

ARTICLE XI.

Of the Justification of Man.

De Hominis Justificatione.

WE are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

TANTUM propter meritum Domini et Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et merita nostra, justi coram Deo reputamur. Quare sola fide nos justificari, doctrina est saluberrima, ac consolationis plenissima, ut in homilia de justificatione hominis fusius explicatur.

SECTION I. — HISTORY.

IT is probable that natural religion inclines all men, uninstructed by Revelation, to seek for pardon and acceptance with God, either by attempting to live up to His law, or by making some personal sacrifices as an atonement for offences against it. The robe laid before the statue of Athena, or the hecatomb offered to Phœbus, were to compensate for sins against their divinity.

If we look to Jewish history, we shall find the prophets remonstrating with the Israelites for thinking that ceremonial observances would satisfy for the breach of God's commandments, and their sincerest penitents acknowledging that sacrifices would not profit them, but that they needed to be purged as with hyssop, and new created in heart (Psalm li.). Hence we may readily see, that the temptation of the Jews was to seek God's favour, when they had fallen from it, by ceremonial rites, without sufficient reference to the spirit of the ritual; as with many it was to seek the same favor by a rigid observance of a mere formal obedience, such as our Lord reproves in the Pharisees, and as St. Paul declares to have been the cause of the fall of his countrymen (Rom. ix. 31, 32). The Rabbins appear to have taught that a man's good deeds would be weighed against his bad; and that if the former preponderated, he would be accepted and rewarded.¹ And forgetting or neglecting the spiritual significance of their prophecies and sacrifices, they expected a Messiah indeed, but a triumphant conqueror,

¹ See Bull, *Harmon. Apost.* II. xvi. 8.

not one who by His death would expiate their sins ; and so the Cross of Christ was a stumbling-block and offence to them. They were profoundly ignorant that Christ should be to them “the end of the Law for righteousness,” that by Him alone all who believed in Him should receive justification and life.¹

It has been thought also, that some among the Jews held that a man would be saved, even without holiness, who simply embraced the creed of Abraham, acknowledging the unity of the Godhead and the Resurrection of the dead ; a view which seems to have been adopted by Mohammed in the Koran. Accordingly, it has been said, that, as St. Paul in his Epistles condemned the former error of his fellow-countrymen, so St. James directed his Epistle against the latter : the one showing, that neither ceremonial observances nor legal obedience could satisfy the demands of God’s justice, but that an atonement and true faith were necessary ; the other, that a mere creed was not calculated to please God, when the life was not consistent with it.²

The sentiments of the fathers on the subject of justification have afforded matter for much discussion. According to some, they taught nearly the doctrine of the Council of Trent ; according to others, they nearly spoke the language of Luther. The truth appears to lie in neither of these statements. Justification had not been in early times the cause of much debate. No fierce contests had arisen upon it. Hence, no need was felt for accurate definitions concerning it. The statements of the fathers are therefore generally rather practical than formal. They dwell much on the Atonement, and the meritorious cause of pardon ; so much so, that they could see the Blood of Christ in the scarlet thread which Rahab tied in her window, and His Cross in the stretched out hands of Moses, when Israel prevailed over Midian.³ But they do not appear ever to have entered thoroughly into the question of justification, as it was afterwards debated in the time of the schoolmen, and, still more, of the reformers.

It is remarkable, that probably the most express statement on the subject which occurs in all the writings of the fathers, is to be found in the very earliest of all, Clement of Rome. Speaking of faithful men of old, he writes, “They were all therefore greatly glorified, not for their own sake, or for their own works, or for the

¹ See Bull, *Harmon. Apost.* 11. xvii. 3.

² See Michaelis, *Introduction to the New Testament*, iv. ch. xxvi. § 6, who considers this to have been the cause of St. James’s argument on justification, and

that his Epistle was written before St. Paul’s, or at least before he had seen St. Paul’s writings.

³ Clem. Rom. *Epist. 1 ad Corinth.* 12. Barnab. *Epist.* 12.

righteousness that they themselves wrought; but through His will. And we also, being called by the same will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, or any works which we did in holiness of heart, but by that faith by which God Almighty has justified all men from the beginning: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen." ¹

The passage is important, not only because of its antiquity, but because of its distinctness. The word "justify" appears to be used, as our Article uses it, for "to account righteous;" not, as the Council of Trent, for "to make righteous" by infusion of holiness; and the instrument of such justification is declared to be and ever to have been, not "wisdom, knowledge, piety, or works done in holiness of heart, but" "faith." ²

With regard to the statements of the later fathers, we must carefully bear in mind, that, without question, they attributed the salvation of man solely and perfectly to the Blood of Christ; that they did not look to be saved because they had deserved salvation, but because Christ had satisfied for their sins; but though this is thus far plain, it will not enable us to come to any certain conclusion as to their views concerning the doctrine of justification scholastically considered.

Such passages as the following show the spirit of the fathers, as regards their reliance on the Atonement of Christ. "Let us without ceasing hold steadfastly to Him, who is our hope, and the earnest of our righteousness, even Jesus Christ, who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree; who did no sin, neither

¹ Clem. Rom. *Epist.* i. cap. 32.

² Πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν, οὐ δὲ αὐτῶν, ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν, ἢ διὰ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας ἧς κατεργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δὲ ἑαυτῶν δικαιοσύμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατεργασάμεθα ἐν δούλῳ καρδίας· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι' ἧς πάντας τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν· ὃ ἔστω δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. Ἀμήν.

Almost the only question which may be raised on the passage is, Does St. Clement contrast faith with works done before the grace of God, or works after the grace of God, i. e. evangelical works? Dr. Waterland says, "It is of great weight with him, that so early and so considerable a writer as Clement of Rome, an apostolical man, should so interpret the doctrine of *justifying faith* as to oppose it plainly even to evangelical works, however exalted." — *Works*, ix.

p. 452. Mr. Faber thinks that, "Indisputably, by the very force and tenor of their definition (*i. e.* as being works done in holiness of heart), they are works performed after the infusion of holiness into the heart by the gracious spirit of God." — *Primitive Doctrine of Justification*, p. 83. Mr. Newman, on the other hand, contends that "in holiness of heart" means no more than "piously," "holily;" and that "works which we did in holiness of heart" (as the article is omitted before *ἔργων* though not the former substantives *σοφίας, εὐσεβείας, &c.*, and the verb *κατεργασάμεθα* is in the aorist) would more naturally, though perhaps not necessarily, signify an hypothetical, not a real case, as in those words of St. Jerome afterwards quoted by Mr. Faber, p. 122, "Convertentem impium per solam fidem justificat Deus, non per opera quæ non habuit." — Newman, *On Justification*, p. 436.

was guile found in His mouth; but suffered all for us that we might live through Him.”¹

“For this cause did our Lord vouchsafe to give up His Body to destruction, that through the forgiveness of our sins we might be sanctified; that is, by the sprinkling of His Blood.”²

“By His stripes healing is conferred on all who come to the Father by Him.”³

“All men fall short of the glory of God, and are justified not by themselves, but by the coming of the Lord.”⁴

“I will not glory because I am righteous, but because I am redeemed. I will glory, not because I am free from sins, but because my sins are forgiven me; not because I have profited, nor because any one hath profited me, but because Christ is my Advocate with the Father, and because Christ’s Blood hath been shed for me.”⁵

“Our righteousness . . . is such in this life that it consists rather in remission of sins than in perfection of virtue.”⁶

“Not to commit sin, is the righteousness of God; but man’s righteousness consists in the mercy of God.”⁷

Thus far it is plain that the fathers believed what the Scriptures taught and what the Article of our Church maintains, that “we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not for our own works or deservings.” And if anywhere they seem to speak a language not strictly in accordance with this doctrine, we ought in fairness to conclude that they do not mean really to contradict themselves, though they speak broadly and as the Scriptures speak, concerning the necessity of that “holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.” But when we come to technical terms, and express definitions, we shall find considerable difficulty in ascertaining the sense attached to them in the patristic writings. We have already seen something like a distinct statement in Clement of Rome, and something nearly approaching it may be found in those who followed him. A few examples I have thrown into the note.⁸ Yet

¹ Polycarp, *Epist.* VIII.

² Barnab. *Ep.* v.

³ Just. *M. Dial.* p. 366. See also Bp. Kaye’s *Justin Martyr*, p. 77.

⁴ Iren. IV. XXXVII. See also Beaven’s *Irenæus*, p. 194.

⁵ Ambros. *De Jacobo et Vita Beat.* I. 6. See Newman, *On Justification*, p. 401.

⁶ August. *De Civit.* XIX. 27. See Calvin, *Institut.* III. 12.

⁷ Non peccare Dei est justitia; hominis

autem justitia, Dei indulgentia. — Bernard, *Sermon.* 21 et 23 in Cantic. See Calvin, *Institut.* III. 12. See also Neander, VIII. p. 218.

⁸ Οὐ γὰρ ὄη γε εἰς βαλανεῖον ἡμᾶς ἐπεμ-
πεν Ἡσαίας ἀπολουσομένους ἐκεῖ τὸν φόνον
καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀμαρτίας, οὐς οὐδὲ τὸ τῆς
θαλάσσης ἰκανὸν πᾶν ὕδωρ καθαρῆσαι, ἀλλὰ
ὡς εἰκὸς πάλαι τοῦτο ἐκείνο τὸ σωτήριον
λουτρὸν ἦν, ὃ εἶπετο τοῖς μεταγινώσκουσι,
καὶ μηκέτι αἵματι τράγων καὶ προβάτων

it seems, on a general examination of the most remarkable passages from the ancient writings on this subject, that it is extremely difficult to say whether the fathers always understood the word "justification" in a forensic sense, as signifying acquittal from guilt and imputation of righteousness, or rather, as, in addition to that, containing in it the notion of infusion of righteousness. It has already been observed that we must not expect in their words the precision of controversy, where no controversy had been raised. In order of time, acquittal from guilt and infusion of righteousness (or what in modern Theology have been called justification and sanctification) go together, and are never separated. Therefore, though at times the fathers seem to use the term "justification" merely in its forensic sense, yet sometimes they speak too as if it included the idea of making just, as well as of esteeming just.

For example, in one place St. Chrysostom (on Rom. viii. 33: "It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?") writes: "He does not say, it is God that forgave our sins, but, what is much greater, *It is God that justifieth.* For when the Judge's sentence declares us just (*δικαίους ἀποφαίνει*), and such a Judge too, what signifieth the accuser?"¹ Here he seems to speak as if he considered justification as no more than "declaring or pronouncing just." Yet, in other parts of the same work, he clearly shows that in justification he considered something more to be included than remission and acquittal. Thus, in the Eighth Homily on Rom. iv. 7, ("Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven,") we read: "He seems to be bringing a testimony beside his purpose. For it does not say, Blessed are they whose faith is reckoned for righteousness. But he does so purposely, not inadvertently, to show the greater excellence. For if he be blessed that by grace

σποδῶ δαμάλωσ, ἢ σεμδάλωσ προσφοραῖς καθαρῶμενον, ἀλλὰ πιστεὶ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. ὅς διὰ τοῦτο ἀπέθανεν. κ. τ. λ. — Just. M. Dial. p. 229, d.

Non incognitus igitur erat Dominus Abrahamæ, cujus diem concupivit videre: sed neque Pater Domini; didicerat enim a Verbo Domini, et credidit ei; quapropter et deputatum est ei ad justitiam a Domino. Fides enim quæ est ad Deum altissimum justificat hominem. — Irenæ. iv. 13. See also iv. 27.

His igitur consideratis pertractatisque pro viribus quas Dominus donare dignatur, colligimus non justificari hominem præceptis bonæ vitæ nisi per fidem Jesu Christi, hoc est non lege operum sed fidei; non litera sed spiritu, non facto-

rum meritis sed gratuita gratia. — August. *De Spiritu et Litera*, cap. 22.

Convertentem impium per solam fidem justificat Deus, non opera bona quæ non habuit: alioquin per impietatis opera fuerat puniendus. Simul attende, quia non peccatorem dicit justificari per fidem sed impium, hoc est, nuper credentem asseruit.

Secundum propositum gratiæ Dei.] Qui proposuit gratis per solam fidem peccata dimittere. — Hieron. *In Epist. ad Rom.* cap. iv. Tom. v. pp. 937, 938. The Benedictine editors consider this commentary as not Jerome's. See also *In Epist. ad Galat.* cap. iii.

¹ *Homil. in Ep. ad Rom.* xv. See also Hom. vii. on ch. iii. 27.

received forgiveness, much more he that is made just and that manifests faith." Again, Homil. x. on Rom. v. 16, ("the free gift is of many offences unto justification,") he argues that "it was not only that sins were done away, but that righteousness was given." It is true that to be esteemed righteous is more than to be esteemed sinless; as the one would only deliver from punishment, the other give a right to reward; and so St. Chrysostom may only mean that justification is more than pardon, because to be accounted righteous is more than to be acquitted of guilt. But it appears to have been common to many of the fathers to leave in some uncertainty the question, whether justification did or did not contain in it the making that of which it involved the imputation.

This is especially observable in the works of St. Augustine. For example, in the 45th chapter of the *De Spiritu et Litera*, where he is reasoning on the words of St. Paul, "The doers of the Law shall be justified." He asks "What is to be justified but to be made just by Him who justifies the ungodly, so that from ungodly, he becomes just?" and so he concludes, that by this phrase St. Paul means that "they shall be made just who before were not so, not who before were just; that so the Jews, who were hearers of the Law, might understand that they need the grace of a justifier that they might become doers of the Law." Or else, he proposes to interpret it in the other way, "*shall be justified*, as though it were said, shall be held and accounted righteous; just as it is said of a certain one, *He willing to justify himself*, that is, to be held and esteemed just." So then Augustine appears to leave it an open question, whether to *justify* is to *make*, or to *esteem* and *hold* as righteous.

Yet, though there be such ambiguity, we need be but little solicitous on the subject; but rather conclude, that "the point having never been discussed, and those fathers never having thoroughly considered the sense of St. Paul, might unawares take the word (justify) as it sounded in the Latin, especially the sense they affixed to it signifying a matter very true and certain in Christianity."¹

Dr. Waterland, in his treatise on *Justification*,² has collected a great number of passages from the fathers, to show that they considered every person at his baptism to receive the gift of justification. Our limits will not allow us to follow him at length. But if we take justification to mean remission of sin and admission into

¹ Barrow, II. Sermon v. *On Justification by Faith*.

² Waterland's *Works*, IX. p. 442.

God's favour, it needs but very slight acquaintance with the writings of the early Christians to know, that as they confessed their faith "in one baptism for the remission of sins," so they universally taught that all persons duly receiving baptism, and not hindering the grace of God by unbelief and impenitence, obtained in baptism pardon for sin, admission into the Christian Church and covenant, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit of God; and that so they were thenceforth "children of God, members of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven."

To sum up what has been said. In the essence of this Article the fathers' language is clear. They held, that all hope of salvation must spring from the mercy of God through the merits of Christ. They taught, that every person baptized (not forfeiting the grace by sin and impenitence) was looked on as a member of the body of the faithful, and so in favour with God. They spoke too of faith as that state of salvation in which we receive justification and life. But (if at least we make some exceptions) they do not speak in the clear and controversial language of later days; nor is it always certain, whether by the word *justified* they understand that a man's faith is accounted to him for righteousness, or that, being the great sanctifying principle, it is the instrument whereby God works in him holiness.

It would be beside our purpose and exceed our limits to investigate at length the definitions of the schoolmen. Learned discussions are liable to much misunderstanding. But the impressions popularly conveyed by the teaching of the scholastic divines, and especially the view which was taken of them by Luther and their opponents, are very important to our right apprehension of the controversy at the time of the Reformation.

In the first place it appears that the schoolmen generally understood justification to mean not infusion of righteousness, but forgiveness of sins. It is true, they looked on it as the immediate result of, and as inseparably connected with grace infused; but their definitions made justification to mean, not the making righteous, but the declaring righteous.¹

It is not to be supposed that they denied or doubted that such

¹ Primo quæritur, an justificatio impii sit remissio peccatorum? Et videtur quod non . . . Sed *contra* est quod dicitur in Glossa Rom. viii. Super illud "Quos vocavit, hos et justificavit." Glo. remissione peccatorum: ergo remissio peccatorum est justificatio. — Aquinas,

Question. Disput. quæst. 28, Art. 1. quoted by Laurence, *Bapt. Lect.* p. 119.

Neander, VIII. p. 222, gives an interesting account of the scholastic discussions on justification. His statements appear different from those in the text, but it is only so at first sight.

justification sprang primarily from the grace of God, and meritoriously from the death of Christ. The faults charged upon their system are, that they looked for merit *de congruo*, and *de condigno*, that they attached *efficacy* to *attrition*, that they inculcated the doctrine of *satisfaction*, and that they assigned grace to the Sacraments *ex opere operato*.

Luther especially insists that these scholastic opinions were directly subversive of the doctrine of St. Paul, and of the grace of God. "They say," he writes, "that a good work before grace is able to obtain grace of *congruity* (which they call *meritum de congruo*), because it is meet that God should reward such a work. But when grace is obtained, the work following deserveth eternal life of debt and worthiness, which they call *meritum de condigno*. . . . For the first God is no debtor, but because He is just and good, He must approve such good work, though it be done in mortal sin, and so give grace for such service. But when grace is obtained, God is become a debtor, and is constrained of right and duty to give eternal life. For now it is not only a work of free-will, done according to the substance, but also done in grace, which makes a man acceptable to God, that is to say, in charity." "This is the divinity of the kingdom of antichrist; which here I recite, that St. Paul's argument may be the better understood, for two things contrary to one another being put together may be the better understood."¹

Again, the compunction for sin which might be felt before the grace of God was given, was called *attrition*; compunction arising from the motions of God's Spirit being called *contrition*. Now *attrition* was considered as a means whereby God predisposed to grace. So that it had in it some merit *de congruo*, and so of its own nature led to *contrition* and to justification.²

There being some difficulty in knowing whether a man's repentance was *contrition* or merely *attrition*, the Church was supposed to come to his aid with the power of the keys. The sacrament of penance added to *attrition*, and works of satisfaction being enjoined, the conscience was to be stilled, though it might yet be uncertain whether true repentance and lively faith had really been attained.³

¹ Luther, on Galatians, ii. 16.

² See Laurence, *B. L. Lect. iv. and vi.* Also notes on *Lect. vi.* The following is one sentence from a long passage quoted by him, p. 321, from Scotus, *Lib. iv. dist. iv. quæst. 2.*

"Potest ergo dici quod Deus disponit per attritionem, in aliquo instanti dare

gratiam: et pro illa attritione, ut pro merito, justificat, sicut est meritum justificationis. Et licet non continuaretur idem actus circa peccatum in genere naturæ et moris, qui prius, adhuc in illo instanti infunderetur gratia, qui jam præcepit meritum de congruo."

³ Laurence, as above, and p. 320.

Once more, the doctrine that the Sacraments worked grace and so effected justification independently of the faith of the receiver, and merely *ex opere operato*, was by the reformers charged upon the schoolmen, as overthrowing the doctrine of justification, through faith, by the merits of Christ.¹ And at last when by attrition perfected by penance, satisfaction, and absolution, and through the grace of God passing into contrition, the sinner was believed to be pardoned, and his soul justified before God, it still remained a question whether there was not a certain amount of temporal punishment to be endured, in this life perhaps, but more probably in purgatory, before the soul be received into full favour with God, and be pronounced "not guilty" in His presence.

The abuses which prevailed at the time of the Reformation connected with the above doctrines are popularly known. Hence, especially, the merit attached to pilgrimages, and other works of satisfaction, which were thought capable of averting the temporal punishments yet due to sin; although of course eternal punishment could be averted only by the merits of Christ. Hence, too, the famous sale of indulgences, which first prompted Luther to take the steps which led rapidly to his breach with the see of Rome.

It is possible that much of the teaching of the schoolmen, and of the more learned and pious of the divines of the Middle Ages, may, when fairly interpreted, admit of a sense far more innocent than we are apt to attribute to it, and might, if confined to the schools, have produced comparatively little mischief. But the effect produced upon the popular mind was evidently noxious. Nothing can be more plain than the fact, that reformers, in all countries, felt that the great evil against which they had to fight was the general belief that man could merit God's favour by good deeds of his own, and that works of mercy, charity, and self-denial, procured (through the intercession of Christ, or perhaps of the Virgin Mary) pardon for sin and acceptance with God.

It was in opposition to all this, that Luther so strongly pronounced his doctrine of "justification by faith only." He saw the extreme importance of teaching men to acknowledge their own weakness, and to rely on the Atonement "as a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world." Salvation was to be ascribed to grace, not to be claimed as a right; and with the view of effectually destroying all hope from *claims*, he adopted the language of St. Paul, and put forth in its strongest possible form, as the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesie*, the statement,

¹ Laurence, p. 324.

that "justification is by faith only," without works, love, or holiness. That is to say, he asserted that man is justified through, or because of the merits of Christ, and that the sole *instrument* of his justification is *faith*. This faith indeed will produce charity, and so good works; but, when considered as justifying, it must be considered as apart from holiness, and charity, and good works.

The vehemence of his temper, and the great importance which he attached to his doctrine, led him to state it in language which we may not approve. Such language, if used now, when very different errors prevail from those most common in Luther's time, might, in all probability, lead to Antinomianism and fanaticism of all kinds. But it is necessary to put ourselves into Luther's position, and to take a fair view of the man, whose energy brought about the greatest revolution in history, in order to judge fairly of his language and opinions.

For example, Luther stated that faith alone, not faith informed or perfected by charity, was that which justified. This seems opposed to the language of St. James (ch. ii. 14, &c.), and even to the language of St. Paul, who tells us that it is "faith, which worketh by love," which "availeth in Christ Jesus" (Gal. v. 6). Accordingly, the schoolmen had distinguished between *fides informis*, a faith which was merely speculative, and had in it neither love nor holiness, and *fides formata*, or faith which is perfected by the charity and good works which spring from it; to which faith they attributed the office of justifying.¹ Now this statement, that it is *fides formata* which justifies, Luther denied. By so doing it will be thought by many that he contradicted Scripture, the fathers, the homilies of our own Church, and the sentiments of many contemporary reformers. But the ground on which he did so he himself clearly explains to us. The schoolmen and Romanist divines, according to him, taught that faith, furnished with charity, justified the sinner, in order that they might assign the office of justification, not to the faith, but to the charity: that so it might be said, Faith justifies indeed; but it is because of the merit of that charity, and of those good works which it contains, and which give it all its efficacy. "Faith," he says, is, according to them, "the body and the shell; charity the life, the kernel, the form, and furniture." "But we," he continues, "in the stead of this charity, put

¹ On this scholastic distinction see Calvin, *Instit.* Lib. III. ch. ii. § 8. Also Neander, VIII. 220, 221. Calvin himself denies the justice of the distinction on this ground: *Fides in Christi notitia sita*

est. Christus nisi cum Spiritu sui sanctificatione cognosci nequit. Consequitur fidem a pio affectu nullo modo esse distrahendam. A very different argument from Luther's.

faith, and we say that faith apprehends Jesus Christ, who is the form which adorns and furnishes faith As the schoolmen say that charity adorns and furnishes faith, so do we say that it is Christ which furnishes or adorns faith, or rather, that He is the very form and perfection of faith. Wherefore Christ apprehended by faith and dwelling in the heart is the true Christian righteousness, for which God counteth us righteous, and giveth us eternal life.”¹

Faith then, he taught, will justify, not because it is full of love, but because it is full of Christ. Therefore, too, he thought it necessary to state that faith justified, before it had charity or good works with it; though, of necessity, it must produce charity and good works, as soon as it has justified. Faith he compares to the bride, Christ to the bridegroom. The bride will be alone with the Bridegroom, but as soon as she cometh forth from the bridechamber, she will be attended by her bridesmaids and followers, good works and holiness.

The earnestness with which he pursued his object, and the infinite importance which he attached to it, led him into vehemence of expressions, and perhaps inaccuracy of statements, which only the circumstances of the case can extenuate. At times he seems to speak as if faith itself was the cause, not merely the instrument, of salvation. At other times he writes as if good works were rather to be avoided than desired. But it is fair to consider these expressions as the result of inadvertence and the impetuosity with which he pleaded a favourite cause, when we find statements of the evil of Antinomianism, and the excellency of those works which spring from faith, in other portions of the very same writings.²

It should be added, that Luther plainly put forth the statement that the sins of the believer are imputed to Christ, and so that Christ's righteousness is imputed to the believer.³ He speaks often of the desirableness of attaining to personal assurance of salvation, and at times appears to identify this assurance with justifying faith.⁴

¹ Luther on Galat. ii. 16. See also on Gal. ii. 17; v. 16.

² For example, on Gal. iii. 22: “When we are out of the matter of justification, we cannot enough praise and extol those works which God has commanded. For who can enough commend the profit and fruit of only one work, which a Christian does in and through faith? Indeed, it is more precious than heaven and earth.” See also on Gal. iii. 19, 23, 27, &c.

³ See on Gal. ii. 16; iii. 13.

⁴ See on Gal. iii. 13. *Opera*, 1554. Tom. v. p. 350. Concerning Luther's view of the connection of justification with baptism, we may refer to his commentary on Gal. iii. 27, Tom. v. p. 369. There he says, “We have by nature the leathern coat of Adam, but we put on Christ by baptism.” In *Baptismo non datur vestitus legalis justitiæ aut nostrorum operum, sed Christus fit indumentum nostrum Evangelice Christum induere, non est legem et opera, sed inæstimabile donum induere, scilicet re*

The council of Trent was much occupied in discussing Luther's doctrine of justification. Indeed, the Tridentine fathers appear to have gone to the consideration of it, with the conviction that all his errors might be resolved into this one.¹

It was universally agreed among these divines, that faith justifies. But what justifying faith was, or how it justified, was much debated. "All agreed, that justifying faith is an assent to whatsoever is revealed by God, or determined by the Church to be believed; which, sometimes being joined with charity, sometimes remaining without it, they distinguished into two sorts: one, which is found in sinners, which the schools call unformed, solitary, idle, or dead; the other, which is only in the good, working by charity, and therefore called formed, efficacious, and lively." But it was not universally agreed that justifying faith was to be called faith formed by charity; Marinarus, a Carmelite, objecting that St. Paul did not say that faith was formed by charity, but that it worketh by charity.²

There was much discussion concerning works before grace, and merit *de congruo*; in which the Franciscans maintained, whilst the Dominicans denied, that good works could be done without the Spirit of God, and so merit grace of congruity.³ But concerning works after grace, all agreed to condemn Luther, who denied intrinsic goodness to works done in and after grace, and asserted even that they were sins. These, they all asserted, having been wrought by the Spirit of God, were essentially good and perfect.⁴ They all agreed too, that only faith could not be said to justify, since God and the Sacraments do justify, as causes in their several kinds.⁵

But the principal points of the difficulty were: first, Is a man justified, and then acts justly? or, Does he act justly, and then is justified? and, secondly, Is the word "justify" to be used in the forensic sense of imputing righteousness; or does it mean infusion of habitual righteousness into the heart? On the latter point there was much difference of opinion; the Franciscans strongly opposing the forensic sense, which was as strongly upheld by Marinarus. None doubted that Christ had merited for us, but some blamed the word to *impute*, because it was not found in the fathers; whilst others said that, agreeing on the thing, it was needless to dispute about the word; a word which it appears the Dominicans especially

missionem peccatorum, justitiam, pacem, consolationem, lætitiã in Spiritu Sancto, salutem, vitam, et Christum ipsum. See also *De Sac. Baptism.* Tom. i. p. 72.

¹ Sarpi, *Hist. Lib.* 11. p. 178.

² *Ibid.* p. 183.

³ *Ibid.* p. 185.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 186.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 183.

would have accepted, as showing that all was from Christ, but that they suspected any word which was popular with the Lutherans.¹

After many such discussions as these, the Council finally drew up sixteen heads and thirty canons or anathemas on the subject of justification, yet so guarded and obscure that each party wrote treatises to prove that the decisions were in their favour.² The most important of the decrees were the following: (2) That God sent His Son to redeem both Jews and Gentiles. (3) But that, though He died for all, yet those only enjoy the benefit to whom His merit is communicated. (4) That the justification of the wicked is a translation from the state of a son of Adam to that of a son of God, which, since the Gospel, is not done without baptism or the vow thereof. (5) That the beginning of justification in adults proceeds from preventing grace. (7) That justification is *not only remission of sins, but sanctification* also; and has five causes: the final, God's glory and eternal life; the efficient, God; the meritorious, Christ; the instrumental, the sacraments; and the formal, righteousness, given by God, received according to the good pleasure of the Holy Ghost, and according to the disposition of the receiver, receiving together with remission of sins, faith, hope, and charity. (8) That, when St. Paul saith that man is justified by faith and *gratis*, it ought to be understood, because faith is the beginning, and the things which precede justification are not meritorious of grace.³

Among the *anathemas*, some of the most important are: (1) That a man may be justified without grace. (11) That man is justified only by the imputation of the justice of Christ, or only by remission of sins without inherent grace, or charity; or that the grace of justification is only the favour of God. (12) That justifying faith is nothing but confidence in the mercy of God, who remitteth sins for Christ. (14) That man is absolved and justified, because he doth firmly believe that he is justified.⁴

These articles and canons show the difference between Luther and the Council of Trent, so far as we can be certain of the design of the latter. Yet the most eminent divines present in the Council, after its decrees, debated on their sense;⁵ so that at last it was necessary to make a decree against all notes, glosses, and commentaries; the Pope reserving to himself the right of solving difficulties, and settling controversies on the subject.⁶

¹ Sarpi, *Hist.* Bk. II. p. 187.

² *Ibid.* p. 202.

³ Concil. Trident. Sess. VI. capp. 2, 3,

⁴ Concil. Trident. Can. 1, 11, 12, 14.

⁵ Sarpi, Bk. II. p. 215.

⁶ *Ibid.* Bk. VIII. p. 762.

Roman Catholic writers since the Reformation have generally gone against the forensic sense of the word "justify;" have held, that God by grace implants inherent righteousness in the heart, makes the sinner righteous by union with Christ and the indwelling of His Spirit, and that then He esteems him, what in fact He has made him, a holy and righteous man. Their view has been thus stated by one who may be supposed to have carefully studied it. "It appears that they hold two things:—that the presence of grace implies the absence of mortal sin; next, that it is a divine gift bringing with it the property of a continual acceptableness, and so recommending the soul to God's favour so as to anticipate the necessity of any superadded pardon."¹

To return to the Lutheran divines: Melancthon, the Confession of Augsburg, and generally the more moderate Lutherans, softened and explained the strong language of Luther. With them Faith was trust (*fiducia*), or fiduciary apprehension. It was made clear, that faith in itself had no virtue, but that the meritorious cause of justification was the death and satisfaction of Jesus Christ. So that justification by faith was even said to be a *correlative* term for justification or salvation by the merits and death of Christ. Nay, justification by faith was even called a *Paulina figura*, by which was meant that we are saved by grace, and not by claims or merits of our own.²

¹ Newman, *On Justification*, p. 396. See also Bellarmine, *De Justific.*; and Barrow, II. Sect. v. p. 79.

Bellarmino states the causes of justification thus: 1. *The final cause*, God's glory and our salvation. 2. *The efficient cause*, God's goodness and Christ's merits. 3. *The material cause*, the mind or will of man, in which righteousness abides, and in which are formed the dispositions predisposing to the formal cause. 4. *The formal cause*, internally, the habit of grace; externally, the righteousness of Christ. *De Justific.* Lib. I. cap. 2. Justification he denies to consist in remission of sins or imputation of righteousness only, but asserts it to have for its formal cause the infusion of habitual righteousness. Lib. II. cap. 3, 6, 15. Good works he asserts to be meritorious of eternal life, but that, because they are wrought in us by the grace of God. Lib. V. cap. 12, *et passim*.

² Fide sumus justi, id est, per misericordiam propter Christum sumus justi; non quia fides sit virtus, quæ mereatur remissionem sua dignitate. — Melancth. *Loci Theolog. de Argum. Advers.* p. 286. Laurence, *B. L.* p. 333.

Cum dicitur, Fide justificamur, non

aliud dicitur, quam quod propter Filium Dei accipimus remissionem peccatorum et reputemur justi Intelligatur ergo propositio *correlative*, Fide justi sumus, id est, per misericordiam propter Filium Dei sumus justi seu accepti. — Mel. *Loci Theol. de Voc. Fidei*, f. 199, 2. Newman, *On Justif.* p. 278.

Cum igitur dicimus *Fide justificamur*, non hoc intelligimus, quod justi sumus propter ipsius virtutis dignitatem, sed hæc est sententia, consequi nos remissionem peccatorum, et imputationem justitiæ per misericordiam propter Christum Jam bonas mentes nihil offendet *novitas hujus Paulinæ figuræ, Fide justificamur*, si intelligant proprie de misericordia dici, eamque veris et necessariis laudibus ornari. Quid potest enim esse gratius conscientiæ afflictæ et pavidæ in veris doloribus quam audire, hoc esse mandatum Dei, hanc esse vocem sponsi Christi, ut statuunt certe donari remissionem peccatorum seu reconciliationem, non propter nostram dignitatem, sed gratis, per misericordiam, propter Christum, ut beneficium sit certum. — Confessio August. 1540. *De Fide, Sylloge Confessionum*, Oxf. 1827, p. 182.

Thus then it was ruled, that the peculiar significance of St. Paul's language, and of the Lutheran use of it, implied, not an opposition of faith to charity, or of faith to holiness, but an opposition of the merits of Christ to the merits of man, of the mercy of God to the claims which a sinner might suppose himself to have for acceptance in God's presence.

Still it was clear that, in some sense, *faith* was made the *instrument* or *formal* cause of justification. And the question still remained, Had such faith love in it, or was it to be considered as apart from love? We have seen that Luther declared that justifying faith had not love in it till it had justified; and to his definitions some of the Lutherans adhered, though he may himself afterwards have in some degree modified them.

Melancthon and the moderate Lutherans appear to have spoken rather differently. Melancthon says, that "no doubt there are love and other graces in faith; but that, when St. Paul says, 'we are justified by faith,' he means, not by the virtue of that grace, but by the mercy of God, for the sake of the Mediator."¹ The Confession of Augsburg declares, that "faith cannot exist except in those who repent;" that "among good works, the chief is faith, which produces many other virtues, which cannot exist till faith has been conceived in the heart."² Again, it reconciles St. James and St. Paul, by explaining that St. James speaks of a mere historical faith, whilst St. Paul speaks of reliance on God's mercy in Christ.³ It distinctly asserts, that faith brings forth good works, and quotes with approbation the words of St. Ambrose, *Fides bonæ voluntatis et justæ actionis genitrix est.*⁴ All then, but a few of the more rigid Lutherans, agreed that it was a living, not a dead faith, a faith full of good works, not a bare and historical assent to truth, which justified the soul. Still, the question remained, Was it *fides, quæ viva est*, or, *fides qua viva est*, (*i. e.* faith, which is living, or faith, because it is living,) which justifies? Some thought, that if it were considered as justifying because it was living, then there would be some merit attached to that which quickened it, or which

¹ Concedo in fiducia inesse dilectionem, et hanc virtutem et plerasque alias adesse oportere; sed cum dicimus, Fiducia sumus justi, non intelligatur nos propter virtutis istius dignitatem, sed per misericordiam recipi propter Mediatorem, quem tamen oportet fide apprehendi. Ergo hoc dicimus correlative.—Melancth. *Loci Theolog. de Argum. Advers.* p. 284. Laurence, *B. L.* p. 332. Newman, *Justific.* p. 10.

² Nec existere fides potest nisi in his qui pœnitentiam agunt, quia fides consolatur corda in contritione et terroribus peccati . . . Inter bona opera, præcipuum est et summus cultus Dei fides ipsa, et parit multas alias virtutes, quæ existere non possunt, nisi prius corda fidem conceperint.—*Confess. August. Syll. Conf.* p. 83.

³ *Sylloge Conf.* pp. 181, 182.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 183.

showed it to be alive, *i. e.* to charity. “Modes were invented of explaining the difficulty, which savoured more of metaphysical subtlety than of practical wisdom, such as that mentioned by Bishop Bull: “Faith justifies, pregnant with good works, but not as yet having given birth to them.”¹

Bucer, a divine, who had some concern in our own Reformation, and whose opinions are therefore particularly interesting to us, seems to have been very moderate on this subject. He expresses his regret that language should be used concerning faith alone, to the exclusion of holiness, such as to offend well-meaning men. He considers that no one should object to the additions of *viva* or *formata* as applied to justifying faith; since it is plain that St. Paul spoke of a living faith as justifying, and only meant to exclude self-righteousness.²

Several controversies concerning justification arose among the Lutherans, even in the lifetime of Luther. Osiander, A. D. 1550, broached some opinions, the exact nature of which it may be difficult to define. They appear to have been chiefly, “that faith does not justify by applying and embracing the righteousness of the Man Christ, but by uniting to Christ, who then by His Divine nature dwells in the heart, and that this union both justifies before God, and sanctifies the sinner.” There was probably, however, something more than this, or it would hardly have excited the vehement opposition of so mild a man as Melancthon.³

Of a very different kind were the errors of Agricola, (A. D. 1538,) who is accused of having carried the doctrine of *faith alone* to its most noxious extreme. He is esteemed the founder of the Antinomians; and is said to have held that all licentiousness and sin were allowable, if only Christ was received and embraced by a lively faith. He was vigorously opposed by Luther.⁴

To proceed from the Lutheran to the Calvinistic reformers: they appear for the most part to have symbolized with Luther in his general statement concerning justification. They declared that *to justify* was a forensic term signifying to *remit sins*, and pronounce *righteous*.⁵ They said, that we receive this justification not by

¹ Bull, *Harm. Apostol.* Diss. Prior. vi.

² See especially on Psalm xi. quoted by Bull, *Harm. Apostol.* Diss. Post. II. 8.

³ Mosh. *Ch. Hist.* Art. xvi. § III. part II. See also Calv. *Instit.* III. cap. xi. 5-11, who accuses him of opinions bordering on Manicheism.

⁴ Mosh. as above.

⁵ *Justificatio significat Apostolo in disputatione de Justificatione, peccata remittere, a culpa et pœna absolvere, in gratiam recipere, et justum pronunciare. — Confess. Helvet. Sylloge, p. 51.*

Nos justificationem simpliciter interpretamur acceptionem, qua nos Deus in gratiam receptos pro justis habet — Calvin, *Inst.* III. xi. 2.

works, but by faith in God's mercy; and because faith receives Christ, our righteousness, and ascribes all to God's grace in Christ, therefore justification is attributed to faith, and that chiefly because of Christ, not because it is any work of ours.¹ They considered it to consist especially in the imputation of our sins to Christ, and of Christ's righteousness to us; and strenuously denied that justification was in consequence of any internal sanctification wrought in us by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, and the faith which He inspires.² They denied that justification was of faith and works conjoined.³ But when the question arose, Is the faith which justifies to be considered as alone, and *informis*, or lively, and full of good works, (*formata*)? they seem to have decided that it was the latter and not the former. Although Calvin complained that the distinction was nugatory, inasmuch as faith never could exist apart from the holiness which it produces.⁴

Our own reformers soon embraced the doctrine of Luther, with such modifications as their own wisdom suggested. In the Articles set forth in 1536, justification is defined to signify remission of sins and acceptance into the favour of God. We are said to attain this justification for the only mercy and grace of the Father, freely for Jesus Christ's sake, through contrition and faith joined with charity;⁵ language which is repeated in the *Institution of a Christian Man*.⁶

As on other subjects, the English reformers' views grew more fixed and definite after the death of Henry VIII. The Homily of Salvation, and the 11th Article of 1552, expressed definitively the judgment of Cranmer and his companions on justification. The 11th Article, as drawn by them, ran thus: "Justification by

¹ *Sylloge*, p. 52.

² Deus nos justificat non imputans nobis peccata, sed imputans Christi nobis justitiam. *Sylloge*, p. 52.

Hinc et illud conficitur, sola intercessionis justitiæ Christi nos obtinere ut coram Deo justificemur. Quod perinde valet ac si diceretur hominem non in seipso justum esse, sed quia Christi justitia imputatione cum illo communicatur: quod accurata animadversione dignum est. Siquidem evanescit nugamentum illud, ideo justificari hominem fide, quoniam illa Spiritum Dei participat quo justus redditur: quod magis est contrarium superiori doctrinæ quam ut conciliari unquam queat. Neque enim dubium, quin sit inops propriæ justitiæ, qui justitiam extra seipsum quærere docetur. — Calv. *Inst.* III. xi. 23.

³ Calv. *Inst.* III. xi. 13, 14.

⁴ Quapropter loquimur in hac causa, non de ficta fide, de inani et otiosa et mortua, sed de viva, vivificanteque, quæ propter Christum, qui vita est et vivificat, quem comprehendit, viva est et dicitur, ac se vivam esse vivis declarat operibus. Nihil itaque contra hanc nostram doctrinam pugnat Jacobus ille, qui de fide loquitur inani et mortua, quam quidam jactabant, Christum autem intra se viventem per fidem non habebant. — *Confess. Helvet. Sylloge*, p. 53. See also Calvin, *Inst.* III. ii. 8, quoted above.

⁵ *Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII.* Oxford, p. 12.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 209.

only faith in Jesus Christ, in that sense as it is declared in the Homily of Justification, is a most certain and wholesome doctrine for Christian men." The Article as it stands now is somewhat differently worded, but probably conveys the same sense. Both send us to the "Homily of Justification" as the interpreter of the sense in which the Church of England understands "Justification by faith;" and therefore the definitions of this homily, if we can discover them, are the definitions of the Anglican Church concerning this debated point. There is no homily entitled the Homily of Justification, but the Homily of Salvation treats expressly of justification; and it has therefore always been understood, either that this homily alone, or this conjoined with that which precedes and that which follows it, is the homily referred to in the Article.

The Article itself, as it now stands, appears to speak very much the language of Melancthon and the Confession of Augsburg; for its statement of the doctrine of justification by faith is, that "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings." This is language very similar to that of Melancthon, quoted above, who considered justification by faith, and salvation by grace, to be correlative terms; and to that of the Confession of Augsburg, which calls justification by faith a *Paulina figura* for remission of sins by mercy, for the sake of Christ. For further explanation the Article sends us to the homily, which teaches as follows.

It begins by defining justification to be "the forgiveness of sins and trespasses." "This justification or righteousness, which we so receive of God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, allowed, and accepted for our perfect and full justification. . . . God sent His Son into the world to fulfil the Law for us, and by shedding of His most precious Blood, to make a sacrifice and satisfaction, or (as it may be called) amends to His Father for our sins, to assuage His wrath and indignation conceived against us for the same. Insomuch that infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made His children, and inheritors of His Kingdom of Heaven. And they which in act or deed do sin after baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort that there remaineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation. This is that justification of righteousness which St. Paul speaketh of when he saith, *No man is justified by the works of the*

law, but freely, by faith in Jesus Christ. Gal. ii. . . . The Apostle toucheth specially three things, which must go together in our justification. Upon God's part, His great mercy and grace : upon Christ's part, justice, that is, the satisfaction of God's justice . . . upon our part, true and lively faith in the merits of Jesus Christ, which yet is not ours, but God's working in us . . . Therefore St. Paul declareth here nothing upon the behalf of man concerning his justification, but only a true and lively faith, which nevertheless is the gift of God, and not man's only work without God. And yet

How it is to be understood that faith justifieth without works.

that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread and the fear of God, to be joined with faith, in every man that is justified, but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that, although they be

all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether ; nor the faith also doth not shut out the justice of our good works, necessarily to be done afterwards of duty towards God : (for we are most bounden to serve God in doing good deeds, commanded by Him, in His holy Scripture, all the days of our life :) but it excludeth them, so that we may not do them to this intent, to be made just by doing of them." ¹

Again — " The true understanding of the doctrine, we be justified freely by faith without works, or that we be justified by faith in Christ only, is not that this our own act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth justify us, and deserve our justification unto us (for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue which is within ourselves) ; but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that although we hear God's word and believe it ; although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread and fear of God within us, and do never so many good works thereunto ; yet we must renounce the merit of all said virtues, of faith, hope, charity, and all other virtues and good deeds which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak and insufficient and imperfect to deserve remission of our sins and our justification ; and therefore we must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace and remission, as well of our original sin in baptism, as of all actual sin committed by us after our baptism, if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to Him again. So that as St. John the Baptist, although he was never so virtuous and godly a man, yet in this matter of forgiveness of sin, he did put the peo-

¹ First Part of the *Homily of Salvation*.

ple from him, and appointed them to Christ, saying thus unto them: *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world*, John i.; even so, as great and godly a virtue as the lively faith is, yet it putteth us from itself, and remitteth or appointeth us unto Christ, for to have only by Him remission of our sins, or justification. So that our faith in Christ (as it were) saith unto us thus: It is not I that take away your sins, but it is Christ only; and to Him only I send you for that purpose, forsaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works, and only putting your trust in Christ.”¹

It is plain that the doctrine contained in these extracts (from a homily which has unusual authority, as being virtually assented to by every one who signs the Articles) is briefly as follows. That, which the English reformers meant by justification by faith, is, that we can never deserve anything at God’s hands by our own works, — that therefore we must owe our salvation only to the free mercy of God, who, for the sake of His Son Jesus Christ, pardons and accepts all infants who are baptized in His name, and all persons who sin after baptism, when by His grace they are brought to repentance and conversion, — that justification is especially assigned to faith, not because of any peculiar excellence in faith itself, but rather because faith sends us from itself to Christ, and because by it we apprehend Christ and rest upon Him only for acceptance with God, — that, though therefore we ascribe justification to faith only, it is not meant that justifying faith either is or can be without its fruits, but that it is ever pregnant and adorned with love, and hope, and holiness.

Language in strict conformity with this was uniformly held by those who had the chief hand in drawing up the Articles and compiling the Liturgy, and is to be found in those semi-authoritative documents which were from time to time set forth by them.²

¹ Second Part of *Homily of Salvation*. Also concerning the difference between a dead and living faith, and the reconciliation of St. Paul and St. James, see Part 3. See also the conclusion of the 3d part of the *Homily on Prayer*; the 2d part of the *Homily on Almsdeeds*, near the middle; the conclusion of the second *Homily of the Passion*, and particularly the whole of the *Homilies of Faith and Good Works*.

² We may refer particularly to the following: Cranmer’s *Catechism*, Oxf. pp. 98, 114, 115, 143, 205; Cranmer’s *Works*; ed. Jenkyns, Oxf. 11. p. 121, 111. 553.

Justification is thus briefly explained in Edw. VI.’s Catechism: “As oft as we use to say that we are made righteous and saved by faith only, it is meant thereby, that faith or rather trust alone, doth lay hand upon, understand, and perceive our righteous making to be given us of God freely: that is to say, by no deserts of our own, but by the free grace of the Almighty Father. Moreover, faith doth engender in us the love of our neighbour, and such works as God is pleased withal. For if it be a true and lively faith, quickened by the Holy Ghost, she is the mother of all good saying and doing And although good works

Owing to the unhappy divisions of later times in the Church of England, there has been no small difference among her divines on this head of justification; a difference, however, which there is good reason to hope is rather apparent in scholastic and logical definitions, than in its bearing on vital truth or practical godliness.

The great Hooker wrote a treatise on Justification, in which he strongly impugns the doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning justification by infusion of righteousness, and maintains the principle of imputation, distinguishing the righteousness of justification as external to us, the righteousness of sanctification as internal.¹

Bishop Bull in his *Harmonia Apostolica* admits that sense of justification by faith, which, he says, all the sounder Protestants have attached to it, namely, Salvation by grace only. He takes justification in the forensic sense, the meritorious cause of which is Christ, the instrument or formal cause being *fides formata*, or faith accompanied by good works.²

Dr. Barrow, in the first five of his Sermons on the Creed, discusses the nature of faith and justification with great learning and moderation. Justification he shows to be a forensic term, to be given for the sake of Christ, to be the result of God's mere mercy, apart from our deserts; yet he considers baptism and faith to be the conditions of justification, and faith to include its effects. Faith is a hearty reception of the Gospel, first exerting itself by open avowal in baptism, to which time therefore the act of justification especially pertains. Yet too every dispensation of pardon granted upon repentance may be also termed justification. Hence every

cannot deserve to make us righteous before God, yet do they so cleave unto faith, that neither can faith be found without them, nor good works be anywhere without faith."—(*Enchiridion Theolog.* i. p. 25.)

So Noel's Catechism: Ad Dei misericordiam confugiendum est qua gratis nos in Christo nullo nostro merito nec operum respectu, amore et benevolentia complectitur; tum peccata nobis nostra condonans, tum justitia Christi per Fidem in ipsum ita nos donans ut ob eam, perinde ac si nostra esset, ipsi accepti simus . . . *M.* Non ergo inter hujus justitiæ causas Fidem principem locum tenere dicis, ut ejus merito nos ex nobis justii coram Deo habeamur? *A.* Nequaquam: id enim esset Fidem in Christi locum substituere . . . *M.* Verum an a bonis operibus ita separari hæc justitia potest, ut qui hanc habet, illis careat? *A.* Nequaquam . . . *M.* Justitiam ergo, Fidem, ac bona opera, natura coherentia esse dicis, quæ proinde non

magis distrahi debeant quam Christus illorum in nobis auctor a seipso divelli possit.—*Enchirid. Theolog.* i. p. 282.

Jewel's *Apology*: Itaque unicum receptum nostrum et perfugium esse ad misericordiam Patris nostri per Jesum Christum, ut certo animis nostris persuadeamus illum esse propitiationem pro peccatis nostris; ejus sanguine omnes labes nostras deletas esse . . . Quamvis autem dicamus nihil nobis esse præsidii in operibus et factis nostris, et omnis salutis nostræ rationem constituamus in solo Christo, non tamen ea causa dicimus laxæ et solute vivendum esse, quasi tingi tantum et credere, satis sit homini Christiano, et nihil ab eo aliud expectetur. Vera Fides viva est, nec potest esse otiosa.—*Enchirid. Theolog.* pp. 181, 182.

¹ *Discourse on Justification, &c. Works*, III. pt. II. p. 601. Oxf. 1836.

² Bull's *Harm. Apost. and Examen Censuræ. Works*, Oxf. III. IV.

person is justified freely for Christ's sake at his baptism, continues justified whilst he is in a state of lively faith, and returns to a state of justification, if he have fallen from it, by repentance.¹

Dr. Waterland, in a very able tract on the same subject, argues, that the causes of justification are (1) the moving cause, God's grace and goodness; (2) the meritorious cause, Christ; (3) the efficient cause, the Holy Spirit — that its instruments are (1) baptism; (2) faith — that its conditions are, (1) faith; (2) obedience.²

Mr. Alexander Knox, a writer of great originality and piety, expressed himself unable to believe the protestant doctrine of justification. The forensic sense of the word seemed to him too like a legal fiction: and he could not believe that God could pronounce any one just, or account any one righteous, who had really no such inherent quality as justice or righteousness. Accordingly, he solved the difficulty by asserting that God pronounces those righteous by justification, whom He has already made so by sanctification.³

In still later days, Mr. Faber has written an able work to prove that in the earliest Christian writers, from Clement of Rome downwards, the word justification is used strictly in its forensic sense, and that justification is ascribed to faith alone.⁴

Lastly, not very long before his secession to the Church of Rome, Mr. Newman published a most logical treatise, in which he professes to steer a middle course between the Roman and the Lutheran doctrines. He takes the forensic sense of the term justification — and asserts, that it is conferred in baptism, is maintained by faith, and consists in the indwelling of the Spirit of God, and the being made members of the Body of Christ.⁵

Whatever speculative differences may have existed of late or in times gone by, it is no small comfort to know, that it has been allowed by all that fallen man cannot of himself become worthy of eternal salvation, that he stands in need both of pardoning mercy and sanctifying grace, that this mercy and this grace have been procured for him by the all-prevailing merits of the Redeemer, and that these blessings, offered to all, may be appropriated to the individual believer by that faith which the Holy Spirit will implant, and which must produce love and holiness and all good fruits. The

¹ *Works*, fol. Vol. II. especially Sermons IV. v.

² Waterland, *On Justification*, *Works*.
Van Mildert, IX. p. 427

³ Knox's *Remains*.

⁴ Faber's *Primitive Doctrine of Justification*.

⁵ Newman, *On Justification*; see especially Lect. III. VI. IX.

divines of Trent and their most extreme antagonists have denied none of these propositions.

SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

I. SENSE of the word *Justification*.

The word which we render *just* or *righteous* (namely, *δίκαιος*, or in the Hebrew *יָדָיִק*) has two principal significations: the one popular, the other accurate. In its popular signification, it is nearly equivalent to *good, holy, pious*, (*ἀγαθος, εὐσεβής, רָצִיךְ*); and is used commonly of men, who are living a pious and upright life, not according to the perfect standard of the law of God, but subject to such imperfection and impurity as is common to man. Examples of this usage may be found in the following, among many other passages: Gen. vi. 9. Ps. xxxvii. 12. Prov. iv. 18; xxiv. 16. Matt. i. 19; x. 41; xxiii. 29. Mark vi. 20. Luke ii. 25. Acts x. 22. James v. 16. In its more accurate sense, *δίκαιος* signifies absolutely, strictly, and perfectly righteous or just, without defect or impurity, like the holy Angels, or like God Himself. As for instance, in Job ix. 2. Matt. xxvii. 19. Luke xxiii. 47. Rom. ii. 13; iii. 10. 1 Tim. i. 9. In which, as in most similar passages, the word particularly seems to express *innocent, not guilty*, with reference to a tribunal of justice, or question of crime. The same distinction is equally observable in the substantive *righteousness* (*יָדָיִק דִּיקַיִסִּינָה*); which at one time stands for strict and perfect justice, (as in Acts xvii. 31. Rom. iii. 5. Rev. xix. 11, &c.); at other times for such goodness, holiness, or good deeds, as men under the grace of God are capable of (as in Ps. xv. 2. Isai. xxxii. 17. Matt. v. 10, 20; vi. 33. Acts xiii. 10. Rom. vi. 18, 19, 20; viii. 10; xiv. 17. Eph. v. 9; vi. 14. Heb. xii. 11).

The verb *δικαίωω*, which strictly corresponds with the Hebrew causative verb *יָדָיִק*, and is translated in English “to justify,” in some degree partakes of the ambiguity of the adjective, from which it is formed; yet, not so as, fairly considered, to introduce much difficulty into the doctrine of which we have to treat.

1. The literal signification of the verb, whether in Hebrew or in Greek, is “to make righteous.” It may therefore, of course, be used for something like an infusion of righteousness into the mind

or character of a man ; and the passive may signify the possession of that righteousness so infused ; and such a sense appears probably to belong to it in Rev. xxii. 11, " He that is righteous, let him be righteous still " (ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοθήτω, in some MSS. from a gloss δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω.)¹

2. But a very slight examination of the question can scarcely fail to convince us, that the commoner use of this verb in the Scriptures is in the sense of a judicial sentence ; and

(1) It signifies to execute a judicial act, in the general, towards a person, and to do him right, whether in acquitting or in condemning him. Thus in 2 Sam. xv. 4 : " Oh ! that I were made a judge in the land, that every man which hath any suit or cause might come unto me, (וְהִצְדַּקְתִּי וְכִי דִקְאוֹסָא אֶתְּוֹן) and I would *justify* him," that is, do him right.

So Ps. lxxxii. 3 : " Defend the poor and the fatherless, *justify* (וְהִצְדַּקְתֶּם דִּקְאוֹסָא) the poor and needy," *i. e.* do them right.

(2) Especially it signifies to pronounce sentence in a man's favour, acquit him, free him from punishment. Deut. xxv. 1 : " The judges . . . shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked."

1 Kings viii. 32. 2 Chron. vi. 23 : " Then hear Thou in Heaven, and do, and judge Thy servants, condemning the wicked, to bring his way upon his head ; and justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness."

Prov. xvii. 15 : " He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination unto the Lord." So Exod. xxiii. 7. Psalm li. 4.

And so in the new Testament, Matt. xii. 37 : " By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned " (*i. e.* in the day of Judgment : see ver. 36).

(3) In consequence of this sense of the word *to justify*, it is sometimes used in general for to *approve* or *esteem* a person *just*. So Matt. xi. 19, " Wisdom is justified of her children." In Luke x. 29 ; xvi. 15, we read of people who " justified themselves." Luke xviii. 14, " The publican went home *justified*," (*i. e.* approved either by God or his own conscience,) " rather than the Pharisee." Luke vii. 29, " All the people justified God," (*i. e.* declared their approbation of God's dealings in the mission of John,) " being baptized with John's baptism."

¹ The following passages have also been thought to have the word in this sense, Job xxxv. 7, 8. Ezek. xvi. 52. Eccles. xviii. 22 ; xxxi. 5. but perhaps without sufficient ground :

(4) So again, *to justify* is used for *to free from burdens or obligations*, such as the obligations which a particular law imposes on us, as Rom. vi. 7, “He that is dead is freed from sin” (literally is “justified,” *δεδικαίωται*).

It appears, then, that in passages where the word “to justify” occurs with no particular reference to the doctrine of this Article, it is almost always used in a sense more or less connected with the ideas of acquittal, pardon, acceptance, or approbation: *i. e.* in a forensic or judicial sense. It remains to see, whether this is the sense in which St. Paul uses it, when directly and especially treating on justification by faith. Now this will appear, if we consider and compare the following passages. In Rom. v. 9, we read, “Being justified by His Blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him.” With this compare Eph. i. 7, “in whom we have redemption through His Blood, *the forgiveness of sins.*” Again, if we compare Rom. iii. 24, 25, 26, we cannot fail to conclude that *justification* is a synonym for *remission of sins*. “Being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness *for the remission of sins* that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.”

Then the word *justify* is used as equivalent to *count or impute righteousness* and to *cover sin*. This appears plainly from Rom. iv. 5, 6, 7.

Again, by comparing Rom. v. 9 with Rom. v. 10, it seems that to *justify* is synonymous with *to reconcile with God*; for *πολλῶ μᾶλλον δικαιωθέντες*, “much more being justified,” in the one verse, answers to *πολλῶ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες*, “much more being reconciled,” in the other.

Once more, *justification* is directly opposed to *condemnation*, as in Rom. v. 18, “By the offence of one (judgment came) upon all men to *condemnation*, even so by the righteousness of One (the free gift came) upon all men unto *justification* of life.”¹ Again, in

¹ It has been argued, (Bellarm. *De Justif.* l. 2, c. 3.) that as Adam’s sin was *infused* into his posterity, so this passage must mean that in justification Christ’s righteousness is *infused* into His disciples. To which it has been replied, (Barrow, 11. Sermon v. p. 80.) that justification and condemnation being “both acts of God, and it being plain that God con-

demning doth not infuse any inherent unrighteousness into man, neither doth He justifying (formally) (if the antithesis must be pat) put any inherent righteousness into him: inherent unrighteousness in the former case may be a consequent of that condemnation, and inherent righteousness may be connected with this justification; but neither *that* nor *this*

Rom. viii. 33, 34, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that *justifieth*. Who is he that *condemmeth*?"¹

But which is more important than the comparison of particular passages, if we consider the whole course of St. Paul's reasoning in the earlier chapters of the Romans, we must be led to conclude that by justification he means acquittal from guilt and acceptance with God. He begins by proving that all men, Jews and Gentiles, are *condemned* by the law (whether of Moses or of nature) under which they lived (Rom. i. ii.) He shows from the Law itself that the Jews as well as the Gentiles were guilty before God (Rom. iii. 9-19); and that therefore all the world (if the Gospel be not taken into account) are lying under God's wrath and subject to His condemnation. And this course of reasoning leads him to the conclusion, that if we would have *justification* at all it must be not by the works of law, but by the faith of Christ (Rom. iii. 20). Now in such a connection, what must justification mean? Man subject to the law (whether revealed or natural) had so much sinned as to be subject to *condemnation*. The thing to be desired was his *justification*; which justification could be only by the free grace of God through Christ. Surely then that *justification* must mean pardon for the sins which he had committed, and deliverance from the condemnation into which his sins had thrown him.

This is further shown immediately afterwards by the case and the language of saints of the old Testament. Abraham was justified (or as it is explained, "accounted righteous") by faith, not by his own good works and deservings. And David looks on a state of blessedness as one in which a man has "his iniquities forgiven, and his sins covered" (Rom. iv. 1-8). The thing then which all the world needed, and which could be obtained only through God's mercy in Christ, was covering of sin, and forgiveness of iniquity. This therefore must be what St. Paul means by the term *Justification*.

II. Sense of the word *Faith*.

Having arrived at a conclusion as to the sense of the words *jus-*

may formally signify those qualities respectively: as the inherent unrighteousness consequent upon Adam's sin is not included in God's condemning, so neither is the inherent righteousness proceeding from our Saviour's obedience contained in God's justifying men."

¹ The antithesis is not in the least degree altered, if the punctuation and trans-

lation of this passage, which is more probably correct, be adopted. *Τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ; Θεὸς ὁ δικαίων; τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Χριστὸς ὁ ἀποθάνων, κ. τ. λ.:* "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? Shall God who justifieth? Who is he that condemneth? Is it Christ, who died, &c.?"

tify and *justification*, it becomes necessary, in order to appreciate the meaning of the words *Justification by faith*, and the doctrine expressed by those words, to examine the usages of the term *faith* in Scripture, and especially in the writings of St. Paul.

According to its derivation the word should mean persuasion of the truth of anything. But this does not decide its force as a theological virtue, still less its signification in the peculiar language of St. Paul. There can be little doubt that it is used in very different senses in different parts of Scripture.

For example : —

1. It is used to signify truth or good faith (like $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ *fides*) in Matt. xxiii. 23, “the weightier matters of the Law, judgment, mercy, and *faith* ;” and in Rom. iii. 3 : “Shall their unbelief make the *faith* (or faithfulness) of God without effect ?”

2. It is used of the assurance given by one person to another, Acts xvii. 31, “whereof He hath given *assurance* unto all men” ($\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$).

3. It is used as a term to designate the Christian Religion, “the faith” or “the faith of Christ.” So Acts vi. 7, “were obedient to the faith.” Acts xiii. 8, “seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith.” Rom. i. 5, “for obedience to the faith among all nations,” $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\upsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\eta\gamma$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ $\tau\omicron\iota\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\theta\eta\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\iota$ (*i. e.* to convert all nations to the Christian Religion). So xvi. 26. Comp. Eph. iii. 17 ; iv. 5. Phil. i. 25. 1 Tim. iv. 1. Tit. i. 1, 4. James ii. 1. Jude, 3, 20. Rev. ii. 13 ; xiv. 12. In this sense St. Paul appears especially to use it in his Epistle to the Galatians ; where perhaps we may consider, that in his constant antithesis of Law and Faith, he is contrasting the Law of Moses, or the Religion of the Jews, with the Faith of Christ, or the Religion of the Gospel. Some of the more obvious usages of the word in this sense in the Epistle to the Galatians are in the following : Gal. i. 23, “now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed,” iii. 23, “Before faith came ($\pi\rho\acute{o}$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\tau\eta\eta$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$), we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed” ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\tau\eta\eta$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\upsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\phi\theta\eta\gamma\eta$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$). The same sense is apparent in the whole context (vv. 24, 25, 26) ; where it is taught us, that both Jews and Gentiles become children of God by the faith (*i. e.* by embracing the religion or Gospel) of Jesus Christ, having put on Christ by being baptized into Him.

Accordingly, Gal. vi. 10, we read of Christians as being $\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, servants of the Gospel, domestics of the Christian faith.¹

¹ So $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is used for “true religion,” Ps. lxxxvi. 11.

4. There are passages in the Epistles in which it seems plain that faith is spoken of as separable from its results, as an assent to Christian truth without the heart being duly moved by it, and so the life corresponding with it. That is to say, faith is used in that sense which the schoolmen called *fides informis*.

Thus St. Peter (2 Pet. i. 5) bids men “*add to their faith virtue*” and all other Christian graces, as though faith might be considered as apart from other graces. St. Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 2) speaks of a faith strong enough to move mountains, and yet capable of being conceived of as without charity, and so of no value; and in the same chapter (ver. 13) speaks of faith, hope, charity, as three distinct graces, two of which shall pass away, and one, namely, charity, shall abide; and declares this charity to be the greatest of the three. Especially St. James (ii. 14–26) considers the case of faith without works, and declares such a faith unable to justify.

5. Yet, on the other hand, since it is the nature of faith to open the eye of the mind to things spiritual, and to bring home to it the view of Heaven, and hell, of God’s justice and mercy, of man’s liability to judgment, and Christ’s Atonement and Mediation; therefore it is most commonly spoken of as an operative and active principle, “purifying the heart” (Acts xv. 9), and “working by love” (Gal. v. 6). Accordingly, in Heb. xi. St. Paul attributes to the energy of faith all the holiness and heroism of the saints and martyrs in times of old.

6. Especially, as the principal subjects of God’s revelations are His promises, therefore faith came to mean *πεποιθῆσιν*, *fiducia*, reliance on the truth of God’s promises, or trust in His mercy and grace.

Of such a nature was that faith which gave men strength to benefit by the miraculous powers of Christ and His Apostles, Matt. ix. 2, 22: “Thy faith hath made thee whole.” Acts xiv. 9, St. Paul perceived that the cripple at Lystra “had faith to be healed.” See also, Matt. viii. 16; ix. 29; xvii. 20; xxi. 21. Mark ii. 5; iv. 40; v. 34; x. 52; xi. 22. Luke v. 20; vii. 9; viii. 25, 48; xvii. 5, 6; xviii. 42. Acts iii. 16. Jam. v. 15.

So St. James speaks of “praying in faith, nothing wavering” (James i. 6), that is, praying in a spirit of trust in God and reliance on His promises. St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 9) tells us to resist the devil “stedfast in the faith,” *i. e.* steadily relying on the help of God. Of such a nature seems to be “the shield of faith” (Eph. vi. 16), which can “quench the fiery darts of the wicked one.” So we read of “faith and patience,” of “the patience and faith of the saints,”

(Rev. ii. 19; xiii. 10), evidently signifying their resignation and *trust* in God under trials and afflictions. So perhaps we may say that in the above-cited eleventh of Hebrews, faith is represented as a full conviction that what God had promised He was able and willing to perform; hence a trust or reliance on God's truth and promises, by which men overcame earthly temptations and difficulties, despised the world, and fought a good fight. See especially vv. 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19, 26, 27.

Thus much of *faith* generally. The question next arises, In what sense does St. Paul use the word when he speaks of faith as justifying? Is justifying faith a bare historical assent? Is it but a synonym for the religion of Christ? Is it trust and confidence in God? Is it to be considered, as full of its fruits and lively in its operation, or apart from all such, or at least prior to them?

Let us examine those passages of Scripture, whether St. Paul's or not, in which it is certain or probable that faith and justification are considered together, and see what attributes are assigned to the faith so spoken of.

Justifying faith then is:—

1. The work and gift of God.

Matt. xvi. 17. John vi. 29, 44, 45. Phil. i. 29.

2. The character of the regenerate.

Compare Gal. v. 6, with Gal. vi. 15; whence it will appear that regeneration and justifying faith are used convertibly.

3. The sign of regeneration.

1 John v. 1: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God," his faith being the proof of his regeneration.

4. It is seated in the heart, not merely in the understanding.

Rom. x. 10: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness."

5. Is not dead.

See James ii. 14-26; which proves clearly that, if faith is dead and so without works, it does not profit.

6. But, on the contrary, is a full conviction of the truth of God's promises and reliance on them.

See Heb. xi. 19, where Abraham's faith, when he offered up Isaac, is described as an "accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead;" which is the very example adduced by St. Paul, when he is specially treating on the subject of justifying faith (Rom. iv. 18-20), and by St. James, when he is rectifying errors on the same important subject (James ii. 23, &c.)

7. It worketh by love.

Gal. v. 6; where we read that that which “*availeth*” (*i. e.* justifieth) “in Christ Jesus,” is “faith which worketh by love.”

8. Accordingly it sanctifies.

Acts xxvi. 18: “That they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are *sanctified by faith that is in Me.*”

9. It purifies the heart.

Acts xv. 9: “Purifying their hearts by faith.”

10. It overcomes the world.

1 John v. 4: “This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.”

Compare Hebrews xi., throughout the whole of which we have a description of faith as that which overcomes the world. And with this again compare (as before) Rom. iv.; where the same kind of reasoning is used, and the same example adduced concerning *justifying* faith, as in Heb. xi. concerning faith *in the general*.

11. It is evidently connected with its results, and by a kind of *synecdoche* considered as containing them,¹ or pregnant with them.

This will plainly appear, if we examine the three passages in which Abraham's faith is said to have been imputed to him for righteousness, *i. e.* to have been justifying.

Those three passages are Gen. xv. 6. Rom. iv. James ii. 21–23, to which may be added Heb. xi. 8–10.

In Gen. xv. we read of God's promise to Abraham, that he should have a son in his old age, whose seed should be as the stars of heaven for multitude. And unlikely as this was, and against all natural probability, Abraham “believed in the Lord; and He counted it to him for righteousness,” ver. 6.

In Rom. iv. St. Paul quotes this instance of Abraham's faith, and illustrates it thus (ver. 18–22): “Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations; according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb; he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness.”

Now St. James (ii. 21–23) reasons on the subject thus: “Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scrip-

¹ See Barrow.

ture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God."

And similar effects of his faith St. Paul himself speaks of, Heb. xi. 8: "By faith, Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, *obeyed*; and he went out, not knowing whither he went."

See also verses 9-12.

From all which passages it is sufficiently apparent, that when the Scriptures speak of the *faith* of Abraham, which *justified* him, they understand by it a faith of such nature that a man is persuaded by it to disregard all earthly considerations, and to resign himself, contrary to all his worldly interests, to obedient conformity with the will of God.

12. As it was seen of faith in general, that it had special reference to the promises and mercies of God, so it will be found that *justifying faith* has special reference to the Person, sufferings, and mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to God's promises in Him. For example, John iii. 14, 15: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." John vi. 40: "This is the will of Him that sent Me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life." Ver. 47: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me hath everlasting life." Acts x. 43: "Through His Name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." xvi. 31: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Rom. iii. 25, 26: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of Him which believeth in Jesus." x. 9: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." See also John i. 12; iii. 16, 18, 36; v. 24; vi. 29, 35; xi. 25, 26; xvi. 27; xvii. 25. Acts xiii. 38, 39; xx. 21. Rom. iii. 22; iv. 5, 24; x. 4. Philem. 5. 1 John iii. 23; v. 1.

So much indeed is this the character of faith, (at least of that active faith which, as we have seen, is the faith which justifies,) that by it Christ is said to dwell in the heart. Ephes. iii. 17: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." And so it not

only has reference to the work of Christ for us, but it is both the proof of Christ's dwelling in us, and the instrument whereby He dwells in us.

III. General View of *Justification* in Scripture.

Having premised thus much concerning the meaning attached to the term Justification, and to the grace of justifying faith, by the inspired writers in the new Testament, we may now perhaps proceed to state more fully and formally the doctrine of Scripture concerning justification, or pardon and acceptance with God.

In the general, then, we may state concerning the justification of man, that

1. The *moving* cause is God's mercy.
2. The *meritorious* cause is Christ's Atonement.

But we know, that, notwithstanding the infinite mercy of God, and the fulness and all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, yet all men do not benefit by this grace. Therefore we learn that there is need of something internal to connect with the external work of our salvation; Christ in the heart connecting with Christ on the cross; the work of the Spirit to be united to the work of the Redeemer. Hence

3. The immediate efficient cause is the Holy Spirit, who moves the heart by His influences, leads to Christ, regenerates and renews.

4. The first instrument by which God conveys pardon, under ordinary circumstances, is Baptism. Hence this is the first instrument of justification. This will appear from the following.

Even John's baptism (*a fortiori* Christ's) was a "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," *i. e.* for justification. Mark i. 4. Luke iii. 3. When our Lord instituted His baptism, it was with the promise that all who so far believed the preaching of the Apostles as to embrace the faith of Christ and be baptized into it, "should be saved," Mark xvi. 16. When the Apostles were asked by their converts what they should do, they replied, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the *remission of sins*," Acts ii. 37, 38. After St. Paul's conversion to the faith, Ananias called on him to "arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins," Acts xxii. 16.

The Apostle couples being "*washed*" with "sanctified and justified," 1 Cor. vi. 11; speaks of the Church as "cleansed with the washing of water," Eph. v. 26; and places the "washing of regeneration" as a synonym or parallel with the "being justified,"

Tit. iii. 5, 7. See likewise Rom. vi. 4, 7. Col. ii. 12, 14. 1 Pet. iii. 21, &c.

Baptism is that which places us in a state of covenant with God, and hence, in St. Paul's words, is that in which "we put on Christ," and are esteemed "the children of God by the faith in Christ," Gal. iii. 26, 27. Hence a person receiving baptism is put in a position to receive from God the gifts which He has covenanted to give to us in His Son; and the first of those gifts is acceptance into His favour and remission of our sins, that is, justification.

5. The state of heart in which a man must be, who is accepted or justified, is a state of faith, Rom. x. 10. Eph. iii. 17. Accordingly, when justification is considered subjectively, or as connected with the state of the Christian's heart, the instrument is said to be faith. Faith, therefore, may be considered either as the *instrument*, or as the *state* of justification.

6. When a man is said by St. James to be justified *by works*; it is not because his works procure him acceptance meritoriously, but because they are the sign, and fruit, and necessary results of that sanctification by the Spirit which unites him to the Atonement of Christ, and are the necessary and inseparable concomitants — or, in fact, parts — of his faith, as much as light is part of the sun, or fruit is part of the tree which bears it.

Such may be fairly considered as a general view of the doctrine of justification as commonly taught in Scripture. But in order to a full investigation of this question, it is necessary to understand the peculiar signification attached by St. Paul to what may be considered his favorite formula, namely: —

IV. Justification by faith.

Now it is quite clear that St. Paul's great object in the Epistle to the Romans was to put down all *claims* on the part of man to reward, for services done by him to God. Accordingly, in the first three chapters he shows all men, whether Jews or Gentiles, to be *sinners*, and so *deserving*, not justification or acquittal, but condemnation. His conclusion is, that if we are saved, it must be by the merits of Christ or by free grace only; without any *claims* on our part on the score of desert. This truth he expresses under the formula of "Justification by faith."

Hence we conclude, that, in the language of St. Paul, "justification by faith," and "free salvation by grace," are (as it has been seen that Melancthon, the Confession of Augsburg, and our own Article and Homilies, teach) correlative or convertible expressions. The former means the latter.

That this is the case will appear more plainly, if we read connectedly but a very few of the passages in which St. Paul especially propounds his doctrine of justification, *e. g.* Rom. iii. 23, 24, 28: "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being *justified freely by His grace*, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom, &c. . . . therefore we conclude, that a man is *justified by faith* without the deeds of the law."

Eph. ii. 8: "By grace are ye saved through faith," &c.

Tit. iii. 4, 5, 7: "After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us . . . that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

So Rom. iv. 25; v. 1, 9, 16, 20, 21, compared together, clearly show the same thing. "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God," Rom. iv. 25; v. 1. "Much more then, being now justified by His Blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him," v. 9. "The judgment was by one to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification," ver. 16. "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ," vv. 20, 21.

But although we may readily come to the conclusion that justification by faith is little more than a synonymous expression for justification or salvation by free grace; yet we can scarcely doubt, that there is something in the nature of faith which especially qualifies it to be put in a formula to denote *grace* in opposition to *claims*.

Now this would be the case, if *faith* in the argument of the Epistle to the Romans meant nothing more than "the Christian Religion;" which it sometimes appears to mean, especially in the Epistle to the Galatians. For, as the religion of Christ is that by embracing which we embrace God's offers and promises of pardon, it might naturally be put to represent those promises and that grace by which pardon is given. But we can hardly conclude that this is the signification of justifying faith in the Epistle to the Romans; because St. Paul especially adduces the case of Abraham, as a subject of justifying faith (Rom. iv. 1, &c.). But Abraham could no more have been considered as justified by the Gospel or the religion of Christ, than any other person under the old dis-

pensation ; and could not have been spoken of, as living under the Gospel, in opposition to such as lived under the Law.

It should appear, therefore, that it is not Christ's religion, considered as a whole, which is meant by the Apostle when he speaks of *justifying faith* ; but that it is that special religious grace which is called faith, and the qualities of which we have lately investigated. Accordingly we must search for something in the nature of faith itself, or of its objects, which renders it fit to be put in the formula of St. Paul, as the representative of grace, and as opposed to self-justifying claims.

1. First then, faith is a state of heart in which a man is, and is not an enumeration of so many works or good deeds, which a man has done, and for which he may be supposed to claim reward. It therefore fitly and naturally represents a state of grace, in contradistinction to a state of claim, or self-justification. It is that state in which a man is who is regenerate, and so in union with Christ. Yet at the same time, as in the case of the penitent thief upon the cross, it may exist even before it can have brought forth external good works, and therefore obviously cannot recommend us to God on the score of meritorious services, which we have rendered to Him. It is therefore the symbol of acceptance by free mercy, apart from human claims.

2. Next, its character is to rely on the power and promises of God, and not on the strength or works of man. For the eye of faith, seeing Him who is invisible, contrasts His power with its own weakness. Hence it becomes nearly identified with trust (*fiducia*). Such emphatically was the character of Abraham's faith, so specially referred to by the Apostle, which led him to leave his country and sacrifice his son, because "he counted Him faithful who had promised." Hence faith becomes a fit symbol for renunciation of claims and deserts, and trust in God's mercy and pardoning grace.

3. Faith is, perhaps even more than other graces, clearly and obviously the gift of God. We know that we cannot force or contro. our own belief, and therefore feel that we require the eyes of our understanding to be enlightened by inspiration from above. Therefore again faith is less likely than other graces to be made a ground for boasting.

4. Lastly, although this may not be its exclusive object, yet its peculiar and principal object is Christ, and His Atonement and Mediation. Hence, according to Luther, faith is "full of Christ." Hence, according to a greater than Luther, "Christ dwells in our

hearts by faith." Hence faith, leading to Christ and looking to Christ, is, by a natural transition, spoken of in Scripture as if it were invested with attributes which are really above it, and as though it effected that of which it is but the instrument, and whose cause and Author is God in Christ.

To the belief indeed, that justifying faith, as spoken of by St. Paul, means merely a reliance on the Atonement, the often-adduced instance of Abraham seems at first sight opposed. For Abraham, whom St. Paul brings forward as the type of justifying faith, is not spoken of as having full confidence in the pardoning grace of Christ; but his faith, in the instance alluded to (Gen. xv. 5, 6), had reference to God's promise, that his seed should be as numerous as the stars of Heaven. It was *this* faith that was counted to him for righteousness; and, though it may be argued that there was in this promise of God concerning his offspring virtually contained a promise of the Messiah; yet it can hardly be said, that Abraham's belief that God would multiply his seed, meant a belief that he should himself be saved by the merits of Christ, and that, on this account, it was justifying faith.

We must then probably infer that some of the general characters of faith above referred to, rendered Abraham acceptable to God; and that so his faith was counted for righteousness. And this consideration certainly causes some little difficulty in our appreciation of the doctrine laid down by St. Paul. Still, if we examine the whole of his reasoning in the first five chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, we shall find that the great object on which he speaks of the Christian's faith as fixed is the work of Christ, and God's acceptance of us in Him. Even where he adduces the example of Abraham, and insists that Abraham was justified, not by his own merits, but by his faith; he concludes, that, in like manner, faith shall be imputed to us for righteousness, "if we believe in Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification" (Rom. iv. 24, 25). And the following chapter is all devoted to considering the reparation which the righteousness of Christ has made for the ruin which Adam's sin had produced.

It appears, therefore, that the faith of Abraham must have been alleged, rather as illustrative of, than as identical with, the faith of the Christian. It was of the same kind with the Christian's faith, in so far as all faith has the same general characters, and has therefore a similar acceptableness with God. But the peculiar faith of the Christian is that by which he apprehends Christ. **As**

the High-priest laid his hand upon the head of the scapegoat, and by confessing, conveyed the sins of the congregation to the scapegoat, that they might be taken away, so the believer lays his hand on the Head of the Great Sacrifice. He believes in the Redeemer of the world, and in God's love through Him. His soul rests upon his Saviour. His faith therefore is a bond of union with the incarnate Godhead; and so becomes the instrumental cause of justification in us; the meritorious cause of which is all in Christ.

And on this ground most especially it seems, that the Apostle, when labouring to show that human merit and human efforts must fail to bring us to God, and to render us acceptable to Him, produces, and insists so strongly on his peculiar statement of "Justification by faith."¹

V. Certain questions on the Doctrine of Justification.

1. Is justification an act or a state?

Some persons have decided that it is an act, taking place at a particular moment, never to be repeated. Others, that it is a state, which continues or is lost, as the case may be.

If it be the former, it must be limited either (1) to baptism, when, as has been shown, there is promise of remission of sins; or (2) to the moment which may be considered as the turning-point from a life of sin to a life of repentance, faith, and holiness, — a moment known only to God; or (3) to the day of Judgment, when the wicked shall be condemned, and the pious shall be absolved or justified. Either or all of these may be considered as the moment of transition from condemnation to justification, or pardon and acceptance.

But Scripture seems rather to represent justification, as a *state* of acceptance before God. It is quite certain, that some persons are represented as in favour, grace, or acceptance with God, that is justified; others as under His wrath, and liable to condemnation. The prophet Ezekiel (xxxiii. vv. 12-19) contrasts the condition

¹ This is excellently expressed in the following passage from Cardinal Toletus (in cap. iii. ad Roman. annot. 17) quoted by Bp. Forbes, *Considerationes Modestæ cœ Justificatione*, Lib. I. c. III. § 17: —

Quia nempe in fide magis manifestatur, hominem non propria virtute, sed Christi merito justificari: sicut enim in aspectu in serpentem Deus posuit sanitatem in deserto, quia aspectus magis indicabat, sanari virtute serpentis, non operis alicujus proprii aut medicinæ alicujus; ita fides ostendit, justificari peccatores vir-

tute et merito Christi, in quam credentes salvi fiunt, non propria ipsorum virtute et merito. Ea causa est cur fidei tribuitur (justificatio) maxime a S. Paulo qui a justificatione legis opera et humanum meritum aut efficaciam excludere, et in sola Christi virtute et merito collocare nitebatur: idcirco meminit fidei in Christum. Hoc nec pœnitentia nec dilectio nec spes habent. Fides enim immediatius ac distinctius in Eum fertur, cujus virtute justificamur.

of the righteous and the wicked, showing the one to be a condition of acceptance, the other of condemnation: the former continuing so long as the character continues the same, and lost as soon as that character is lost; the latter in like manner continuing, until the wickedness is forsaken and the life renewed, and then giving place to the former, the condition of favour or pardon. In like manner our Lord (John xv. 1-10) speaks of His disciples as clean through His word, and continuing so whilst they abide in Him; but if they abide not in Him, then to be cast forth as a branch, withered, and even burned (see especially vv. 3-6). Language just similar to this is used by St. Paul (see Rom. vi. 1, 2, 19; xi. 20, 21. Gal. v. 4. Col. i. 22, 23. Heb. x. 38, 39). From all which we can hardly fail to conclude that justification before God is a *state* in which a person continues so long as he continues united to Christ, abiding in Him, having Christ dwelling in his heart, being the subject of His grace, and of the sanctification of the Spirit.

If therefore the premises are correct, we may define justification to be a state of pardon and acceptance in the presence of God, bestowed upon us freely for Christ's sake, by the mercy of God, which is first given in baptism to all who receive that sacrament aright, which continues so long as the subject continues in a state of faith, which fails when he falls from the state of faith, and which is restored again when by grace and repentance he is restored to a state of faith. So that we may say, whilst in a state of faith, so long in a state of justification: whilst a believer, so long a justified person. Hence too, concerning the distinction drawn by Luther, that faith is *alone* when it justifies, and that after justification is effected, then come in charity, and good works, and holiness, we may infer that such a distinction can be true only when considered in the abstract, but not as a matter of practical experience. For practically and really, where there is acceptance, there is faith and sanctification, and, springing from them and reigning with them, are all the graces of a Christian's life.

2. It having been laid down, that faith (*facta operibus*) may be considered, either as the *state* or the *instrument* of justification, it may be a question, whether we ought to say that faith, or faith and good works, or faith and holiness, are the *condition* or *conditions* of justification.

The answer to this question, as given by many divines of high authority in the Church, has been in the affirmative. But the question is, whether or not we can deduce an affirmative answer from the Scripture. No doubt, faith and holiness are, as regards

justification, graces *sine quibus non*. There is no justification nor salvation where there is not faith, love, holiness, obedience. But when we state that faith and good works are *conditions*, we in effect suppose the Almighty to offer us what have been called the *Terms of the Gospel*; terms that is of the following kind: "Now that by Christ's mediation God's wrath has been appeased, if you will repent, believe, and obey, you shall be saved." Conditions imply a bargain of this kind. Now there may be no objection to looking on the matter in some such light as this; but it does not appear to be the form in which the Scriptures represent God's dealings with us. The new Testament seems to speak of us as pensioners on the bounty of God's grace. Especially when justification by faith is spoken of, "it is *of faith*, that it might be *by grace*," Rom. iv. 16. And though it is true that it would be an act of immeasurable grace for God to pardon our past sins, on condition that, by His help, we avoided sin and lived holily for the future, yet this does not appear to be the statement anywhere made by the Apostles; nor does such an act of grace come up to the standard of that infinite mercy of God in Christ Jesus, which is revealed to us in the Gospel. It has already been shown that one peculiar reason why justification by faith represents free salvation by grace is, that faith is itself most clearly "the gift of God." Therefore it is spoken of as the instrument of our justification, not because it is a *condition*, which we can make with Him, but because it is itself a *gift* which He bestows on us.

Besides, if we could make conditions with God, even after He had accepted an atonement for the past, it might be hard to say that "boasting" was altogether "excluded" (Rom. iii. 27). Excluded indeed it might be in strict justice, because the forgiving of past sins, and the accepting of imperfect obedience for the future, would be, of itself, an act of boundless grace, when we deserve nothing but condemnation. But still, comparing ourselves with ourselves, we might easily be inclined to feel proud of even imperfect obedience, if it were made the condition of our salvation. Therefore, we may perhaps fairly conclude, that salvation is not of works, not merely not as the cause, but not even as the terms or conditions of our justification. Nor is faith itself the condition on which God accepts us, although it is the instrument by which He justifies us, and the state in which we are when justified.

3. Whereas it is taught by St. Paul that a man is justified by faith, and yet it is taught both by St. Paul and throughout the new Testament that we shall be judged according to our

works,¹ are we driven to conclude that there is an inconsistency in the statements of Scripture?

The answer to this is, that as all persons who are justified are regenerate and in a state of faith, their faith and regeneration will necessarily be to them the source of holiness and good works. Now the clearest tokens both to men and angels of their internal condition of faith and sanctification must be their good works; nay, the clearest proof even to themselves. Hence, that they should be judged by their works, and rewarded according to their works, is thoroughly consistent with God's dispensations. The meritorious cause indeed of their salvation is Christ's Atonement; the instrument by which they are brought into covenant with God is baptism; the means whereby their state of acceptance is maintained is faith; but the criterion by which their final state will be determined shall be works. And all these are so knit up together in the redeemed, regenerate, believing, sanctified Christian, that it is nowise derogating from the excellence of the one to ascribe its proper office, in the economy of salvation, to the other.

4. The ordinary instruments of justification being baptism and faith, can a person be justified where either of these is wanting?

That persons can be justified without faith where faith is impossible, may appear from the case of infants. Though they are too young for active faith, yet clearly are they not so for salvation, nor therefore for justification. Our Lord bids us bring little children to Him, and says that "of such is the Kingdom of Heaven" (Mark x. 14). And St. Paul says, the children of believing parents are holy (1 Cor. vii. 14). And if infant baptism be a custom for which we have sufficient authority, then, as baptism is for the remission of sins, it follows that infants in baptism may receive remission of sins or justification, though not yet capable of faith. Similar reasoning is applicable to the case of idiots, or persons otherwise irresponsible, who, like infants, are incapable of active faith, but of whom we may reasonably hope that they are not incapable of salvation. As regards baptism, that, as a general rule, it is the ordinance of God, without which we cannot look for the promises of God, is quite apparent from passages already referred to, such as Mark xvi. 16. Acts xxii. 16. Gal. iii. 26, 27, &c. In these and similar passages remission of sins is promised to such as believe the Gospel, and submit to baptism. Yet, as we have seen

¹ See, for instance, Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6; 1 Cor. iii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 10; 1 Peter i. 17; Rev. ii. 23, xx. 13, xxii. 12.

concerning faith, that though generally necessary, yet cases may and do exist where it is impossible, and so not required, in like manner we may reasonably conclude that cases may exist in which baptism may be dispensed with. Though Christ has appointed baptism, and we have no right to look for His blessing if we neglect it, yet we cannot presume to limit His mercy even by His own ordinances. Indeed, we find in the Acts of the Apostles (x. 4, 44) a case, the case of Cornelius, in which God accepted and poured His Holy Spirit on a person who had not been baptized; and though St. Peter thought it necessary that baptism should be at once administered to him, and thereby taught us the deep value of that Sacrament, still this case sufficiently shows that God does at times work without the intervention of means appointed by Himself, and therefore teaches us that we must not exclude from salvation those who, from ignorance or inability, have not received the blessing of baptism.

5. Is the language of St. James opposed to the doctrine of St. Paul?

It has been already seen that St. Paul means by Justification by faith, free salvation by God's grace; and that, where he speaks of faith as the instrument of justification, he means a lively faith, productive of good works. (See especially Rom. vi.) St. James probably wrote against such as abused the doctrine of St. Paul, and taught that a speculative barren faith, or mere orthodoxy, was sufficient for salvation without the fruits of faith. Accordingly, he asks, "Can this faith save him?" He says, "Faith, if it have not works, is dead, being alone."¹ But it must be observed that St. Paul never speaks of a dead faith as profiting. On the contrary, he declares that faith without charity would be nothing (1 Cor. xiii. 2). It is plain, therefore, that St. Paul considers faith as pregnant with its results, though not as justifying because of its results, and does not design to put in opposition to one another faith and the

¹ James ii. 14, 17.

Many people have endeavoured to reconcile St. Paul and St. James, by supposing that the former speaks of justification before God, the latter of justification in the sight of men. But it is quite clear that St. James speaks of the same kind of justification as St. Paul, from James ii. 14, 23. In the former verse he speaks of faith without works as not capable of *saving* a man; *i. e.* of course, of justifying him before God, for justification before man can never *save*. And in the latter verse, he adduces the case of Abra-

ham, as of one who had a faith which brought forth works, and says, it was this kind of faith which was imputed to him for righteousness, *i. e.* clearly before God. Evidently the two apostles differ in their use of the word "faith," not in their use of the word "justify." Both speak of justification before God: but one says that we are justified by faith, *i. e.* by a *living* faith; the other denies that we are justified by mere faith, *i. e.* (according to his own explanation) by a *dead* faith.

good works which naturally spring out of a lively faith, but rather faith and legal works, — “the works of the Law,” — works done in a self-justifying spirit, and looked on as meriting reward. Faith, therefore, he declares, justifies without such works, — the works of the Law; but he does not say that a faith which does not bring forth the works of faith, will justify. On the other hand, St. James asserts that faith will not justify, if it do not bring forth good works; but by good works he means evangelical works, the works of faith, not legal works, the works of the Law. Hence, there is no necessary contradiction in the language of the two Apostles. St. James simply considers justifying faith as *including* the works of *faith*. St. Paul considers justifying faith as *excluding* the works of the *Law*.¹

¹ Sine operibus fidei, non legis, mortua est fides. — Augustin. *Liber de Diversis Questionibus. Quæst. 76.*
 de operibus quæ fidem præcedunt, iste Tom. vi. p. 68.

[On the dispute with regard to *fides informis* and *fides formata* (see p. 291), the following remark deserves attention: “There is probably some truth on each side. We are justified by a faith which is at least potentially a *fides formata*; although the *office* of justifying belongs not to the works of faith but to faith itself.” *England vs. Rome* (H. B. Swete), p. 35, note. — *J. W.*]

ARTICLE XII.

Of Good Works.

ALBEIT that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; inso-much that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

De Bonis Operibus.

BONA opera, quæ sunt fructus fidei, et justificatos sequuntur, quanquam peccata expiare, et divini judicii severitatem ferre non possunt: Deo tamen grata sunt, et accepta in Christo, atque ex vera et viva fide necessario profluunt, ut planè ex illis, æque fides viva cognosci possit, atque arbor ex fructu judicari.

SECTION I.—HISTORY.

THE great length at which the last Article was considered renders it less necessary to say much upon this. Our present twelfth Article did not exist in the forty-two Articles of King Edward's reign, but was added in the year 1562, after the accession of Queen Elizabeth. It is evidently intended as a kind of supplement to the eleventh, lest that should be supposed to teach Solifidianism. Archbishop Laurence traces the wording of it to a passage in the Wirtemberg Confession, to which it certainly bears great resemblance.¹

The general object of the Article was, no doubt, to oppose the Antinomian errors, which had originated with Agricola, and which there was some danger might spring from Lutheranism.² With such the whole Reformation was charged by the divines of the Roman communion, and therefore it was the more needful that the reformers should protest against them.

There are certain particular expressions also in the Article which require to be explained historically. We have seen that the schoolmen talked of good works, done without the grace of God,

¹ The passage is:—

De Bonis Operibus.

Non est autem sentiendum, quod in bonis operibus, quæ per nos facimus, in judicio Dei, ubi agitur de expiatione peccatorum, et placatione divinæ iræ, ac merito æternæ salutis, confidendum sit.

Omnia enim bona opera, quæ nos facimus, sunt imperfecta, nec possunt severitatem divini judicii ferre.—Laurence, *B. L.* Notes on Sermon. 11. p. 235.

² Mosh. *Ch. Hist.* Cent. XVI. § III. pt. II. as quoted in the last Article.

meriting grace *de congruo*. “To this Luther and the reformers opposed the statement that works done without the grace of God might be apparently, but were not really good. And to this purpose is the thirteenth Article of our Church, which we have soon to consider. Luther asserted that good works, which are pleasing to God, are not wrought but in faith; for “whatever is not of faith is sin;” and where there is faith, there is justification; therefore good works follow, not precede justification. Our Article uses this language without in this place discussing the merits of it. In the thirteenth Article the question is more fully entered on. It may be mentioned that language very similar had before been used by Augustine, and from him very probably was it borrowed by Luther. “Good works,” says that father, “follow a man’s justification, do not precede it in order that he may be justified.”¹

Another expression in the Articles is, that “good works cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God’s judgment.” In the historical account of the last Article we saw that the Council of Trent condemned Luther for denying intrinsic goodness to works done after grace, and asserted that, as they were wrought by the Spirit of God, they were essentially good and perfect. The Council also taught that to the justified God’s commandments are possible, that justification is preserved and increased by good works, that the good works of the just, which are the gifts of God, are withal the merits of the justified.²

We have seen also that Bellarmine and the Romanist divines assert, that good works which are wrought in us by the grace of God are, by virtue of that grace, meritorious of eternal life; ³ *i. e.* according to the schoolmen, they merit reward *de condigno*. The words of our Article are evidently opposed to these opinions. For, though they speak plainly of the necessity and value of works wrought by grace, they declare that “they cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment.”

SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

WE may perceive, from what has been said, that the Article opposes three doctrines.

¹ Sequuntur opera bona justificatum, non præcedunt justificandum.—*De Fide et Operibus*, c. 14.

² Session VI. Canons 18, 24, 32.

³ Bellarmine, *De Justificatione*, Lib. v. cap. 12, quoted in the *History of Art.* XI

I. Merit *de congruo*;— II. Merit *de condigno*;— III. Antinomianism.

Or otherwise the Article teaches :—

I. That good works follow after justification ;

II. That though they spring from the grace of God and a lively faith, still they cannot put away sin and endure the severity of God's judgment.

III. Yet (1) that in Christ they are pleasing to God : and (2) That they spring out necessarily of a true and lively, *i. e.* a justifying faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit.

I. The question of merit *de congruo* and works before justification being the special subject of the next Article, we may defer its consideration till we consider that Article.

II. That the good works of justified men are not perfect enough to put away sin, and endure the severity of God's judgment, may be proved as follows.

Our Lord tells us, that after we have done all that is commanded us " we are still unprofitable servants, having done only that which was our duty to do " (Luke xvii. 10). But, if this be the case, how can we ever do anything to put away our former sins? Our best deeds leave us still unprofitable ; and if we had never sinned, we should still have only done our duty, and could claim no reward. But when we have sinned, it is clear that no degree of subsequent obedience (which would have been due even if we had not sinned) can cancel the sins which are past. And to this we must add that, even under grace, obedience is never perfect. " In many things we offend all," says St. James (iii. 2) ; and St. John tells us that " if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves " (1 John i. 8). And both the Apostles are evidently speaking to and of regenerate Christians. The Psalmist prays God not to " enter into judgment with him, because in His sight *no man living* could be justified " (Psalm cxliii. 2). Accordingly, St. Paul argues that the person who is blessed in God's sight is not the man who lives blameless in the Law, but " he whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered," even " the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin " (Rom. iv. 7, 8). " All have sinned and come short of the glory of God ; " and therefore must be " justified freely by His grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus " (Rom. iii. 23, 24). Such passages fully prove that, in whatever strength or power

good works are wrought, they are not perfect enough to put away sin, and to endure the judgment of God.

Still, though the Church denies the *merit* of good works, and their sufficiency to screen us from the wrath and endure the judgment of God, she yet teaches,

III. 1. That in Christ, they are pleasing and acceptable to God ; and 2, that they do necessarily spring out of a true and lively faith.

1. In Christ they are pleasing and acceptable to God.

(1). The words *in Christ* are introduced to remind us that whatever is good in us must spring from the grace of Christ, and whatever in us is acceptable to God is acceptable for Christ's sake. In all the servants of Christ, God sees the image of His Son. In all the members of Christ, God sees the Spirit of His Son descending from the Head to the Members, like the holy oil on Aaron's head, which flowed down to the skirts of his clothing. In all the branches of the heavenly Vine, God sees the fruit thereof, as put forth by virtue of the life and nourishment derived from the Vine itself; and that Vine is Christ. In every wedding-guest who has on the wedding-garment, the King sees the wearer clothed in the robe of His own Son, and acknowledges them all as His children : " for we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus : for as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ " (Gal. iii. 26, 27). Accordingly, the Scriptures constantly, when they speak of Christians and the works of Christians as pleasing to God, teach us that it is " in Christ." So we read, " There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus " (Rom. viii. 1). " In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision ; but faith which worketh by love " (Gal. v. 6). " We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works " (Ephes. ii. 10). We are to " do all in the name of the Lord Jesus " (Col. iii. 17). We are to " offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ " (1 Pet. ii. 5). We are to " give thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ " (Eph. v. 20). " By Him we are to offer the sacrifices of praise to God " (Heb. xiii. 15).

(2) But then the good deeds which Christians perform in Christ are *pleasing and acceptable to God*.

Our Lord tells us, that " not every one that saith unto Him, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven ; but he that doeth the will of His Father which is in Heaven " (Matt. vii. 21). He assures us of the reward of those who have left all for His sake,

that they shall receive a hundredfold, and eternal life (Mark x. 29, 30). He tells us, that, "if we forgive, we shall be forgiven; that if we give, it shall be given to us" (Mark xi. 26; Luke vi. 37, 38). He shows us by parables, that those who of two talents make five, shall receive five cities; those who make of five talents ten, shall receive ten cities (Matt. xxv. 14-30. Compare Luke xix. 12-26). He tells us that at the judgment-day they who have fed the hungry, clothed the naked, and visited the afflicted, shall be placed on the right hand, and go into life eternal (Matt. xxv. 31-46). He tells us of "a prophet's reward," and "a righteous man's reward" (Matt. x. 41, 42). And, in short, assures us that He will "reward every man according to his works" (Matt. xvi. 27).

So, from His Apostles we learn, that "in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him" (Acts x. 35): that the sacrifice of our bodies is "acceptable to God" (Rom. xii. 1): that the labour of Christ's servants "shall not be in vain in the Lord" (1 Cor. xv. 58): that "God loveth a cheerful giver" (2 Cor. ix. 7): that, if we are not "weary in well-doing, in due season we shall reap, if we faint not" (Gal. vi. 9): that our new creation in Christ Jesus is "unto good works, which God hath beforehand ordained that we should walk in them" (Eph. ii. 10): that the new man "after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. iv. 24): that our call is "not to uncleanness, but to holiness" (1 Thess. iv. 7): that "every one who nameth the name of Christ must depart from iniquity" (2 Tim. ii. 19); must "be careful to maintain good works" (Tit. iii. 8): that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. xii. 14): that with "such sacrifices" for His service "God is well pleased" (Heb. xiii. 16): that "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world" (Jas. i. 27): that faith without works will not profit (Jas. ii. 14): that "to do well and suffer for it, and take it patiently, is acceptable to God" (1 Pet. ii. 20): that whatsoever we ask of God we receive, if "we keep His commandments, and do those things which are pleasing in His sight:" and that "he that keepeth His commandments dwelleth in Him, and He in him" (1 John iii. 22, 24. Compare Rom. vi. *passim*, Rom. viii. 1-14, and the concluding chapters of all St. Paul's Epistles).

Thus we plainly see that good works wrought in Christ are not

only useful and desirable, but are absolutely necessary for every Christian, and are pleasing and acceptable to God. "We do not take away the *reward*, because we deny the *merit* of good works. We know that in the keeping of God's commandments there is *great reward* (Ps. xix. 11); and that unto him that soweth righteousness there shall be a *sure reward* (Prov. xi. 18). But the question is, whence he that soweth in this manner must expect to reap so great and so sure a harvest; whether from God's justice, which he must do, if he stand upon merit, or from His mercy, as a recompense freely bestowed out of God's gracious bounty, and not in justice due for the worth of the work performed. Which question, we think the prophet Hosea hath sufficiently resolved, when he biddeth us *sow to ourselves in righteousness, and reap in MERCY* (Hos. x. 12). Neither do we hereby any whit detract from the truth of that axiom, that *God will give every man according to his works*; for still the question remaineth the very same, whether God may not judge a man according to his works, when He sitteth upon the throne of grace, as well as when He sitteth upon the throne of justice? And we think here, that the Prophet David hath fully cleared the case in that one sentence, Psalm lxii. 12, '*With thee, O Lord, is MERCY*; for thou rewardest every one according to his work.'

"Originally therefore, and in itself, we hold that this reward proceedeth merely from God's free bounty and mercy; but accidentally, in regard that God hath tied Himself by His word and promise to confer such a reward, we grant that it now proveth in a sort to be an act of justice; even as in *forgiving of our sins*, which in itself all men know to be an act of mercy, He is said to be *faithful and just* (1 John i. 9), namely, in regard of the faithful performance of His promise."¹

To conclude, then, the Scriptures prove, and the Church teaches, that, not upon the ground of merit, but yet according to God's will and appointment, good works, wrought in Christ, are necessary for every Christian, are pleasing and acceptable to God, and will in the end receive "great recompense of reward," even that "crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give in that day" (2 Tim. iv. 8).

2. That good works "do spring out necessarily of a true and living faith," is a proposition which may be considered to have been incidentally but fully proved in treating on the eleventh Article. It may therefore here be sufficient to refer but briefly

¹ Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. XII.

to a few of the passages of Scripture in which this is most plainly set forth.

The sixth chapter of Romans throughout is an explanation entered into by the Apostle, to show that this doctrine of justification does not supersede the necessity of good works; inasmuch as justified persons walk in newness of life, are made free from sin, and become servants of righteousness. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews is an enumeration of signal works of holiness, which were produced through the energizing power of the faith by which the saints of old lived and acted. St. James, in his famous chapter (ii. vv. 14-26), explains at length, that if faith be living, it will necessarily bring forth works, and that if there be no works, the faith is dead. We read of being "sanctified by faith" in Christ (Acts xxvi. 18). God is said to "purify the heart by faith" (Acts xv. 9). Faith is said to be "the victory which overcometh the world" (1 John v. 4). The faith which "availeth in Christ Jesus," is called "faith which worketh by love" (Gal. v. 6).

Perhaps the strongest proof of this proposition is, that in all those writings of St. Paul (especially his Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians) where he peculiarly treats of faith, he passes directly from faith to speak of holiness, counselling Christians, as the consequence of his doctrine concerning faith, to bring forth good works. This we may observe in the latter chapters of both these Epistles, and indeed of all his Epistles. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews indeed, which professes to explain to us what faith is, does so almost entirely by giving a list of the works which have sprung from it; just as one who wished to describe the excellence of a fruit-tree would dwell chiefly on the beauty and goodness of its fruit.

We may be assured, therefore, that we cannot assign too high a place to good works, so long as we do not assign to them the power of *meriting* salvation. They spring from faith, and they feed faith; for the more faith is called into action, the brighter and the stronger it grows. And as in the bodily economy of man, good health gives birth to good spirits, and yet again, good spirits support and invigorate health; so it is in his spiritual life. Faith gives rise to holiness, and holiness gives energy to faith.

ARTICLE XIII.

Of Works before Justification.

De Operibus ante Justificationem.

WORKS done before the Grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school-authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

OPERA quæ fiunt ante gratiam Christi et Spiritus ejus afflatum, cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant, minime Deo grata sunt; neque gratiam, ut multi vocant, de congruo merentur; immo cum non sint facta, ut Deus illa fieri voluit et præcepit, peccati rationem habere non dubitamus.

SECTION I. — HISTORY.

THIS Article is intimately connected with the four preceding Articles, and is intended, probably, to prevent any mistakes, and more fully to explain some points in them.

In the former Articles an account has been given of most of the errors against which this Article is directed; and the very wording of it shows that the scholastic doctrine of congruous merit is especially aimed at. Here, however, it may be proper to remark that the question has arisen concerning the nature of heathen virtue, a question of great difficulty, on which the fathers touched, both before and after the Pelagian controversy. Clement of Alexandria particularly speculated much upon the mode in which God's grace and the teaching of Christ visited men before the coming of the Gospel. "His notion was, that philosophy was given to the Gentiles by God, for the same purpose for which the Law was given to the Jews: in order to prepare them for justification under the Gospel by faith in Christ." "It is certain, however, that Clement did not believe that heathen virtue possessed of itself any efficacy towards justification. For he says, that every action of the heathen is sinful, since it is not sufficient that an action is right; its object or aim must also be right."¹

¹ Bishop Kaye, on the Writings of Clement of Alexandria, p. 426. See also pp. 122, *seq.*

Indeed, these opinions of Clement do not seem to interfere at all with the doctrine of this Article; for Clement evidently considered that God mysteriously worked in the Gentiles by His grace; using, as an external means, the imperfect instrument of their own philosophy. So that whatever good, he thought, might have existed in heathens, he still ascribed to God's grace, and therefore did not consider their goodness "as works done before the grace of Christ."¹

We have already seen, how the Pelagians and Semi-pelagians² denied the necessity of preventing grace; and held that, in the first instance, God only called men by His word and ordinances, and that by their own strength such as were called might turn to God, and seek His assistance.

In controversy, they appear to have referred to the case of virtuous heathens, many of whom might put to shame the lives of Christians. To Julianus, who advances this argument, Augustine replies at great length. Augustine's position was, that "what was not of faith was sin." Julianus supposes the case of a heathen, who covers the naked and does works of mercy; and asks, "If a Gentile have clothed the naked, is this act of his therefore sin, because it is not of faith?"³ Augustine replies that it is; "not because the simple act of covering the naked is sin, but because none but the impious would deny, that not to glory in the Lord, on account of such a work, was sin."⁴ He then goes on to argue, that a bad tree cannot bring forth really good fruit, that an unbelieving tree is a bad tree, and that apparently good works are not always really so, as the clemency of Saul in sparing Agag was sin. So he, who does unbelievingly, whatever he does, does ill; and he who does ill, sins.⁵ The good works which an unbeliever does are the works of Him, who turns evil to good. But without faith we cannot please God.⁶ If the eye be evil, the whole body is dark; whence we may learn, that he who does not do good works with the good intention of a good faith (that is, of a faith which worketh by love), his whole body is full of darkness. And since the good works, or apparent good works, of unbelievers cannot bring them to Heaven, we ought to hold, that true goodness can never be

¹ See Bishop Kaye, as above, p. 122, &c.

² See History of Art. IX. and X.

³ Si gentilis, inquis, nudum operuerit, numquid quia non est ex fide, peccatum est?

⁴ Prorsus in quantum non est ex fide, peccatum est. Non quia per se ipsum

factum est, quod est nudum operire, peccatum est; sed de tali opere non in Domino gloriari, solus impius negat esse peccatum. — *Cont. Julianum, Lib. IV. c. 30.*

⁵ Cap. 31.

⁶ Cap. 32.

given but by the grace of God through Christ, so as to bring a man to the kingdom of God.¹

This was the kind of reasoning, which the fathers of that day used against the Pelagian arguments, that truly good deeds might be done without the grace of God.²

The doctrine of the schoolmen concerning grace of congruity bore a suspicious resemblance to that of Semi-pelagians. In the history of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh Articles enough has been said on this subject; and of the zeal with which Luther maintained the absolute necessity of preventing grace, in order that man should make any efforts, or take any steps towards godliness.³

The case of Cornelius (Acts x.) was an argument often made use of in favour of grace of congruity. He, it was said, was a Gentile, and therefore not under the influence of God's grace; and yet it was told him, "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God" (ver. 4). Hence it was argued, that he did what was acceptable to God, though without the grace of God.

Luther treats Cornelius as a man who had faith in a promised Mediator, although he did not yet know that that Mediator was come; and so, he argues, that his good deeds were of faith, and therefore acceptable.⁴

At the Council of Trent the general opinion was strongly against Luther on these points. Catarinus indeed maintained, with great learning, that "man, without the special help of God, can do no work which may be truly good, though morally, but sinneth still." In confirmation of which, he quoted Augustine, Ambrose, Prosper, Anselm, and others. He was violently opposed by the Franciscans, but supported by the Dominicans.⁵

In the end, the seventh canon of the sixth session of the council condemned those who said, "That works done before justification are sins, and that a man sinneth the more, by how much the more he laboureth to dispose himself to grace."⁶ Which canon does not

¹ Aut certe quoniam saltem concedis opera infidelium, quæ tibi eorum videntur bona, non tamen eos ad salutem sempiternam regnumque perducere: scito nos illud bonum hominum dicere, illam voluntatem bonam, illud opus bonum, sine Dei gratia quæ datur per unum Mediatorem Dei et hominum nemini posse conferri; per quod solum homo potest ad æternum Dei donum regnumque perducere. Cap. 33. See also Augustine, *De Fide et Operibus*, where, in opposition to the

Pelagian opinion that good works must be added to faith, he contends that good works spring from faith.

² The reader may see many passages from Jerome, Prosper, and others, to the same effect, in Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. xi.

³ See especially Luther on Gal. ii. 16.

⁴ Luther on Gal. iii. 2.

⁵ Sarpi, pp. 183-185.

⁶ Session vi. Can. 7, and Sarpi, p. 210.

exactly contradict the words of our Article, except it be in the last sentence of it.

The Lutheran Confessions of faith speak very reasonably on this subject. The twentieth article of the Confession of Augsburg states a principal reason for maintaining justification by faith to be, that we might not think to deserve grace by our own good works antecedent to grace.¹

Our own reformers seem to have been influenced by a very similar view. The Homilies say, that “without faith can no good work be done, accepted and pleasant to God.” “Without faith all that is done of us is but dead before God; although the work seem never so gay and glorious before man.”²

Again, “As the good fruit is not the cause that the tree is good, but the tree must first be good before it can bring forth good fruit; so the good deeds of man are not the cause which maketh man good, but he is first made good by the Spirit and grace of God, that effectually worketh in him, and afterwards he bringeth forth good fruits.”³

“They are greatly deceived that preach repentance without Christ, and teach the simple and ignorant that it consisteth only in the works of men. They may indeed speak many things of good works, and of amendment of life and manners: but without Christ they be all vain and unprofitable. They that think that they have done much of themselves towards repentance, are so much the farther from God, because they do seek those things in their own works and merits, which ought only to be sought in our Saviour Jesus Christ, and in the merits of His death and passion and bloodshedding.”⁴

SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE subjects embraced by the Article are, —

I. That works before grace and the inspiration of the Spirit are not pleasing to God, forasmuch as they are not of faith.

II. They do not make men meet to receive grace *de congruo*.

¹ *Sylloge*, pp. 130, 131.

² First part of *Homily on Good Works*.

³ Second part of the *Homily on Alms-*

deeds.

⁴ First part of the *Homily of Repent-*

ance.

III. Rather, as not being done as God hath willed, it is believed that they have the nature of sin.

Of these three positions, the second must follow from the proof of the first. For if good works without grace are not pleasing to God, they cannot predispose to grace. As regards the *title* of the Article, "Of Works before Justification," we may observe, that it was probably adopted because the question discussed in the Article itself went, at the time of the Reformation and the Council of Trent, under that name.¹ All questions concerning merit *de congruo*, and works done before grace, were considered as embraced in the general term, "the question concerning works before justification." The Article itself says nothing about *justification*. All that it determines is, that, in order for works to be acceptable to God, they must be done by the grace of God, and must spring from a principle of faith.

Against the whole tenor of the Article, and in favour of all which it condemns, the principal arguments from Scripture are such as these. Certain passages of Scripture seem to speak highly of particular individuals, who were not Christians or true believers, *e. g.* Naaman the Syrian, and Cornelius the centurion. They had not the faith of Christ, and yet their good deeds are approved. It may, however, be replied, that both of them evidently acted from a principle of faith. Naaman went to the prophet and sought relief, because he believed that, as a prophet, he had power to heal him. Again, Cornelius, though not a Jew, was evidently a believer in the One true God, a *proselyte of the gate*, if not a *proselyte of righteousness*; and therefore we cannot say that he had no faith, nor that he was without the grace of God.

The same may be said of the Ninevites. Their repentance, it is argued, was accepted by God; and yet they were heathens, and therefore not true believers. But it is certain that their repentance sprang from their faith in Jonah's preaching, and may very probably have been produced by that Holy Spirit who at all times has striven with men: and hence it was not of the nature of simple, naked, unassisted efforts to do good.

¹ Luther had used this language, that a man was justified first, and then did good works: and so "works before justification," became a common expression. Our Church in the XIth Article speaks of good works as "following after justification." We are not, of course, bound to consider that every act of a

man, who is not in a state of full sanctification, is therefore devoid of goodness and of the nature of sin. This article sufficiently explains both its own meaning and the meaning of the phrase, "follow after justification," in the XIth Article, namely, that no works are good which do not come of grace.

A stronger argument against the doctrine of this Article seems derivable from the language of St. Paul, Rom. ii. 14, 26, 27. There he speaks of the Gentiles or heathens, "which have not a law," and yet "do by nature the things contained in the Law," and so "are a law unto themselves." And he says, that "if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the Law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the Law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the Law?" Here the apostle seems to speak as if the heathen, who had not the revealed knowledge of God's will, yet might so do His will as to be acceptable with Him.

In like manner, many learned men, of the Reformed Communion, as well as of the Roman, understand St. Paul's reasoning in Gal. iv. to be like what was shown in the last Section to have been the opinion of Clement of Alexandria; namely, that before the Gospel both Jews and Gentiles were kept by God in a state of bondage or tutelage, waiting for the liberty of the children of God; that to the heathen their condition was one of elementary servitude, preparatory to the Gospel, as was that of the Jews. If the first seven verses of this chapter be compared carefully with the eighth and ninth, there will appear some ground for such an interpretation. From these passages it is argued, that heathens, who could not have faith, and were not subjects of grace, were yet capable in their degree of pleasing God.

To this reasoning we may reply, that nothing can be more obscure than the question as to God's dealings with, and purposes concerning the heathen world. Revelation is addressed to those whom it concerns, and tells us very little of the state of those to whom it is not addressed. Our business is to follow Christ, and not to ask "Lord, and what shall this man do?" There is a marked purpose in Scripture not to satisfy man's idle curiosity. The question therefore, at times so much debated, whether it be possible or impossible that the benefits of Christ's redemption should reach to those millions of human beings who never have heard and never could hear of Him, is left in deep obscurity; and when people have reasoned on the subject, their arguments have mostly been inferences deduced from other doctrines, and not express statements of Scripture.

This much, however, we may fairly conclude, that if the passages just referred to prove that the heathen can do what is pleasing to God, and be accepted by Him, it is because His Holy Spirit can

plead with them, even through the imperfect means of natural religion. St. Paul says, it was God's will that men "should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him" (Acts xvii. 27). And he is there speaking of the world in its times of heathen darkness. It is possible that there may have been an imperfect faith, even "in times of ignorance which God winked at." We know not, but that they who touched but the hem of Christ's garment, may have found virtue go out of it.

But with regard to the teaching of our Article, we may fairly conclude that it rather refers to the case of persons within, not without the sound of the Gospel. This is the practical question. It does not concern us practically to know how it may be with the heathen; although, of course, their case affects the general question. And the case of the heathen is so obscure, that we can hardly be justified in bringing it to throw light on a case which concerns ourselves and our own state before God.

But it may be farther said that God approves of justice, and temperance, and charity, in themselves, and of themselves; and therefore if a man who has neither faith nor grace, acts justly, and does mercy, and lives soberly, God must approve and be pleased with such acts, just as he would disapprove and hate the contrary. But, in reply, it is urged, that God sees the heart, and loves what is good in us, only when it springs from a good source. Indeed, there are some sinners much greater sinners than others, whom He will visit with "greater damnation." But though in themselves He loves justice and mercy, He does not love and accept the man who does them, unless that man does them from right motives; and as "every good and perfect gift is from above," we infer that good motives cannot come but from Him, "who worketh in us to will as well as to do according to His good pleasure." The man "dead in trespasses and sins," must have life given him from above, before he can walk in newness of life, and do what is well pleasing in God's sight.

Having thus considered the principal objections, we may now proceed to prove our propositions.

I. And first: "Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasing to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith."

The language concerning the new birth may come in here. John iii. 3: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God:" the language of our Lord to His disciples, John xv.

5, "Without Me ye can do nothing:" and the language of St. Paul concerning the state of the unregenerate and carnal mind, "In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing," Rom. vii. 18. "The carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God," Rom. viii. 7, 8. All these and many similar passages were considered at length under Article IX.; and they surely prove that the natural man, without the aid of God, cannot bring forth fruits which are pleasing to God. As our Lord says expressly, "Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in Me," John xv. 4.¹

But, moreover, as it is taught us that the source of all true holiness is faith, so if our good works do not spring from faith, they cannot be pleasing to God. Thus, "without faith it is impossible to please God," Heb. xi. 6. "The just shall live by faith," Rom. i. 17. Nay! we are even told that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin," Rom. xiv. 23: and that evidently, because apparently good works, if not springing from a good source, are not really good.

Hence the statement of our Article seems fully borne out, that "works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith."

II. The second proposition follows from the first: namely, that works done without grace do not make men meet to receive grace *de congruo*.

If they are not acceptable to God, it is manifest that they cannot procure grace from Him. It is true, that "the Law of the Lord is an undefiled law, converting the soul;" and that he who strives earnestly to fulfil God's commandments may always expect to have his exertions assisted by fuller supplies of the grace of God.² But this is because God loves to reward His grace in us by farther gifts of that grace — because all those earnest strivings are in themselves proofs of the Spirit of God working in us. Good works are in no degree to be underrated; and the more a man does of them, the more he is likely to gain strength to do more.

This is the regular course of growth in grace. Even naturally, good habits are acquired by performing good actions: and spiritually, those that use the grace of God find it increasing in them.

¹ The reader may refer to what was said under Art. x. on Free Will.

² On this principle it is that "If any man will (θέλη) do the will of God, he

shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God," John vii. 17. "God resisteth the proud but giveth grace to the humble," 1 Pet. v. 5.

But this is quite a distinct view of the case from that taken by the maintainers of congruous merit. Their doctrine is that a man, without any help from God, and by a strong effort of his own will, can so fulfil the commandments, as, though not of actual right, yet, on a certain principle of congruity, to draw down the grace of God upon him. Scripture, on the contrary, seems to teach that every attempt of this kind is displeasing, as being the result of arrogance and self-sufficiency. The Pharisees, who thought themselves not blind, are told that that was the very cause of their condemnation, whereas, if they were aware of their own weakness, they should receive their sight. "If ye were blind, ye should have no sin; but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth" (John ix. 41). The Jews are spoken of as cast off and blinded, because they sought to find their way to God, and to attain to righteousness, through the works of the Law, and through their own righteousness, instead of by the faith of Christ (see Rom. ix. 30, 31); for they "were ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, they did not submit themselves to the righteousness of God" (Rom. x. 3).

III. The Article concludes by saying, that forasmuch as such works "are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin."

Works done in self-righteousness, done with a view to justify ourselves by our own merits, are not done as God hath willed, but in a wrong spirit and temper; and therefore, proceeding from a bad principle, must be bad. There may be in such works a mixture, as there often is, of good with the bad motive. This God alone can see, and will approve the good, whilst He disapproves the bad. Many a person tries to do right, acting in ignorance, and on the principle that such a mode of action is what God has appointed, and what He will reward. Such a person may have very imperfect knowledge of the truth, and may not be sufficiently aware of his own weakness, and his own need of Divine strength. But mixed with such errors, there may be pure principles of faith and desire to serve God; and God, who sees the heart, may give more blessing to such a person than to many a better instructed Christian. The Article, however, may be quite right, notwithstanding, in saying that works, not springing from grace, and not done in faith, have the nature of sin. As a general proposition, it is true that "whatever is not of faith is sin." And the spirit which leads a man, instead of relying on God's mercy in Christ,

and seeking the aid of His Spirit, to rely on his own unassisted efforts, is also sin. It is a virtual denial of human infirmity, of the Atonement of Christ, and of the need of the Spirit.

Again, the only thing, which makes good works to be good, is the fact that God has commanded them. Hence, if we find them not done in the way and for the end to which God has ordained them, we are justified in saying that they are not good works, but bad works. The passages quoted from the Homilies in the former section show sufficiently that this was what the reformers meant by the words of the Article.