, but has been content with statements which assume the right reception as well as the right administration, and with a general declaration that infants ought to be baptized. Thus in the eye of the Church the Sacrament is assumed to be complete in all its parts. But the divine part therein can only be spoken of hypothetically and conditionally. Whether the spiritual regeneration assumed has really taken place or not can be known to man only from the after fruits. It is further urged that this is the model on which all our services are composed. Each grace contemplated in the several acts of worship – repentance, faith, love, humility – is assumed to be present in the language put into the mouths of the worshippers. The language of doubt and hesitation is nowhere admitted, not even into a service of such almost miscellaneous use as that for the burial of the dead. All bears the same glow of faith and hope. But, it is urged, this language of faith ought not to be paraphrased in the case of Baptism, any more than in the other services, into theological assertions of the invariable presence of the graces thus assumed.

It will now be necessary to elucidate by examples these schools of doctrine. It is not deemed necessary or advisable to notice further the class A1. Tridentine and scholastic theology is broadly contrasted with that of the English Church, and has been sufficiently set forth in the words of Trent. We turn to class A2. It is often very difficult to find a passage containing language sufficiently definite to identify the class of doctrine of any given divine to our absolute satisfaction. But it appears that Hammond and Thorndike belong to this present class, and (though not without hesitation) Bishop Bethell's work on Regeneration, which has had much authority within the last fifty years, must be assigned to it also. He speaks of Waterland with approval, but seems, in the author's opinion, to go beyond him. Certainly he lacks the admirable power of making himself distinctly understood which characterized that great divine. Bishop Bethell, with Waterland and others, distinguishes between Regeneration and Renovation, when

he defines regeneration as conveying the 'spirit of grace, which is designed to be a principle of spiritual life,' but 'is merely a potential principle.' And when he speaks of 'the infused virtue of the Holy Ghost,' though 'dormant and inactive,' he seems to fall within the class now under consideration.

Proceeding to class A3, we shall have the great advantage of the lucid statement of Dr. Waterland in his *Regeneration Stated and Explained*, of which we proceed to give some account;—

'Regeneration is but another word for the new birth of a Christian. ... This 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. ... Regeneration complete stands in two things which are, as it were, its two integral parts – the grant made over to the person, and the reception of that grant. The grant once made contains always the same, but the reception may vary because it depends upon the condition of the recipient.

'Renovation, I understand, is a renewal of the 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.'

Waterland afterwards takes the cases of adults and infants. With regard to the former there can be no *salutary* regeneration without renovation accompanying it, or until in after years renovation is wrought in the soul. With regard to infants, he says that, being in a state of innocence and incapacity, they need no repentance and cannot have faith; that '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.'

According to these very clear statements and definitions it is manifest that this able divine did not consider that any real moral and spiritual change was wrought *in the soul*, of necessity, in Baptism. All that change he separates from regeneration under the name renovation. Accordingly he proceeds to say that 'the renewing also of the *heart* may come gradually on with their first dawnings of reason in such measures as they shall yet be capable of. ... In this case, it is to be noted that regeneration precedes, and renovation can only follow after: though infants may perhaps be found capable of receiving some seeds of internal grace sooner than is commonly imagined.' This last definite expression of doctrine as to the case of infants leaves no hesitation as to the correctness of the classification here made.

The class B will be sufficiently illustrated by the sketch of the celebrated Gorham case which will follow. The work of Dean Goode on 'Infant Baptism' is a powerful and learned treatise advocating this mode of interpretation.

It is probable that the great majority of those usually known as the Evangelical party in the Church of England hold opinions falling under this head. But not a few of them, including men of considerable learning, belong to the class A3. It will, however, be admitted that individual

writers, while holding these general principles of interpretation, arrange the details with some considerable variety. For a general view of the whole question there is no more masterly summary than the *Review of the Baptismal Controversy*, by Dr. Mozley, the Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford.

From a consideration of the several statements so far made, it will be manifest that one who desires to estimate accurately the opinions of others on this subject, or to state distinctly his own, must carefully define two things – first, in what sense the word regeneration is used and asserted in respect of Baptism; secondly, whether such regeneration is held to be absolutely and invariably attached to Baptism or not. Failing this, it is apparent that such a gross absurdity might result, and in fact has resulted, in ignorant or careless minds, as the confusing of an extreme Tridentine divine with a moderate English Churchman of the class A3; for each of them teaches invariable baptismal regeneration, but each means a widely different thing.

With regard to the word *Regeneration* Dr. Mozley (chap. iv.) writes thus: 'Two definitions of regeneration may be said to divide theological opinion; according to one of which it is a state of pardon and of *actual goodness*, according to the other a state of pardon, and a new *capacity* only for goodness, or an assisting grace.' The extreme phrase of the former of these is the scholastic and Tridentine view of an infusion of all virtues into the soul of the baptized. [See above, The Roman Doctrine of Baptism.] This would be absolutely repudiated by those divines who may be called moderate Anglicans. Waterland, for example, speaking of the regeneration of infants, says that he does not believe that a *moral* change takes place in them, and 'for this plain reason, because I am persuaded that the thing is impossible, morality and immorality being alike incompatible with their state of being.' Bishop Bethell also (chap. viii.) says that 'in the case of infants the spirit of grace, which is designed to be a principle of spiritual life, is merely a potential principle. ... The infused virtue of the Holy Ghost is, to speak in the mildest terms, dormant and inactive when religious instruction and moral discipline are neglected.' And he proceeds in strong language to reject, in the name of our Church, the 'scholastic speculations' on the implantation of all virtues.

It will appear, therefore, upon the whole, setting aside the influence of Roman theology, that those in our Church who distinguish the word *regenerate* from its kindred expressions – *renewed*, *converted*, *born of God*, &c. – which involve an actual change of moral and spiritual character and affections, maintain an universal baptismal regeneration. Those who take the word *regenerate* as a comprehensive word, involving the change just noticed, maintain that it can only be asserted in baptism hypothetically and in the language of faith and hope.

The internal controversies of the Church of England of late years have turned so much on the baptismal question that a few notes on this subject may be added. Dr. Mozley writes: 'The baptismal controversy was the controversy of the first half of this century. It produced treatises from a succession of writers – Archbishop Lawrence, Bishop Mant, Mr. Biddulph, Mr. Faber, Bishop Bethell, Dr. Pusey, Dr. Goode, Archdeacon Wilberforce, and others. It came to a head in the Gorham trial, and has since dropped.' If this be so, a slight sketch of the points in debate, and the bearing of the decision in the Gorham case, will be useful to illustrate what may be legally held in the Church of England on this subject. In 1847, whilst that controversy was at its height, the Rev. G. C. Gorham was presented to the living of Brampford Speke in Devonshire. Dr. Philpotts, then Bishop of Exeter, after a prolonged personal examination, refused to institute Mr. Gorham to the living, on the ground of unsound doctrine on the subject of Baptism. An action was brought against the Bishop in the Court of Arches to rebut this charge and procure institution to the living. Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, then judge of that court, pronounced against

Mr. Gorham in an elaborate judgment, declaring the doctrine of the Church of England to be that infants are undoubtedly, and without any exception, regenerated in Baptism.

The agitation produced by this decision was intense. Neither of the two contending parties probably represented the general body of the English clergy. Bishop Philpotts declared in one of his charges that on the subject of Baptism we are agreed with Rome. How far this is from being the case anyone comparing the Tridentine statements with the language of such an acknowledged English divine as Waterland would see in a moment. On the other hand, Mr. Gorham made statements with regard to Baptism with which many, who might agree with him generally, would refuse to symbolize. But it was felt that the issue was raised between an absolute unconditional interpretation of the baptismal service and that hypothetical charitable construction of its language which had been held ever since the Reformation by many great divines. The judgment had rejected the latter altogether, and cast it out from any place in the Church of England.

From the sentence of the Court of Arches an appeal was made to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, consisting of five eminent judges, the two Archbishops, and the Bishop of London. The two Archbishops and four judges concurred in reversing the decision of the inferior court. The Bishop of London and one judge refused to concur.

In the judgment delivered by Lord Langdale in the name of the Judicial Committee, the following five propositions were selected from the statements of Mr. Gorham, as containing the doctrines which had been condemned: –

1. That Baptism is a sacrament generally necessary to salvation; but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of Baptism that regeneration *invariably* takes place in Baptism.

2. That the grace may be granted before, in, or after Baptism.

3. That Baptism is an effectual sign of grace by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as *worthily* receive it; in them alone it has a wholesome effect; and that without reference to the qualification of the recipient it is not in itself an effectual sign of grace.

4. That infants baptized and dying before actual sin are certainly saved.

5. But that *in no case* is regeneration in Baptism unconditional.

The judgment passed in review the baptismal and other offices of our Church, together with the Articles. It came to the conclusion that 'the services abound with expressions which must be construed in a charitable and qualified sense, and cannot with any appearance of reason be taken as proofs of doctrine.' It further declared that 'there are other points of doctrine respecting the Sacrament of Baptism which are capable of being honestly understood in different senses.' It proceeded to fortify this position by showing that opinions, in the main not distinguishable from Mr. Gorham's, had been held from the first by eminent prelates and divines without censure or reproach. Among these, Bishop Jewel, Hooker, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Carlton, and Bishop Prideaux were cited.

On these grounds Mr. Gorham was acquitted of the charge of holding false doctrine, and he was ultimately instituted to the disputed benefice.

It will be seen, therefore, that, as the law stands, the hypothetical interpretation of the expressions in the baptismal service is equally legal with the more absolute and invariable interpretation. It must not, however, be inferred that there are no limits to the license allowed by our Church on this matter. It was intended by our Reformers to exclude equally Roman excess on the one hand and Zwinglian defect on the other. Neither ought the student of divinity to allow himself to suppose it a matter of indifference which opinion he should espouse within the legal

limits of the Church of England. But rather he should seek with all prayer and diligence to know what opinion most nearly harmonises with the whole body of revealed truth.

The foregoing observations will make it almost superfluous to say that it is difficult to allege passages from divines of established reputation which may be accepted as typical representations of the doctrine of the Church of England on the effects of Infant Baptism. It is conceived that there is no such difficulty with regard to the main doctrines of the faith, or with regard to the other Sacrament. One chief reason for this difficulty will be found in the age of the ordinary recipient of Baptism. An infant seems to be outside our usual means for estimating spiritual results. Were the subject Adult Baptism, there would be less scope for difference. There would be a variety of opinion about the exact nature of the grace conveyed in this rite, and as to how far it was conveyed in and with the Sacrament, or how far the Sacrament was a sign and seal of grace already received; but all would agree that without faith and repentance in the adult recipient the spiritual grace was not given. Any general discussion of English theology, much more of patristic theology, on the doctrine of Baptism is far too large for this work. The student must be referred to treatises expressly dealing with the subject, some of which have been mentioned above. One name, however, is so prominent as that of a recognised English divine, and has been so frequently and generally used in this work, that we cannot omit consideration of his statements. Hooker has devoted eight chapters (58–65) of the fifth book of his *Ecclesiastical Polity* to the discussion of the nature, effects, and ritual of Baptism. What are usually considered the most important passages, as bearing upon this Article are the following: –

1. 'If outward Baptism were a cause in itself possessed of that power, either natural or supernatural, without the present operation whereof no such effect could possibly grow; it must then follow that, seeing effects do never prevent [i.e., *precede*] the necessary causes out of which they spring, no man could ever receive grace before Baptism; which being apparently both known and also confessed to be otherwise in many particulars, although in the rest we make not Baptism a cause of grace; yet the grace which is given them with their Baptism doth so far forth depend on the very outward Sacrament, that God will have it embraced, not only as a sign or token of what we receive, but also as an instrument or mean whereby we receive grace. Because Baptism is a Sacrament which God hath instituted in His Church, to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ; and so through His most precious merit obtain, as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life.' [B. V. c. lx.]

2. 'Predestination bringeth not to life without the grace of external vocation, wherein our Baptism is implied. For as we are not naturally men without birth, so neither are we Christian men in the eye of the Church of God but by new birth; nor, according to the minifest ordinary course of divine dispensation new-born, but by that Baptism which both declareth and maketh us Christians. In which respect we justly hold it to be the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life, a seal, perhaps, to the grace of election before received; but to our sanctification here a step that hath not any before it.' [Ibid.]

3. 'The law of Christ, which in these considerations maketh Baptism necessary, must be construed and understood according to rules of natural equity. ... And (because equity so teacheth) it is on all parts gladly confessed that there may be in divers cases life by virtue of inward Baptism, even where outward is not found. ... Touching infants which die unbaptized, since they neither have this Sacrament itself, nor any sense or conceit thereof, the judgment of many hath gone hard against them. But yet, seeing grace is not absolutely tied unto Sacraments:

and besides, such is the lenity of God that unto things altogether impossible He bindeth no man; but where we cannot do what is enjoined us, accepteth our will to do instead of the deed itself; again, forasmuch as there is in their Christian parents, and in the Church of God, a presumed desire that the Sacrament of Baptism might be given them, yea, a purpose also that it shall be given: remorse of equity hath moved diverse of the school divines in these considerations ingenuously to grant that God, all-merciful to such as are not able in themselves to desire Baptism, imputeth the secret desire that others have in their behalf, and accepteth the same as theirs, rather than casteth away their souls for that which no man is able to help.' [B.V. c. 60.]

4. 'How should we practice iteration of Baptism, and yet teach that we are by Baptism born anew; that by Baptism we are admitted unto the heavenly society of saints; that those things be really and effectually done by Baptism which are no more possibly to be often done than a man can naturally be often born? ... As Christ hath therefore died and risen from the dead but once, so that Sacrament which both extinguisheth in Him our former sin and beginneth in us a new condition of life is by one only actual administration for ever available; according to that in the Nicene Creed, "I believe one Baptism for remission of sins".' [B. V. c. 62.]

5. 'The fruit of Baptism dependeth only upon the covenant which God hath made; that God by covenant requireth in the elder sort faith and Baptism; in children the Sacrament of Baptism alone, whereunto He hath also given them right by special privilege of birth within the bosom of the Holy Church; that infants, therefore, which have received Baptism complete, as touching the mystical perfection thereof, are by virtue of his own covenant and promise cleansed from all sin; forasmuch as all other laws, concerning that which in Baptism is either moral or ecclesiastical, do bind the Church which giveth Baptism, and not the infant which receiveth it of the Church.' [Ibid.]

6. 'The whole Church is a multitude of believers, all honoured with that title; even hypocrites for their profession's sake, as well as saints because of their inward sincere persuasion, and "infants as being in the first degree of their ghostly motion towards the actual habit of faith." The first sort are faithful in the eye of the world; the second faithful in the sight of God; the last in the ready direct way to become both, if all things after be suitable to these their present beginnings.' [B. V. c. 64.]

7. 'Were St. Augustine now living, there are which would tell him, for his better instruction, that to say of a child it is elect, and to say it doth believe, are all one; for which cause, since no man is able precisely to affirm the one of any infant in particular, it followeth that, precisely and absolutely, we ought not to say the other. Which precise and absolute terms are needless in this case. We speak of infants as the rule of charity alloweth both to speak and think. They that can take to themselves in ordinary talk a charitable kind of liberty to name men of their own sort God's dear children (notwithstanding the large reign of hypocrisy), should not, methinks, be so strict and rigorous against the Church for presuming as it doth of a Christian innocent. For when we know how Christ in general hath said that "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" which kingdom is the inheritance of God's elect; and do withal behold how His providence hath called them to the first beginnings of eternal life, and presented them at the well-spring of new birth, wherein original sin is purged; besides which sin there is no hindrance of their salvation known to us, as themselves will grant; hard it were that, having so many fair inducements whereupon to ground, we should not be thought to utter (at the least) a truth as probable and allowable, in terming any such particular infant an elect babe, as in presuming the like of others whose safety nevertheless we are not absolutely able to warrant.' [Ibid.]

8. Baptism implieth a covenant of league between God and man: wherein as God doth bestow presently remission of sins and the Holy Ghost, binding Himself also to add (in process of time) what grace soever shall be further necessary for the attainment of everlasting life; so every baptized soul, receiving the same grace at the hands of God, tieth likewise itself for ever to the observation of His law.' [B. V. c. 64.]

These appear to be all the principal passages in this work distinctly setting forth Hooker's doctrine of Baptism. It is of great importance, and it requires great care and theological accuracy to assign to these statements the place which Hooker intended. The closing words of quotation 1 and the greater part of 2 have often been torn from their place in Hooker's theological system, and exhibited as a proof that this great divine held the doctrine of universal spiritual regeneration in Baptism with an almost Tridentine interpretation of infused habits of virtue. Those who know what Hooker's doctrines really were must conclude that either there was some great inconsistency not to be attributed to so deep a thinker and so cautious and systematic a divine, or else that the bearing of his teaching on Baptism has been in many quarters misapprehended. We refer especially to his Discourses on Justification, and on the Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect. The student may notice particularly the twenty-sixth section of the former, from which the following brief extract may serve as a specimen: –

9. 'If, therefore we which once hath the Son may cease to have the Son, though it be but for a moment, he ceaseth for that moment to have life. But the life of them which have the Son of God is everlasting in the world to come. But because as Christ being raised from the dead died no more, death hath no more power over Him, so justified man, being allied to God in Jesus Christ our Lord, doth as necessarily from that time forward always live, as Christ, by whom he hath life, liveth always.'

Many striking passages to the same effect may be alleged. See particularly [*Ecc. Pol.* B. V. c. 56.] one which sets forth the communion between Christ and the Church, founding the doctrine on the eternal purpose of God for the salvation of his true mystical Church. In short Hooker, together with the Elizabethan divines (with scarcely an exception), held what would *now be called* Calvinistic opinions, and was favoured by Archbishop Whitgift, the chief author of the Lambeth Articles. It is not meant that he advocated the more harsh and severe parts of Calvinism, or that he approved of the unqualified reprobation asserted in the Lambeth Articles. We must, therefore, read Hooker's account of the effects of Baptism together with such statements as the following [*Ecc. Pol.* B. V. c. 56.]; –

10. 'We participate Christ partly by imputation, as when those things which He did and suffered for us are imputed unto us for righteousness; partly by habitual and real infusion, as when grace is inwardly bestowed while we are on earth and afterwards more fully both our souls and bodies made like unto His in glory. The first thing of His so infused into our hearts in this life is the Spirit of Christ; whereupon, because the rest, of what kind soever, do all both necessarily depend and infallibly also ensue; therefore the Apostles term it some time the seed of God, some time the pledge of our heavenly inheritance, some time the handsel or earnest of that which is to come.'

11. 'So that all His foreknown elect are predestinated, called, justified, and advanced unto glory, according to that determination and purpose which He hath of them: neither is it possible that any other should be glorified, or can be justified, and called, or were predestinated, beside them, which in that manner are foreknown. ... It followeth: – 1. That God hath predestinated certain men, not all men. 2. That the cause moving Him hereunto was not the foresight of any virtue in us at all. 3. That to Him the number of His elect is definitely known. 4. That it cannot

be but their sins must condemn them to whom the purpose of His saving mercy doth not extend. 5. That to God's foreknown elect final continuance of grace is given. 6. That inward grace whereby to be saved is deservedly not given unto all men. 7. That no man cometh unto Christ whom God by the inward grace of His Spirit draweth not. 8. And that it is not in any man's own mere ability, freedom, or power, to be saved; no man's salvation being possible without grace. Howbeit God is no favourer of sloth, and therefore there can be no such absolute decree touching man's salvation as on our part includeth no necessity of care and travail, but shall certainly take effect whether we ourselves do wake or sleep.' [*Fragments of an Answer to a Letter of certain English Protestants*. Keble's Hooker, App. To B. V. No. 1, p. 751.]

On a review of the above statements we gather that Hooker maintained the following doctrines: –

1. The election to life of a predestinated number. [Quotation 11.]

2. That these, and these only, are called and justified. [Quotation 11.]

3. That the justified man doth thenceforward always live as necessarily as Christ liveth. [Quotation 9.]

4. That when the soul participates Christ, the first thing of His infused into the heart is the Spirit of Christ, whereupon the rest, *of what kind soever*, necessarily depend and *infallibly ensue*. [Quotation 10.]

5. Those who are thus justified, and have participated Christ, and have His spirit infused into their heart, 'do not sin in anything any such sin as doth quite extinguish grace, clean cut them off from Christ Jesus; because the seed of God abideth in them, and doth shield them from receiving any irremediable wound.' [Sermon on Perpetuity of Faith, vi.]

To these statements we must now add with regard to Baptism: –

6. That through Baptism the soul is 'incorporated into Christ,' and so receives the 'saving grace of imputation' and the infused virtue of the Holy Ghost. [Quotation 1.]

7. That Baptism is 'the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life, a seal perhaps to the grace of election, but to our sanctification here a step that hath not any before it.' [Quotation 2.]

8. That the case of unbaptized infants may nevertheless be excepted on principles of equity. [Quotation 3.]

9. That Baptism extinguishes our former sins in Christ, and begins in us a new condition of life. [Quotation 4.]

10. That infants in Baptism are cleansed from all sins. [Quotation 5.]

11. That infants are in the first degree of their ghostly motion towards the actual habit of faith. [Quotation 6.]

12. That no one is able precisely to affirm of any infant that it is elect. But that we speak of infants as the rule of charity allows. It is as probable and allowable to term a particular infant an elect babe as to presume the like of adults, as some have done. [Quotation 7.]

This last paragraph contains in truth the key to the whole difficulty, and we may now arrange the foregoing conclusions in a consistent order, thus: –

It is known to God alone who are indeed His elect. He has not permitted us to judge. Hence we may, by the rule of charity, *presume* that any particular infant is one of the elect, and speak of it accordingly. *If it be one* of the elect (and not otherwise), it is in Baptism made a participant of Christ and receives the first fruits of the Spirit, from which all needful graces, and ultimately the glorified state, will in due time 'infallibly ensue;' and it will be preserved from final apostasy as long as it lives by the eternal life of Christ, its Head.

Such, it is believed, was the real system of Hooker. He distinguished carefully [*Ecc. Pol.* B. III. 1.] between the Church visible and the mystical Church, teaching us that 'the everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness belong to the mystical Church,' but the duties belong to the visible Church.

In his language about the Sacraments it will be found, on a careful consideration, that this distinction is always tacitly assumed: the Church visible owes the duty of careful administration, the members of the Church mystical (and these alone) receive, and 'infallibly' receive, all the grace which Sacraments are meant to convey. But he does not, while treating of the Sacraments, perpetually throw in this chilling distinction. On the other hand, with a glow of charity he contemplates the partakers as indeed members of Christ, he views the Sacraments in their spiritual and reciprocal completeness, and he claims the full grace which they were meant to betoken and to convey.

Hence we conclude that Hooker really belongs to the class of those who interpret the expressions in the baptismal services as the language of charitable presumption.

If this seem strange to any, it can only be from lack of acquaintance with the language of Hooker's contemporaries, or from approaching his writings with preconceived ideas derived from other schools of theology.

The historical fact is very material to notice that, among all the controversies raised by the earlier Puritans about the baptismal service, none was *ever* raised about the doctrine of Regeneration as taught in it. It will be observed that Hooker contests with his opponents the answers of the sponsors, the use of the cross, the validity of lay baptism &c., but that he is not called upon to defend the expressions around which modern controversy has been waged. It was not until other ideas on the Sacraments had become prominent in the Church of England in the times of Charles, that Baptismal Regeneration was generally taught apart from election. Then the language of the service was soon called into question, and the controversy, so commenced, has continued to our day.

Indeed, Calvin himself used language with respect to Baptism quite as strong as that of Hooker. [*Catechism of the Church of Geneva.*]

'*Q*. Do you attribute nothing more to the water than that it is a figure of ablution?

'*A*. I understand it to be a figure, but still so that the reality is annexed to it: for God does not disappoint us when He promises us His gifts. Accordingly it is certain that both pardon of sins and newness of life are offered to us in Baptism and received by us.

'*Q*. Is this grace bestowed on all indiscriminately?

'*A*. Many, precluding its entrance by their depravity, make it void to themselves. Hence the benefit extends to believers only, and yet the Sacrament loses nothing of its nature.

'*Q*. If repentance and faith are requisite to the legitimate use of Baptism, how comes it that we baptize infants?

'*A*. It is not necessary that faith and repentance should always precede Baptism. They are only required from those whose age makes them capable of both. It will be sufficient then if, after infants have grown up, they exhibit the power of their Baptism.'

It is thought that these references and observations may suffice to introduce the student to the theological treatment of the effects of the Sacrament of Baptism. The accumulation of literature on this subject bearing upon its Patristic, Scholastic, Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican treatment is enormous. It is important that all who are teachers of religion should understand clearly the general bearings of the different aspects of the questions raised. But it may be doubted whether much more than this may not frequently prove rather prejudicial than helpful to

him who is called upon to minister and to teach among ordinary congregations. For theological subtleties of doctrine and precise theological definition are either distasteful or unintelligible, and are at least seldom edifying or instructive, to most of our people.

Infant Baptism

The chief controversial work on this subject is Dr. Wall's learned *History of Infant Baptism*, published at the beginning of the last century. He received the thanks of the Lower House of Convocation. Later editions contain replies to various opponents, some of whom praise him for his candour and fairness. It contains a careful examination of the Patristic statements on the subject, and a discussion of the Scriptural argument. He also wrote a more popular and compendious abridgment, under the title of a *Conference between two men that had doubts about Infant Baptism*. This has been repeatedly reprinted by the Christian Knowledge Society. On the subject of Infant Baptism the language of our Church is studiously moderate. It is customary to discuss the scanty statements of the earliest fathers bearing upon it. But our Article seems to pass this by, simply saying that it is most agreeable with the institution of Christ. There is doubtless a reference here to the well-known passage alleged in the Gospel in the baptismal service, '*Of such is the kingdom of heaven*.' If the kingdom of heaven be taken in our Lord's usual meaning as His visible Church or kingdom among men, and if baptism be the acknowledged rite of ordinary covenant admission into that Church or kingdom, it would seem at once to follow that the baptism of young children is most agreeable with the institution of Christ. It may also be shown to be 'most agreeable with the words of institution which include '*every creature*.'

Dr. Hey, writing on this Article, gives this summary of precedents deducible from the Scriptures on this question: – 'On the one hand, they mention no instance of Infant Baptism; on the other hand, they afford no instance of Baptism being delayed. Some families are spoken of collectively as being baptized; but the children are not mentioned particularly.'

To this must be added the support afforded by the analogies of circumcision. It is unlikely that Christianity should have introduced a *restrictive* change in respect of admitting children without a special announcement of it. And this the more because the Church for some years was chiefly composed of converted Jews.