

ARTICLE XVII.

Of Predestination and Election.

PREDESTINATION to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season : they through grace obey the calling : they be justified freely : they be made sons of God by adoption ; they be made like the image of His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ ; they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God : so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture : and, in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

De Prædestinatione et Electione.

PRÆDESTINATIO ad vitam, est æternum Dei propositum, quo ante jacta mundi fundamenta, suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decrevit, eos quos in Christo elegit ex hominum genere, a maledicto et exitio liberare, atque (ut vasa in honorem efficta) per Christum, ad æternam salutem adducere. Unde qui tam præclaro Dei beneficio sunt donati, illi Spiritu ejus, opportuno tempore operante, secundum propositum ejus, vocantur, vocationi per gratiam parent, justificantur gratis, adoptantur in filios Dei, Unigeniti ejus Jesu Christi imagini efficiuntur conformes, in bonis operibus sancte ambulantes, et demum ex Dei misericordia pertingunt ad sempiternam felicitatem.

Quemadmodum prædestinationis, et electionis nostræ in Christo pia consideratio, dulcis, suavis, et ineffabilis consolationis plena est, vere pius, et iis qui sentiunt in se vim Spiritus Christi, facta carnis, et membra, quæ adhuc sunt super terram, mortificantem, animumque ad cœlestia et superna rapientem : tum quia fidem nostram de æterna salute consequenda per Christum plurimum stabilit, atque confirmat, tum quia amorem nostrum in Deum vehementer accendit : ita hominibus curiosis, carnalibus, et Spiritu Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuo versari prædestinationis Dei sententiam, pernitiosissimum est præcipitium, unde illos diabolus protrudit, vel in desperationem, vel in æque pernitiosam impurissimæ vitæ securitatem. Deinde promissiones divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis generaliter propositæ sunt, et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est, quam in verbo Dei habemus, diserte revelatam.

SECTION I. — HISTORY.

THE XVIIth Article is almost, word for word, the same as the original Article of 1552.

The questions concerning God's eternal predestination are by no means peculiar to the Christian religion. The Essenes among the Jews, Zeno and the Stoics, and the followers of Mohammed, were all rigid predestinarians; believing that all the affairs of the world and the actions of the human race were ordered by an eternal and inexorable decree.

In the Christian Church there has never been any doubt or question, but that the Scriptures teach us concerning the election and predestination of God. All Christians believe in the doctrine of election. The question is, therefore, not whether the doctrine of election is true, but what the meaning of election is. Now on this point there is a vast variety of sentiment.

1. *Calvinism.* The doctrine of Calvin and the Calvinists is, that from all eternity God predestinated a certain fixed number of individuals, irrespective of anything in them, to final salvation and glory; and that all others are either predestined to damnation, or, at least, so left out of God's decree to glory that they must inevitably perish.

2. *Arminianism.* The doctrine of Arminius and the Arminians is, that, from all eternity, God predestinated a certain fixed number of individuals to glory; but that this decree was not arbitrary, but in consequence of God's foreknowledge, that those so predestinated would make a good use of the grace given; and that, as God necessarily foresees all things, so foreseeing the faith of individuals, He hath, in strict justice, ordered His decrees accordingly.

According to both these schemes, *election is to life eternal*: and the *elect* are identical with *the finally saved*.

3. *Nationalism.* The opinion of Locke and some others is, that the election, spoken of by God in Scripture, does not concern *individuals* at all, but applies only to *nations*; that, as God chose the Jews at one time to be His people, so He has since ordained certain nations to be brought into the pale of the Christian Church. Here the *elect* are all *Christian nations*.

4. *Ecclesiastical Election.* Others have held, that, as the Jews of old were God's chosen people, so now is the Christian Church; that every baptized member of the Church is one of God's elect, and that this election is from God's irrespective and unsearchable decree. Here therefore *election is to baptismal privileges*, not to final glory; and the elect are identical with the *baptized*; and the election constitutes *the Church*.

5. Some have held, that there is an election to baptism of some individuals, and again an election out of the elect: so that *some*

are elected by God's inscrutable decree to grace, and from among these some by a like inscrutable decree to perseverance and to glory. Here the *elect* are, in one sense of the word, identical with the *baptized*; in another sense of the word, with the *finally saved*.

6. Lastly, some have taught, that, whereas to all Christians grace enough is given to insure salvation, if they will use it, yet to some amongst them is given, by God's eternal decree, a yet greater degree of grace, such that by it they must certainly be saved. This is the theory which has sometimes been called *Baxterian*, from Richard Baxter, the distinguished nonconformist divine.

The subject of predestination naturally embraces other cognate subjects, such as original sin, free-will, final perseverance, particular redemption, and reprobation. The three former have been considered under the IXth, Xth, and XVth Articles respectively, and much of the history of the predestinarian controversy will be found under the history of those Articles.¹

From the classification above given it will be evident, that the mere use of the terms election or predestination by a writer will not at all determine in what sense that writer uses them, nor to which of the six classes above enumerated his doctrines may be assigned.

Among the earlier fathers, especially those of the apostolic age, the language used is mostly general, and therefore difficult to fix to a particular meaning.

Clement of Rome speaks of a sedition in the Church, "as alien and foreign from the elect of God."² "Ye contended," he writes, "day and night for the whole brotherhood, that, with compassion and a good conscience, the number of His elect might be saved."³ To the same Church of Corinth he speaks of God as having "made us unto Himself a part of the election. For thus it is written, When the Most High divided the nations, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels; His people Jacob became the

¹ The five points of Calvinism, as they are called, are, —

1. Predestination, including Predestination, or election to life eternal, and Reprobation, or Predestination to damnation.

2. Particular Redemption, *i. e.* That Christ died only for a chosen few.

3. Original Sin.

4. Irresistible Grace, or effectual calling, the opposite to which is Free will.

5. Final Perseverance.

² τῆς ἀλλοτριᾶς καὶ ξένης τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ μιᾶς καὶ ἀνοπίου σύσσεως. — 1 Ep. ad Corinth. 1.

³ εἰς τὸ σώξασθαι μετ' ἐλέους καὶ συννεθήσεως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ. — 1 Ep. ad Corinth. 2.

portion of the Lord, and Israel the lot of His inheritance. And in another place he saith, Behold the Lord taketh to Himself a nation from the midst of the nations, as a man taketh the first-fruits of his threshing-floor, and from that nation shall come the Holy of Holies."¹ "In love have been perfected all the elect of God."² "Now God, who seeth all things, the Father of spirits and the Lord of all flesh, who hath elected our Lord Jesus Christ, and us by Him to be His peculiar people, grant to every soul,"³ &c.

Ignatius addresses the *Church* of Ephesus as "blessed through the greatness and fulness of God the Father, predestinated before the worlds continually to glory, — glory enduring, unchangeable, united, and elected in true suffering according to the will of God the Father, and of Jesus Christ our God."⁴ In the same manner he addresses "the holy Church which is in Tralles" as "beloved by God the Father of Jesus Christ, *elect* and worthy of God."⁵

Hermas, in the book of his Visions, constantly speaks of God's *elect*: "God, who hath founded His holy Church, will remove the heavens and the mountains, the hills and the seas, . . . all things shall be made plain to His elect," . . . or, "shall be filled with His elect."⁶ "Canst thou report these things to the elect?"⁷ "Go ye and declare to the elect of God His mighty acts."⁸ The Apostles, bishops, and ministers are said to have ministered to the elect of God.⁹

¹ Πατέρα ἡμῶν, ὃς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἐποίησεν ἐαντῷ. Οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται· Ὅτε διεμέρισεν ὁ Ὑψίστος ἐθνη, ὡς δὲ ἔσπευκεν υἱὸς Ἀδάμ, ἐστῆσεν ὄρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἠριθμὸν ἀγγέλων· ἐγενήθη μερὶς Κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ Ἰσραὴλ· καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει· Ἰδοὺ Κύριος λαμβάνει ἐαντῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσων ἐθνῶν, ὡς περ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἄλω· καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου ἅγια ἄγιων. — 1 *Ep. ad Corinth.* 29.

² ἐν ἁγίῃ ἐτελευτήθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. — *Ibid.* 49.

³ Ὁ παντεπόπτης Θεὸς καὶ Δεσπότης τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ Κύριος πάσης σαρκὸς, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ ἡμᾶς ὀν' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον, ὁση, κ. τ. λ. — *Ibid.* 58.

⁴ Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, τῇ εὐλογημένῃ ἐν μεγέθει Θεοῦ Πατρὸς πληρώματι, τῇ πρωορισμένῃ πρὸ αἰώνων διὰ παντός εἰς δόξαν, παρίμονον, ἄρρεπτον, ἠνωμένην καὶ ἐκκληγεμένην, ἐν πάθει ἀληθινῷ, ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἀνωμακαρίστῃ τῇ οὐσῃ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας, κ. τ. λ. — *Ignat. Ad Ephes.* 1.

⁵ Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, ἡγαπημένῃ

Θεῷ Πατρὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία ἁγία, τῇ οὐσῃ ἐν Τράλλεσιν τῆς Ἀσίας, ἐκλεκτῇ καὶ ἀξιοθέῳ. — *Ignat. Ad Trall.* 1.

⁶ "Ecce Deus virtutum qui . . . virtute sua potenti condidit ecclesiam suam quam benedixit: ecce transferet caelos ac montes, colles ac maria, et omnia plana (al. plena), sicut electis ejus; ut reddat illis repromissionem quam repromisit," &c. — *Lib. 1. Vis. 1. 3.*

⁷ "Potes haec electis Dei renunciare?" — *Lib. 1.*

⁸ "Vade ergo et enarra electis Dei magnalia ipsius. Et dices illis quod bestia haec figura est pressurae superventurae. Si ergo preparaveritis vos, poteritis effugere illam, si cor venturum fuerit purum et sine macula. . . . Vae dubiis iis, qui audierint verba haec et contempserint; melius erat illis non nasci." — *Lib. 1. Vis. iv. 2.*

⁹ "Apostoli et episcopi et doctores et ministri, qui ingressi sunt in clementia Dei, et episcopatum gesserunt, et docuerunt, et ministraverunt sancte et modeste electis Dei qui dormiverunt quique adhuc sunt." — *Lib. 1. Vis. III. 5.*

Here we have the elect spoken of as identical with the Church. We even find language which seems to prove that Hermas considered the elect as in a state of probation in this world which might end either in their salvation or in their condemnation. "Then shall their sins be forgiven which they have committed, and the sins of all the saints, who have sinned even to this day, if they shall repent with all their hearts, and put away all doubts out of their hearts. For the Lord hath sworn by His glory concerning His elect, having determined this very time, even now, if any one shall sin, he shall not have salvation."¹ On the other hand, in one passage he seems to speak of a mansion of glory for the elect in the world to come: "The white colour represents the age to come, in which shall dwell God's elect; since the elect shall be pure and spotless unto eternal life."²

These are the principal passages in the Apostolical Fathers concerning election and predestination. It would be a great point gained, if we could clearly ascertain their sentiments on this subject. They lived before philosophy had produced an effect on the language of theology. Now there is no question on which philosophy is likely to have produced greater effect than on the question concerning God's eternal decrees. When, therefore, we come to the writings of such men as Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, we naturally doubt, whether they speak the language of the Church in their days, or the language of their own thoughts and speculations.

In the passages above cited, there is no marked trace of any of the three schemes which have been designated respectively as Calvinism, Arminianism, or Nationalism. One passage from Clement may seem to speak the language of Nationalism; but it is only in appearance. That ancient father applies the term "nation" to the Christian Church; but it is plain that he merely means, that, as the Israelites of old were chosen to be God's peculiar people, so now His Church is, as it were, a nation chosen out of the nations. He speaks indeed of "the number of God's elect being saved," as though there were a definite number of God's elect, who should be saved in the end; language which, we shall see, is used also by

¹ "Tunc remittentur illis peccata, quæ jam pridem peccaverunt, et omnibus sanctis qui peccaverunt usque in hodiernum diem, et si toto corde suo egerint penitentiam, et abstulerint a cordibus suis dubitationes. Juravit enim Dominator ille, per gloriam suam, super electos suos, præfinita ista die, etiam nunc si

peccaverit aliquis, non habiturum illum salutem." — Lib. i. Vis. II. 2. Compare with this the passage cited in note 8 of last page.

² "Alba autem pars superventuri est sæculi in quo habitabunt electi Dei, quoniam immaculati et puri erunt electi Dei in vitam æternam." — Lib. i. Vis. IV. 3.

Justin and Irenæus. Whether this was intended in the sense which would be affixed to it by Augustine or Calvin, must be a question. We may almost certainly say, it was not so used by Justin Martyr. There is also one passage, the last quoted from Hermas, in which the term *elect* seems used of those who are chosen to life eternal. All the other passages from the apostolical fathers identify the whole Church of God with the election, and therefore the elect with the baptized. It is most undesirable to put any force on language of such importance as the language of writers in the apostolic age. But on a fair review of the whole, it can hardly appear that these fathers speak of election in any sense but one of the two following: either (1) as an election of individuals to the Church and to baptism, or (2) possibly as an election first to baptism, and then a further election out of the baptized to glory. On the first sense, the passages seem clear and decided; on the second, it seems but reasonable to admit that there is great doubt.

In the history of the doctrine of free will,¹ we saw that Justin Martyr ascribed free agency to all human beings, and argued that God does not cause actions, because He foresees them.² On the contrary, he defends Christians against the charge that they believed in a fatal necessity. Our belief in the predictions of the prophet does not oblige us to believe that things take place according to fate. "This only," he says, "we hold to be fated, that they who choose what is good shall obtain a reward; that they who choose what is evil shall be punished."³ So again soon after, he says that "we assert future events to have been foretold by the prophets, not because we say that they should so happen by fatal necessity, but because God foreknew the future actions of all men."⁴ And presently again he speaks of God deferring the punishment of the wicked, till the "foreknown number of the good and virtuous should be fulfilled."⁵ Accordingly Bishop Kaye has concluded that, if Justin Martyr speaks anywhere of predestination to *life eternal*, it is in the Arminian sense, or, as it has been called, *ex prævisis meritis*.⁶ But when Justin Martyr especially speaks of God's election, he appears clearly to intend by it an election of individuals out of the world, and the bringing them by His calling to be

¹ Art. x. Sect. i. p. 261.

² *Dial.* p. 290.

³ ἢ ἂν εἰμαρμένην φάμεν ἀπαράβατον ταύτην εἶναι, τοῖς τὰ καλὰ ἐκλεγομένοις, τὰ ἄξια ἐπιτίμια· καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίως τὰ ἐναντία, τὰ ἄξια ἐπιχρεῖρα. — *Apol.* i. p. 81.

⁴ *Apol.* i. p. 82 a.

⁵ καὶ συντελεσθῆ ὁ ἰριθμὸς τῶν προεγνωσμένων αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶν γεγονότων καὶ ἐναρπῶν, κ. τ. λ. — *Apol.* i. p. 82 d.

⁶ Bp. Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, p. 82.

of His peculiar people the Church. Thus, he is speaking of the Christian Church in antithesis to the Jewish, and he says, "We are by no means a despicable people, nor a barbarous nation, like the Phrygians and the Carians; but God hath elected us, and has manifested Himself to those who asked not for Him. Behold I am God, saith He, to a nation that called not on my Name." Then, speaking of the calling of Abraham by the grace of Christ, he continues, "By the same voice He hath called us all, and we have come out of the polity in which we lived, living evilly, after the manner of the other inhabitants of the world,"¹ &c.

It is probable therefore that, to whatever cause Justin Martyr may have assigned the final salvation of Christians, their *election* he considered to be a calling in from the people of the world to be members of the Church of Christ; as Abraham was called from among the Gentiles to be the founder of the chosen race.

Irenæus, like Clement of Rome and Justin Martyr, speaks of a definite number of persons who shall be saved, and holds the opinion that the world shall last till this number is perfected. Yet he does not hint that any particular individuals were predestinated, of which that number should consist.² As regards predestination to eternal death, he clearly speaks of that as the result of God's foreknowledge of the wickedness of those whom He condemns, and says that the reason why God gave Pharaoh up to his unbelief was that He knew he never would believe.³ He asserts too, that God puts no constraint on any one to believe; but that, foreknowing all things, He has prepared for all fitting habitations.⁴ Thus he was evidently no believer in the doctrine since called reprobation, nor in irresistible grace, or effectual calling.

But it is probable that the meaning which he attached to the

¹ Οὐκοῦν οὐκ ἐκκαταφρόνητος ὄμιλος ἐσμὲν, οὐδὲ βάρβαρον φύλον, οὐδὲ ὅποια Καρῶν ἢ Φρυγῶν ἐθνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός, καὶ ἐμφανῆς ἐγενήθη τοῖς μὴ ἐπερωτώσιν αὐτὸν. Ἰδοὺ Θεός εἰμι, φησὶ τῷ ἔθνει οὐ οὐκ ἐπεκαίεσαντο τὸ ὄνομά μου . . . καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ ἅπαντας δι' ἐκείνης τῆς φωνῆς ἐκύλιεσε, καὶ ἐξήλθομεν ἡδη ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας ἐν ᾗ ἐζώμεν, κ. τ. λ. — *Dial.* p. 341.

² καὶ διὸ τοῦτο πληρωθέντος τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ οὐ αὐτὸς παρ' αὐτῷ προώρρισε, πάντες οἱ ἐγγραφεύτες εἰς ζωὴν ἀναστήσονται . . . ἵνα τὸ συμμετρον φύλον τῆς προορίσεως ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἀνθρωπότητος ἀποτελεσθῆν τὴν ἀρμονίαν τῆρήσῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς. — *Adv. Hæc.* 11. 72.

³ "Deus his quidem qui non credunt, sed nullificant eum, infert cæcitatem. . . Si igitur et nunc, quotquot scit non credituros Deus, cum sit omnium præcognitor tradidit eos infidelitati eorum, et avertit

faciem ab hujusmodi, relinquens eos in tenebris, quas ipsi sibi elegerunt; quid mirum, si et tunc nunquam crediturum Pharaonem, cum his qui cum eo erant, tradidit eos suæ infidelitati," &c — *Lib.* iv. 48.

⁴ "Nec enim lumen deficit propter eos qui semetipsos excæcaverunt, sed illo perseverante quale et est excæcati per suam culpam in caligine constituuntur. Neque lumen cum magna necessitate subjiciet sibi quemquam: neque Deus coget eum, qui nolit continere ejus artem. Qui igitur abstiterunt a paterno lumine et transgressi sunt legem libertatis, per suam abstiterunt culpam, liberi arbitrii et suæ potestatis facti. Deus autem omnia præcens, utrisque aptas præparavit habitationes," &c. — *Lib.* iv. 76; *Conf.* *Lib.* v. 27, 28.

Scriptural term election was, that God chose and elected certain persons to baptism and to be members of His Church. In speaking of Esau and Jacob, as types of the Jewish and the Christian Church, he explains St. Paul's language, in the ninth of Romans, as meaning that God, who knoweth all things, was foretelling the rejection of the Jews, and the election of the Gentile Church.¹ Explaining the parable of the vineyard let out to husbandmen, he says that God first planted the vineyard of the human race by the creation of Adam and the election of the fathers; then let it out to husbandmen, the Jews, surrounding it with a hedge, built a tower, and elected Jerusalem. But when they did not believe, He sent His Son, whom they slew. Then the tower of election being exalted and beautified, the vineyard, no longer walled round, but laid open to the world, is let to other husbandmen, who will bring forth the fruits. For the Church is everywhere illustrious; everywhere the wine-press is dug round, because those who receive the Spirit are everywhere. And soon after, he says that the same Word of God who formerly elected the patriarchs has now elected us.² Thus it appears that Irenæus looked on the Jews as formerly, and on the Christian Church as now, the elect people of God; and so he calls "the Church the synagogue or congregation of God, which He hath collected by Himself."³

Tertullian says little or nothing to guide us to his view of the doctrine of election, except that, in arguing against certain heretics, he maintains that it is unlawful so to ascribe all things to the will of God as to take away our own responsibility and freedom of action.⁴

¹ "In ea enim epistola quæ est ad Romanos, ait Apostolus: *Sed et Rebecca ex uno concubitu habens Isaac patris nostri; a Verbo responsum accepit, ut secundum electionem propositum Dei permaneat, non ex operibus, sed ex vocante, dictum est ei: Duo populi in utero tuo, et duæ gentes in ventre tuo, et populus populum superabit, et major serviet minori.* Ex quibus manifestum est non solum prophetationes patriarcharum, sed et partum Rebeccæ prophetiam fuisse duorum populorum: et unum quidem esse majorem, alterum vero minorem; et alterum quidem sub servitio, alterum autem liberum; unius autem et ejusdem patris. Unus et idem Deus noster et illorum; qui est absconsorum cognitor, qui scit omnia antequam fiant; et propter hoc dixit; *Jacob dilexi, Esau autem odio habui.*" — Lib. iv. 38.

² "Plantavit enim Deus vineam humani generis, primo quidem per plasmationem Adæ, et electionem patrum: tradidit autem eam colonis per eam legis

dationem quæ est per Moysem; sepem autem circumdedit, id est, circumterminavit eorum culturam; et turrim ædificavit, Hierusalem elegit. . . . Non credentibus autem illis, &c. . . . tradidit eam Dominus Deus non jam circumvallatam, sed expansam in universum mundum aliis colonis, reddentibus fructus temporibus suis, turre electionis exaltata ubique et speciosa. Ubique enim præclara est ecclesia, et ubique circumfossus torcular: ubique enim sunt qui suscipiunt Spiritum. . . . Sed quoniam et patriarchas qui elegit et nos, idem est Verbum Dei," &c. — Lib. iv. 70.

³ "Deus stetit in synagoga, &c. De Patre et Filio et de his qui adoptionem perceperunt, dicit: hi autem sunt ecclesia. Hæc enim est synagoga Dei, quam Deus, hoc est, Filius ipse, per semetipsum collegit." — Lib. iii. 6.

⁴ "Non est bonæ et solidæ fidei, sic omnia ad voluntatem Dei referre: et ita adulari unumquemque, dicendo nihil fieri

Clement of Alexandria appears to have used the same language as his predecessors, concerning the Church as the election, and all Christians as the elect of God. He especially defines the Church as the general assembly of the elect.¹ So he quotes Hermas as saying, that the Church is held together by that faith by which God's elect are saved.² The Church, according to Clement, is the body of Christ, a holy and spiritual company; but they who belong to it, but live not uprightly, are, as it were, but the flesh of the body.³ He holds the Church to be one, into which are collected all those who are righteous according to the purpose (κατὰ πρόθεσιν); and continues, that the Church is one, which collects together by the will of God those already ordained, whom God hath predestinated.⁴

But then when we come to the ground or cause of God's election, we find that Clement seems to speak of it as being God's foreknowledge. Thus, in the last passage referred to, he says, the Church embraces "all whom God hath predestinated, having foreknown that they would be righteous before the foundation of the world."⁵ So he speaks of each person as partaker of the benefit, according to his own will; for the choice and exercise of the soul constitutes the difference of the election.⁶ Accordingly, Bishop Kaye thinks, "it is evident that Clement must have held the doctrine of predestination in the Arminian sense;"⁷ and Mr. Faber says, that "this prescientific solution is for the first time enounced by the speculative Clement of Alexandria."⁸

Whether Justin and Irenæus had in any degree enounced the same before, may be a fair question. The causation of sin they clearly refused to attribute to God, declaring that, where He is said to have hardened, it was because He foresaw the sinner was irclaimable. And though Clement of Alexandria speaks more clearly than either of them, concerning God's foreknowledge as the

sine jussione Ejus: ut non intelligamus aliquid esse in nobis ipsis. Cæterum excusabitur omne delictum, si continuerimus nihil fieri a nobis sine Dei voluntate." — *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, c. 2. See Bishop Kaye's view of Tertullian's opinion on this subject in his account of Tertullian, p. 341.

¹ τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καλῶ. — *Stromat.* vii. p. 846, Potter.

² Ἡ τοίνυν συνέχουσα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς φησὶν ὁ ποιμὴν, ἀρετὴ ἢ πίστις ἐστὶ, δὲ ἧς σώζονται οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. — *Stromat.* Lib. ii. p. 458, Potter.

³ See *Stromat. Lib. vii.* p. 885.

⁴ μίαν εἶναι τὴν ἄληθῆ ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἣν

οἱ κατὰ πρόθεσιν δίκαιοι ἐγκαταλέγονται . . . μόνην εἶναι φάμεν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν δὲ ἐνός τοῦ Κυρίου συνήγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους, οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεός. — *Strom.* vii. p. 899.

⁵ οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεός, δίκαιους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς. — *Ibid.*

⁶ μεταλαμβάνει δὲ τῆς εὐποίας ἕκαστος ἡμῶν πρὸς ὃ βούλεται· ἐπεὶ τὴν διαφορὰν τῆς ἐκλογῆς ἄξια γενομένη ψυχῆς αἰρεσίς τε καὶ συνάσκησις πεποίηκεν. — *Strom.* x. *sub fine*, p. 734.

⁷ Bp. Kaye, *Clement. Alex.* p. 434.

⁸ Faber, *Primitive Doctrine of Election*, p. 269.

ground of His predestination, yet he does not differ from them in the view that the Church of God is composed of the elect people of God.

Some divines of the Roman Communion¹ have endeavoured to discover the doctrines of St. Augustine in the writings of Clement; but it is only because he ascribes the beginning, the continuance, and the perfection of religion in the soul, to the grace of God, that they have thence inferred that, as it is all of grace, so it must all be of absolute predestination. Yet every one, but slightly acquainted with the predestinarian controversy, must know, that the chief disputants on every side of this troublesome argument have all alike agreed in ascribing the whole work of religion in the soul to God's grace and the operations of His Spirit; the question having only been, Is that grace irresistible or not? Is the freedom of the will utterly extinguished by it, or not? The passage especially referred to by Bossuet, in proof of the Austinism (so to speak) of Clement, is the prayer with which he concludes his *Pædagogues*, and which is simply, — that God would grant us, that following His commandments we may become fully like Him, and that He would grant, that all passing their lives in peace, and being translated into His kingdom or polity, having sailed over the waves of sin, may be borne through still waters by His Holy Spirit, and may praise God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; day and night unto the perfect day. And to this prayer he adds, that “Since the *Pædagogues* (*i. e.* the Word of God) has brought us into His Church, and joined us to Himself, it will be well for us being there to offer up thanksgiving to the Lord, in return for His gracious guidance and instruction.² This passage, however, rather corresponds with what we have seen to be the general doctrine of Clement, as probably of his predecessors, namely, that God's election brought men to baptism and to His Church, and that His grace, given to them there, enabled them, if not determined to quench the Spirit, to go on shining more and more unto the perfect day.

From this time forth, although the belief in God's election of individuals into His Church, and a frequent identification of the Church with the elect, is observable in all the patristic writers of eminence; yet when the question concerning the final salvation of

¹ Bossuet, *Defense de la Tradition et des Saints Pères*, Tom. II. Liv. XII. chap. 26; Lumper, *Historia Theologico-Critica*, Tom. IV. p. 285.

² *Pædagogus*. Lib. III. sub *fine*, p. 311. The concluding words are, ἐπεὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν

ἐκκλησίαν ἡμᾶς καταστήσας ὁ Παιδαγωγὸς τούτος ἑαυτῷ παρακατέθετο τῷ διδασκαλικῷ καὶ πανεπισκόπῳ λόγῳ, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι ἡμᾶς ἐνταῦθα γενομένους, μισθὸν εὐχαριστίας δικαίας, κατ'ἀλλήλου ἰστέιου παιδαγωγίας αἰνῆ ἀναπέμψαι Κυρίου.

individuals was brought into contact with the question of the Divine decrees, that solution of the difficulty, since called Arminian, was generally adopted.

Origen, the pupil of Clement of Alexandria, himself the greatest speculator of early times, and the great maintainer of the freedom of the will, adopted it in its fullest and most definite form. He expressly says, that God, who foresees all things, no more causes man's sins, nor forces his obedience, than one who looks at a person walking in a slippery place is the cause that he should stumble.¹ Such was the progress of opinion among the early Christians, and so general was the spread of the foreknowledge theory in the third and fourth centuries, that our great Bishop Andrewes considered almost all the fathers to have believed in a foreseen faith, "which," he adds, "even Beza confesses;"² and Hooker, himself an illustrious disciple of St. Augustine, says that "all the ancient fathers of the Church of Christ have evermore with uniform consent agreed that reprobation presupposeth foreseen sin as a most just cause, whereupon it groundeth itself."³

So much was this the case, that even St. Augustine himself, when first entering upon the question of predestination, taught that it was contingent on God's foreknowledge of the faith or unbelief of individuals.⁴ But his farther progress in the Pelagian controversy, where he had to contend against those who grievously abused the doctrine of man's free will, led him to reconsider the questions concerning the grace of God and His predestination and purpose. Indeed he asserts, and that truly, that, before the Pelagian controversy, he had written concerning free will almost as if he had been disputing against Pelagians.⁵ But his statements concerning God's foreknowledge, as antecedent to his predestination, he absolutely retracts.⁶ Thenceforth his belief appears to have been,

¹ Ὡσπερ εἰ τις ὄρων τινα διὰ μὲν ἀμαθίαν προπετῆ διὰ δὲ τὴν προπέτειαν ἀναλογιστῶς ἐπιβυβίνοντα ὁσοῦ ὀλισθήσας, καὶ καταλάξῃσι πεπεσθαὶ ὀλισθήσαντα, οὐχὶ αἰτίως τοῦ ὀλισθῆσαι ἐκείνῳ γίνεται· οὕτω νοητέον τὸν Θεὸν προεωρακότα ὁποῖος ἔσται ἕκαστος, καὶ τὰς αἰτίας τοῦ τοιοῦτον αὐτὸν ἔσεσθαι καθορᾶν καὶ ὅτι ἀμαρτήσεται τάδε γινώσκει, καὶ κατορθώσει τάδε· καὶ εἰ χρῆ λέγειν οὐ τὴν πρόγνωσιν αἰτίαν τῶν γινομένων· οὐ γὰρ ἐφίπτεται τοῦ προεγνωσμένου ἀμαρτησομένου ὁ Θεὸς, ὅταν ἀμαρτάνῃ· ἀλλὰ παραδοξότερον ἰέν, ἀληθὲς δὲ ἐροῦμεν, τὸ ἐσόμενον αἰτίον τοῦ τοιῦνδε εἶναι τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ πρόγνωσιν· οὐ γὰρ, ἐπεὶ ἔγνωσται, γίνεται, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ γίνεσθαι ἐμελλεν, ἔγνωσται.—Origen. *Philocal.* c. xxiii.

² Andrewes, *Judgment of the Lambeth Articles*.

³ *Answer to a letter of certain English Protestants.*

⁴ "Respondemus. præscientia Dei factum esse, qua novit etiam de nondum natis, qualis quisque futurus sit. . . Non ergo elegit Deus opera cujusquam in præscientia, quæ ipse daturus, sed fidem elegit in præscientia: ut quem sibi crediturum esse præscivit, ipsum elegerit cui Spiritum Sanctum daret, ut bona operando etiam vitam æternam consequeretur."—*Proposit. Ex. Epist. ad Romanos Expositio*, Tom. iii. pars 2, 916.

⁵ *Retractationum*, Lib. i. cap. ix. Tom. i. p. 15.

⁶ "Item disputans quid elegerit Deus in nondum nato . . . ad hoc perduxit ratiocinationem, ut dicerem, *Non ergo elegit Deus opera cujusquam in præscientia,*

that Adam fell freely,¹ that, all mankind being born in sin, God's inscrutable wisdom and mercy, for good reasons, but reasons unknown to us, determined to rescue some from sin and damnation.² Accordingly, He prepared His Church, and predestinated some to be brought into the Church by baptism, who thereby became partakers of regenerating grace. These, and these only, could be saved.³ Yet there was a further decree, even concerning the regenerate, namely, that some of them should die before committing actual sin, and therefore be saved; but that, of those who grew up to maturity, some should be led on by the grace of God to final perseverance, and therefore to glory: whereas others, not being gifted according to God's eternal purpose with the grace of perseverance, would not persevere at all; or if they persevered for a time, would in the end fall away and be lost.⁴ It would have been just that all should be damned; it is therefore of free mercy that some should be saved.⁵ God therefore graciously frees some, but leaves others by just judgment to perdition.⁶ "Of two infants, both born in sin, why one is taken and the other left; of two grown persons, why one is called so as to follow the calling, the other, either not called, or not called so as to follow the calling; these are in the inscrutable decrees of God. And of two godly men, why to one is given the grace of perseverance, but to another it is not given, this is still more in the inscrutable will of God. Of this, however, all the faithful ought to be certain, that one was predestinated, and the other not," &c.⁷ The baptized and regenerate may be called of the elect, when they believe and are baptized, and live according to God; but they are not properly and fully elect, unless it is also ordained that they shall persevere and live holily to the end.⁸

These statements of St. Augustine gave considerable uneasiness to many who agreed with him in his general views of doctrine.

quæ ipse daturus est; sed fidem elegit in præscientia, ut quem sibi crediturum esse præscivit, ipsum elegerit cui Spiritum Sanctum daret, ut bona operando etiam vitam æternam consequeretur: nondum diligentius quæsieram, nec adhuc inveneram qualis sit electio gratiæ." — Retract. Lib. i. cap. xxxiii. Tom. i. p. 35.

¹ *De Corrept. et Grat.* 28, Tom. x. p. 763.

² *De Dono Perseverantiæ*, 31, p. 837; *De Corrept. et Gratia*, § 16, Tom. x. p. 758.

³ *De Dono Perseverantiæ*, 23, Tom. x. p. 832.

⁴ *Ibid.* § 1, Tom. x. pp. 821, 822; § 2, p. 823; § 21, p. 831; §§ 32, 33, p. 838.

⁵ *De Naturæ et Gratia*, cap. v. Tom. x. p. 129.

⁶ *De Dono Perseverantiæ*, § 35; Tom. x. p. 839.

⁷ *De Dono Perseverantiæ*, § 21, Tom. x. p. 831: "De duobus autem parvulis originali peccato pariter obstrictis, cur iste assumatur, ille relinquatur; et ex duobus ætate jam grandibus, cur iste ita vocetur, ut vocantem sequatur; ille autem aut non vocetur, aut non ita vocetur. inscrutabilia sunt judicia Dei. Ex duobus autem piis, cur huic donetur perseverantia usque in finem, illi non donetur. inscrutabiliora sunt judicia Dei. Illud tamen fidelibus debet esse certissimum, hunc esse ex prædestinatis, illum non esse."

⁸ *De Correctione et Gratia*, § 16, Tom. x. p. 758.

The members of the monastery of Ailrumetum were especially troubled by these discussions.¹ In consequence, St. Augustine wrote his treatises *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, and *De Correptione et Gratia*. In a short time, the clergy of Marseilles doubting the soundness of St. Augustine's view, Prosper and Hilary² wrote letters to him, stating the scruples of the Gallican clergy, thanking him in general for his defence of the truth, but saying that hitherto the Catholic faith had been defended, without recourse to such a theory of predestination.³ The Gallican clergy state, that their own belief had hitherto been that God's predestination was founded on prevision of faith.⁴

Of these Massilians there appear to have been two parties, one infected with Semi-Pelagian errors, the other sound and catholic.⁵ Both, however, agreed in being startled and displeased with the doctrines of St. Augustine, and in esteeming them new and unheard of. Among those who were thus dissatisfied, Prosper mentions Hilary of Arles,⁶ a bishop of the first learning and piety of that age.

In answer to these letters Augustine wrote his two treatises, *De Prædestinatione Sanctorum* and *De Dono Perseverantiæ*. He acknowledges, as in his book of *Retractions*, that he now saw more clearly than formerly;⁷ yet he says that he had implicitly taught the same doctrines before, but heresies bring out more clearly the truth.⁸ He also says, the earlier fathers did not write much on these doctrines, because they had no Pelagius to write against.⁹ Still he thinks that he can find support from passages in St. Cyprian, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Ambrose. From St. Cyprian he quotes, "We must glory in nothing, as we have nothing of our own."¹⁰ And again he refers to St. Cyprian's interpretation of the petition in the Lord's prayer, "Hallowed be thy Name," as meaning, that we pray that His name may be

¹ See the correspondence of Augustine with Valentinus. — August. *Opp.* Tom. II. pp. 791-799.

² Generally supposed to be the Bishop of Arles, though the Benedictine editor gives good reasons for thinking it may have been another person of the same name.

³ "Quid opus fuit hujuscemodi disputationis incerto tot minus intelligentium corda turbari? Neque enim minus utiliter sine hac definitione, aiunt, tot annis, a tot tractatoribus, tot præcedentibus libris et tuis et aliorum, cum contra alios, tum maxime contra Pelagianos, Catholicam fidem fuisse defensam." — *Epist.*

Hilar. § 8; *Aug. Opp.* Tom. x. p. 787. See also *De Dono Persev.* § 52, Tom. x. p. 850.

⁴ *Ibid.* § 4.

⁵ *Epist. Prosper.* § 3; *Aug. Op.* Tom. x. p. 779; *De Prædestination.* § 2, p. 791.

⁶ *Epist. Prosper.* § 9, p. 873.

⁷ *De Prædestin.* § 7, Tom. x. p. 793.

⁸ *De Dono Persever.* § 53, Tom. x. p. 851.

⁹ *De Prædestin.* § 27, p. 808.

¹⁰ "In nullo gloriandum, quando nostrum nihil sit." — *Cypr. Ad Quirinum*, Lib. III. Cap. 4; *August. De Prædest.* § 7, Tom. x. p. 753; *De Dono Persever.* § 86, p. 841; § 48, p. 848.

sanctified in us. And this he further explains to signify that we pray that we, who have been sanctified in baptism, may persevere in that which we have begun.¹ Hence St. Augustine concludes that Cyprian held the doctrine of perseverance in the Augustinian sense of that doctrine.

From Gregory Nazianzen he cites an exhortation to confess the doctrine of the Trinity, which concludes with an expression of confident hope, that God, who first gave them to believe, would also give them to confess the faith.²

From Ambrose he alleges two passages. In one, St. Ambrose simply argues, that, if a man says he followed Christ because it seemed good to himself to do so, he does not deny the will of God, for man's will is prepared by God.³ The other passage is as follows: "Learn also, that He would not be received by those not converted in simplicity of mind. For if He would, He could from indevout have made them devout. Why they received Him not, the evangelist has himself related, saying, *Because His face was as of one going to Jerusalem*. For the disciples were desiring to be received into Samaria, but those whom God thinks good He calls, and whom He wills He makes religious."⁴

These are the passages alleged by St. Augustine, in proof that more ancient fathers than himself held his view of predestination. With the exception of the last from St. Ambrose, it will appear to most people, that, if St. Augustine had not brought weightier arguments from Scripture than he did from the fathers, he would hardly have succeeded in settling his system so firmly in the minds of his followers. The language of the last passage indeed appears, at first sight, strongly to resemble the language of St. Austin. But it is by no means clear that even this passage does not accord with the views of those fathers who held the election of individuals to the Church and to baptismal grace, but believed that any farther predestination was from foreseen faith; and it is capable of proof,

¹ Cyprian, *In Dominic. Orat.*; August. *De Dono Persever.* § 4, p. 824.

² δώσει γάρ εὐδοκία ὁ τὸ πρῶτον δοῦς, καὶ τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ μάλιστα. — Greg. Nazianz. *Oratio 44 in Pentecosten.*

"Gregorium addamus et tertium qui et credere in Deum, et quod credimus, confiteri, Dei donum esse testatur . . . Dabit enim, certus sum: qui dedit quod primum est, dabit et quod secundum est: qui dedit credere, dabit et confiteri." — Aug. *De Dono Persever.* 49, p. 849.

³ "Quod cum dicit, non negat Deo visum: a Deo enim præparatur voluntas

hominum. Ut enim Deus honorificetur a sancto, Dei gratia est." — Ambros. *Comment. in Lucam apud August.* Ibid.

⁴ "Simul discite, inquit, quid recipi noluistis a non simpliciter mente conversis. Nam si voluisset, ex indevotis devotos fecisset. Cur autem non receperint eum, evangelista ipse commemoravit, dicens, Quia facies ejus erat euntis in Jerusalem. Discipuli autem recipi intra Samariam gestiebant. Sed Deus quos dignatur vocat, et quem vult religiosum faciet." — Ambros. *Comment. in Lucam, Lib. VII apud Augustin.* Ibid.

that such were in fact the views generally held by St. Ambrose.¹ This passage, if fairly interpreted, contains probably no contradiction of his other statements.

It is, of course, a question of no small interest, whether St. Augustine's elders in the faith held the same doctrine with himself on the predestination of God, or whether he was the first to discover it in Scripture. That so learned a divine could find no stronger passages in any of their writings than those just mentioned, is much like a confession of the difficulty of the proof. His own opinions must have great and deserved weight; but if they were novel, we can hardly accept them as true. The passages already quoted from the earliest fathers are all we have to guide us in this question; for it seems now an admitted fact, that from Origen to St. Augustine *irrespective individual election to glory* was unheard of.

Soon after the correspondence with the Massilian Christians, A. D. 430, St. Augustine died, "without any equal," says Hooker, "in the Church of Christ, from that day to this." Prosper followed in the steps of his great master with constancy and success; but he exceeded him in the strength of his predestinarian sentiments: for, whereas Augustine held that the wicked perish from their natural sins, being passed over in God's decree, but not actually predestinated to damnation, Prosper seems plainly to have taught the reprobation of the non-elect.² He drew up a book of sentences from the writings of St. Augustine;³ and with the aid of Celestine and Leo, Bishops of Rome, was successful in opposing the Pelagian heresy.

Not long after, we read of a priest named Lucidus, who, taking up Augustine's predestinarianism, carried it into lengths to which Augustine had never gone. Faustus, Bishop of Riez, who himself was inclined to Semi-Pelagianism, succeeded in inducing him to recant. A synod was assembled at Arles, A. D. 475, where the errors of Lucidus were condemned, and his recantation was re-

¹ See this very successfully shown by Faber, *Primitive Doctrine of Election*, Bk. I. ch. VIII. p. 168, &c. The following passage shows clearly, that he held the views of Clement and Origen concerning God's prevision of faith as the ground of His predestination to glory. In discussing Matt. xx. 23, he writes: "Denique ad Patrem referens addidit: Quibus paratum est, ut ostenderet Patrem quoque non petitionibus deferre solere, sed meritis, quia Deus personarum acceptor non est. Unde et Apostolus ait, Quos

præscivit, et prædestinavit. Non enim ante prædestinavit quam præsciret, sed quorum merita præscivit, eorum præmia prædestinavit." — *De Fide ad Gratianum*, Lib. v. cap. 2, *sub fine*.

Mr. Faber has clearly shown that elsewhere St. Ambrose maintains the doctrine of ecclesiastical election.

² *Epist. ad Ruffinum*, Cap. XIV.; *Append. ad Op. Augustin.* Tom. x. p. 168.

³ See Appendix to Vol. x. of St. Augustine's Works, p. 223, *seq.*

ceived. Some of these errors were, that "God's foreknowledge depresses men to hell, — that those who perished could not have been saved, — that a vessel of dishonour could never become a vessel of honour, — that Christ did not die for all men, nor wills all men to be saved."¹

In the year 529 was held the second Council of Orange, at which Cæsarius of Arles presided. Its canons and decrees bear the signatures of fourteen bishops, and were approved by Boniface II., Bishop of Rome. They are chiefly directed against the errors of the Semi-Pelagians. But to the twenty-five canons on this subject there are appended three declarations of doctrine. 1. That by the grace of baptism all baptized persons can, if they will, be saved. 2. That if any hold that God has predestinated any to damnation, they are to be anathematized. 3. That God begins in us all good by His grace, thereby leading men to faith and baptism, and that, after baptism, by the aid of His grace, we can do His will.² These propositions of the Council of Orange, coming immediately after canons against Semi-Pelagianism and exaggerated notions of free will, express as nearly as possible a belief in Ecclesiastical Election, (*i. e.* election to the church and to baptismal privileges,) but reject the peculiar doctrines of St. Austin.

Some mention was made of Goteschalc in the history of the Xth Article.³ He was a Benedictine monk of the convent of Orbais in the diocese of Soissons, about A. D. 840. He was a great admirer of St. Augustine, and revived his views of predestination; though, like Lucidus, he appears to have gone much beyond his master. If we may believe the account of his doctrines given by Hincmar, he taught that there was a double predestination, of the elect to glory, and of the reprobate to death. God, of His free grace, has unchangeably predestinated the elect to life eternal; but the reprobate, who will be condemned by their own demerits, He has equally predestinated to eternal death.⁴ He taught also, that Christ did not die for those who were predestinated to damnation, but only for those who were predestinated to life.⁵ Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, opposed him with great zeal, and summoned a council at Mentz, A. D. 848, which condemned Got-

¹ Conc. Tom. iv. p. 1041. See also Hooker's Works, edit. Keble, Oxford, 1836; Vol. II. Appendix, p. 736, notes.

² Concil. iv. 1666; Appendix to Vol. x. of St. Augustine's Works, p. 157.

³ See above, p. 265.

⁴ Hincmar, *De Prædestin.* Cap. 5; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* Tom. I. p. 528.

⁵ Hincmar, *Ibid.* c. 27; Cave, *Ibid.* Archbishop Usher wrote a history of the controversy concerning Goteschalc.

eschalc's opinions, and then sent him to Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who assembled a synod at Quiercy, which degraded him from the priesthood, obliged him to burn the tract which he had delivered to Rabanus Maurus in justification of his doctrines, and committed him to prison, where he lay for twenty-one years, and then died.¹

The discussions between Thomists and Scotists, among the schoolmen, have also been referred to under Art. X.² The former were followers of Thomas Aquinas, who himself followed St. Augustine. They appear to have held irrespective predestination to life; but to have admitted neither reprobation, partial redemption, nor final perseverance, in the sense in which the two former were held by Lucidus and Goteschalc.³

We saw, under Article X., how strongly Luther, in his earlier writings, spoke of the slavery of the human will, and the necessity under which it was constrained.⁴ In the first edition of the *Loci Theologici*, Melancthon held language of the same kind. But in the second edition these expressions were all withdrawn; and, as we saw in the last Article, Luther, later in life, condemned what are called Calvinistic views of election. Archbishop Laurence has shown, by abundant and incontrovertible evidence, that after the diet of Augsburg, A. D. 1530, when the famous Lutheran Confession was presented to the Emperor, Luther and Melancthon entirely abandoned the high views of absolute predestination which they had at first adopted. Luther continually exhorted his followers to abstain from all such speculations, and to believe that because they were baptized Christians, they were God's elect, and to rest in the general promises of God.⁵ Luther expressly approved⁶ of the later edition of Melancthon's *Loci Theologici*, put forth A. D. 1535, in which his former views of predestination were retracted.⁷

¹ See Cave, as above; and Mosheim, Cent. ix. pt. ii. ch. iii.

² See above, p. 266. See also Neander, C. H. VIII. p. 171.

³ Archbishop Laurence, in the learned notes to his *Bampton Lectures*, seems to contend that none of the schoolmen believed in predestination, in the absolute and irrespective sense in which St. Augustine held it. But it seems to me that the very passages which he quotes from Aquinas prove that he did hold Augustine's view of predestination to life, though he clearly denied reprobation, and the certainty of individual perseverance: *e. g.* "Deus habet prædestinationem etiam de peccatis; sed prædestinatio est

de bonis salutaribus." — Aquin. *Exposit. in Rom.* cap. 8; Laurence, p. 353. See also the passages immediately following, and the quotations from Aquinas *ap.* Laurence, p. 152; where his view of perseverance seems exactly the same as that which we have seen above to have been St. Augustine's.

⁴ Above, p. 267.

⁵ See Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, note 6, to Sermon VII. pp. 355, *seq.* See especially *Lutheri Opera*, VI. p. 355; Laurence, pp. 356, 357.

⁶ Preface to Vol. I. of his *Works*. Wittenb. 1545; Laurence, p. 250.

⁷ See Laurence, p. 249; Sermon II. note 16. Sermon VII. note 7.

He himself speaks of the predestinarian controversies set on foot in his own time, as the work of the devil.¹ Melancthon too, in the strongest terms, condemned what he called the Stoical and Manichean rage, and urged all people to fly from such monstrous opinions.²

The doctrine both of Luther and Melancthon, after their first change of opinion, appears to have been very nearly that which, we have reason to conclude, was the doctrine of the earliest fathers. They clearly taught that Christ died for all men, and that God willed all to be saved. They held, that all persons brought to baptism and to the Church were to be esteemed the elect people of God, having been led to baptism by the gracious purpose of God. They taught too, that God's purposes were to be *generally* considered, and His promises *generally* interpreted, *i. e.* as implying His *general* designs concerning Christians and the human race, and as concerning classes of persons, according to their respective characters.³

Zuinglius was an absolute predestinarian, ascribing all things to the purpose and decrees of God; but he materially differed from the Calvinist divines who followed him, in holding that God's mercies in Christ, though given irrespectively, and from absolute predestination, were bestowed not only on Christians, but on infants who die without actual sin, and on heathens, who "had grace to live a virtuous life, though ignorant of the Redeemer."⁴

In the Council of Trent, when the question of predestination was discussed, no fault was found with the Lutheran statements on this head; but several points were found for discussion in the writings of the Zuinglians. Many of the Tridentine divines took views of predestination similar to those of St. Augustine, though

¹ *Opp.* Tom. v. p. 197. See under History of Article xvi.

² See his language largely quoted, Laurence, pp. 159, 162, 163, 241, 359, 366, 367, 370. Some of the same passages may be seen in Faber, *Primitive Doctrine of Election*, pp. 350, 351, 352.

³ Luther's sentiments on universal grace are shown by Archbishop Laurence, pp. 160, 359. On his and Melancthon's belief in baptismal election see p. 157; *e. g.* "Quicquid hic factum est, id omne propter nos factum, qui in illum credimus, et in nomen ejus baptizati, et ad salutem destinati, atque electi sumus." — Luth. *Opp.* Tom. vii. p. 355; Laurence, p. 157.

⁴ "De effectu electionis teneamus hanc consolationem; Deum, volentem non

perire totum genus humanum, semper propter Filium per misericordiam vocare, trahere et colligere *Ecclesiam*, et recipere assentientes, atque ita velle semper aliquam esse *ecclesiam*, quam adjuvat et salvat." — Melancth. *Loc. Theolog. De Prædest.*; Laurence, p. 357. See other passages there to the same effect. See also Faber, *Prim. Doct. of Election*, p. 374, note; who brings numerous passages from Melancthon to prove that he held election to baptismal grace.

⁴ "Nihil restat, quo minus inter gentes quoque Deus sibi deligat, qui observent et post fata illi jungantur; libera est enim electio ejus." — Zuing. *Oper.* Tom. ii. p. 371; Faber, *Prim. Doct. of Election*, p. 373; Laurence, *Serm.* v. notes 1, 2, pp. 295–302.

these were strongly opposed by the Franciscans. Catarinus propounded an opinion much like that afterwards held by Baxter, that of Christians, some were immutably elected to glory, others were so left that they might or might not be saved. All agreed to condemn the doctrine commonly called Final Perseverance.¹

Calvin, with the love of system and logical precision which was so characteristic of him, rejected every appearance of compromise, and every attempt to soften down the severity of the high predestinarian scheme. Advancing, therefore, far beyond the principles of his great master, St. Augustine, he not only taught that all the elect are saved by immutable decree, but that the reprobate are damned by a like irreversible sentence, a sentence determined concerning them before the foundation of the world, and utterly irrespective of the foreknowledge of God.² Nay! God's foreknowledge of their reprobation and damnation is the result of His having predestinated it; not His predestination the result of His foreknowledge.³ The very fall of Adam was ordained, because God saw good that it should be so; though, why he saw good, it is not for us to say. But no doubt He so determined, partly because thereby the glory of His Name would be justly set forth.⁴ Those who are thus elect to glory, and those only, are called *effectually*, i. e. irresistibly; whereas the non-elect, or reprobate, have only the external calls of the word and the Church.⁵ Those thus effectually called, are endued with the grace of final perseverance, so that they can never wholly fall away from grace.⁶

These views, with little variation, were adopted by the different bodies of Christians which were reformed on the Calvinistic model. Sufficient account has been given under Article X. of the principal proceedings of the Synod of Dort. The Remonstrants, who agreed with Arminius, and against whom that synod directed its decrees, had adopted that theory concerning God's predestination which had been current among the fathers from Origen to

¹ Sarpi, p. 197.

² "Aliis vita æterna, aliis damnatio æterna præordinata." — *Institut.* III. xxi. 5. "Quod ergo Scriptura clare ostendit dicimus, æterno et immutabili consilio Deum semel constituisse quos olim semel assumere vellet in salutem, quos rursus exitio devovere. Hoc consilium quoad electos in gratuita ejus misericordia fundatum esse asserimus, nullo humanæ dignitatis respectu: quos vero damnationi addidit, his justo quidem et irrepre-

hensibili, sed incomprehensibili ipsius judicio, vitæ aditum præcludi." — *Ibid.* III. xxi. 7.

³ *Institut.* III. xxi. 6.

⁴ "Lapsus enim primus homo, quia Dominus ita expedire censuerat: cur censuerit, nos latet. Certum tamen est non aliter censuisse, nisi quia videbat nominis sui gloriam inde merito illustrari." — *Lib.* III. xxiii. 8.

⁵ *Lib.* III. xxiv. 1, *seq.*

⁶ *Lib.* III. xxiv. 6, 7.

Augustine.¹ They taught that God's predestination resulted from His foreknowledge. They ascribed all good in man to the grace of the Spirit of God; but they held, that God determined to save eternally those who, He foresaw, would persevere in His grace to the end, and that He destined to damnation those who, He knew, would persevere in their unbelief. These views were rejected and condemned by the synod, which distinctly enunciated the five points of Calvinism.²

The disputes on the same subject, which have prevailed in the Church of Rome since the Council of Trent, were all sufficiently alluded to under Article X.³

The doctrine of our own Reformers on this deep question, and the meaning of the XVIIth Article, have been much debated. The Calvinistic divines of our own communion have unhesitatingly claimed the Article as their own; although the earnest desire which they showed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to introduce the far more express language of the Lambeth Articles, shows that they were not fully satisfied with the wording of it. On the other hand, the Arminians assert that the seventeenth Article exactly expresses their own views. The Arminians agree with the Calvinists in holding that God, by his secret counsel, hath predestinated some to life eternal, others to eternal death. They differ from them in that, whereas the Calvinists attribute this predestination to God's sovereign, irrespective, and though doubtless just, yet apparently arbitrary will, the Arminians attribute it to His eternal foreknowledge. Now the Article says nothing concerning the *moving cause* of predestination; and therefore speaks as much the language of Arminius as of Calvin. The latter clauses of the Article appear specially designed to guard against the dangers of the Calvinistic theory, and therefore the former cannot have been intended to propound it. Moreover the sentiments concerning election most prevalent in the Church before the Reformation were that God predestinated to life and death, not according to His absolute will, but according as He foresaw future faith or unbelief; and there being no ground for supposing that the English reformers had been mixed up with any of the predestinarian controversies of Calvin and the Swiss reformers, there is every ground, it is said, for sup-

¹ Calvin himself owns that Ambrose, Origen, and Jerome, held the Arminian view of election. — *Institut.* III. xxii. 8.

² See Mosheim, Cent. xvii. Sect. 11. ch. 11. § 11; Heylyn, *Histor. Quinquartic.*

Part II. ch. IV. And for the decrees of Dordrecht on Predestination, see *Syllabus Confess.* p. 406.

³ Above, pp. 269, 270.

posing that the Article ought to be taken in the Arminian, not in the Calvinistic sense.

In what sense the English reformers really did accept the doctrine of God's election, and in what sense the XVIIth Article is to be interpreted, is truly a question of considerable difficulty. The language of Cranmer and Ridley, and of our own Liturgy, Articles and Homilies, is remarkably unlike Calvin's concerning effectual calling and final perseverance.¹ It is also clear, that the English Reformers held, and expressed in our formularies, with great clearness and certainty, the universality of redemption through Christ.² So that, in three out of five points of Calvinism, Particular Redemption, Effectual Calling, and Final Perseverance, the English reformers were at variance with Calvin.

Still, no doubt, it is possible that they may have been un-Calvinistic in all these points, and yet have agreed with St. Augustine on the general notion and causation of God's predestination; for we have seen that Augustine's views were materially different from Calvin's.

It is pretty certain that Calvin's system had not produced much influence, at the time the XVIIth Article was drawn up. It is true, the first edition of his *Institutes* was written early in his career; and that contains strong predestinarian statements. But the great discussion on this head at Geneva, and the publication of his book *De Prædestinatione*, did not take place till A. D. 1552, the very year in which the Articles were put forth.

It has moreover been clearly shown, that the earlier Articles of the Church of England were drawn up from Lutheran models, agreeing remarkably with the language of Melancthon and the Confession of Augsburg.³ Archbishop Laurence has plainly proved that the greatest intimacy and confidence existed between Cranmer and Melancthon; that for a series of years during the reign of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. both the king and the leading reformers were most desirous of bringing Melancthon to England, and that nothing but the death of Edward VI. prevented the establishment of Melancthon in the chair of divinity at Cambridge, formerly filled by Erasmus and Bucer.⁴ All this must have been

¹ Concerning *effectual calling* see particularly the original xth Article, quoted p. 271; and the whole History of Article x. On Final Perseverance, see History of Art. xvi.

² "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world."—Art. xxxi. "God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind."

—Catechism. "A full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."—Prayer of Consecration at the Holy Communion.

³ See Laurence's *Bampton Lectures*, *passim*, and the historical sections to several of the foregoing Articles.

⁴ See Laurence, *Sermon* 1. note 3, p. 198.

pending at the very time the XVIIth Article was composed. Nay! there is even some reason to think that Cranmer was induced to draw up this Article by suggestion of Melancthon, who, when consulted by Cranmer (A. D. 1548) on the compilation of a public confession on this particular question, wrote recommending great caution and moderation, adding that at first the stoical disputations about fate were too horrible among the reformers, and injurious to good discipline; and urging that Cranmer "should think well concerning any such formula of doctrine."¹

From such facts it is inferred that the Lutheran, not the Calvinist reformers, had weight, and were consulted on the drawing up of this Article; and that, as Lutheran models were adopted for the former Articles, so, although there is no Article in the Confession of Augsburg on predestination, yet the views of that doctrine current among the Lutheran divines were more likely to prevail than those among the Calvinists, who had as yet had no influence in Great Britain.

The published writings of Cranmer and Ridley have remarkably little which can lead to an understanding of their own views of God's predestination. We hear that Ridley wrote a "godly and comfortable treatise" on "the matter of God's election;" but it has never yet come to light. In the letter wherein he speaks of having prepared some notes on the subject, he says, "In these matters I am so fearful that I dare not speak further, yea, almost none otherwise than the very text doth, as it were, lead me by the hand."²

Cranmer's writings are, even more than Ridley's, free from statements on God's predestination. But Archbishop Laurence has brought several passages from Latimer, Hooper, and other contemporaneous divines of the Church of England, which show that they held decidedly anti-Calvinistic sentiments, and which prove that even the Calvinism of Bradford was of the most moderate kind.³

If from the writings of the reformers we pass to the formularies of the Church, the Liturgy, the Catechism, and the Homilies, we shall find that they appear to view the election of God as the choosing of persons to baptism, the elect as identical with the baptized, or, what is the same thing, with the Church of Christ throughout

¹ "Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio Stoicæ disputationes apud rostros de fato, et disciplinæ nocuerunt. Quare te rogo, ut de tali aliqua formula doctrinæ cogites." — Melancth. *Epist.* Lib. III. *Epist.* 44; Laurence, p. 226.

² Letter to Bradford in the Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, Ridley's *Remains*, Parker Society's edition, p. 867.

³ See Laurence, *Sermon* VIII. note 8, p. 389-394.

the world. Thus, in the Catechism, every baptized child is taught to say, "God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth *me* and all the *elect* people of God." In the Baptismal Service we pray that the child "now to be baptized, may receive the fulness of God's grace, and ever remain in the number of His faithful and *elect* children." In the daily service we pray, "Endue thy ministers with righteousness, and make thy *chosen* people joyful. O Lord, save thy people, and bless thine inheritance." Where God's inheritance, the Church, is evidently the same as His "chosen" or *elect* "people," whom we pray that He will bless, save, and make joyful. In the Burial Service, we pray God to "accomplish the number of His *elect*, and hasten His kingdom, that *we*, with all those departed," &c. Where the *we* appears to be connected with God's *elect*. In the Homily of falling from God all Christians are plainly spoken of as the "chosen" (*i. e.* *elect*) "vineyard of God," which yet by falling away may be lost. "If we, which are the chosen vineyard of God, bring not forth good fruits, that is to say, good works He will pluck away all defence, and suffer grievous plagues to light upon us. Finally, if these serve not, He will let us lie waste, He will give us over" &c.

From all these considerations, it is more probable that an Article drawn up by Cranmer should have expounded the doctrine of ecclesiastical or baptismal election, than that it should have contained the doctrine of Calvin or Arminius. For both the other documents drawn up by himself, and the writings of his great counsellor, Melancthon, exhibit the clearest evidence of their belief in such ecclesiastical election. Add to which, the early fathers, whose writings Cranmer most diligently searched, are very full of the same mode of explaining the truth.

The question still remains, after all this historical probability, Will the wording of the Article bear this meaning? or are we absolutely constrained to give another interpretation to it? Persons but little acquainted with scholastic disputations and with the language of controversy are apt at first sight to think the XVIIth Article obviously Calvinistic, though others, somewhat better read, are aware that it will equally suit the doctrine of Arminius: but both might be inclined to suppose that it could not express the opinions of Melancthon and of the majority of the primitive fathers, and what, we have seen reason to conclude, were Cranmer's own opinions. Let us see whether this is the case.

In the first place then, the words of the concluding paragraph in the Article have been shown to bear so remarkable a resemblance

to the language of Melancthon (language particularly objected to by Calvin¹), that it could hardly have been accidental. “Furthermore,” it runs, “we must receive God’s promises in such wise as they be *generally* set forth in holy Scripture; and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God.” The word *generally* is in the Latin *generaliter*, which means not *for the most part*, but *universally* or *generically*, i. e. as concerning classes of persons. Now Melancthon writes, “And if other things may be nicely disputed concerning election, yet it is well for godly men to hold that *the promise is general or universal*. Nor ought we to judge otherwise concerning the will of God than according to the revealed word, and we ought to know what God hath commanded that we may believe,”² &c.

But in the beginning of the Article we read of “predestination to life,” and of God’s purpose “to deliver from curse and damnation:” expressions which may seem tied to the notion of election embraced by Augustine, Calvin, and Arminius, namely, predestination to life eternal. It is, however, to be noted, that it would quite suit the way of thinking common to those who held ecclesiastical election, to speak of election to baptism as *election to life*, and as *deliverance from curse and damnation*. For the Church of Christ is that body, which, having been purchased by the Blood of Christ, is destined to life eternal, and placed in a position of deliverance from the curse of original sin. Baptism is for the remission of sin. All baptized infants have been elected therefore to life, and delivered from curse and damnation. The election to life eternal indeed is mediate, through election to the Church, not immediate and direct. Every baptized Christian has been chosen out of the world to be placed in the Church, in order that he may be brought by Christ to everlasting salvation, as a vessel made to honour. He may forfeit the blessing afterwards, but it has been freely bestowed on him. All persons endued with such an excellent benefit of God are called according to His purpose by His Spirit. They are freely justified and made Sons of God by adoption (language specially used in the Catechism of baptized children); they be made like the image of the only-begotten, Jesus Christ, for the baptized Christian is said to be regenerate after the likeness of Christ. The next step in his course is to walk in good works; the last to attain, by God’s mercy, to everlasting felicity.

¹ See Laurence, p. 180.

² “Et si alia subtiliter de electione disputari fortasse possunt, tamen prodest piis tenere quod *promissio sit universalis*. Nec debemus de voluntate Dei aliter judi-

care quam juxta Verbum revelatum, et scire debemus, quod Deus præceperat, ut credamus.” — *Opera*, iv. p. 498; Laurence, pp. 172, 362, 363.

Such language then, which is the language of the Article, suits the baptismal theory as well as the Calvinistic theory; and it has been contended with great force by Archbishop Laurence and Mr. Faber, that no other sense can be properly attached to it.

On the whole, however, it seems worthy of consideration, whether the Article was not designedly drawn up in guarded and general terms, on purpose to comprehend all persons of tolerably sober views. It is hardly likely that Cranmer and his associates would have been willing to exclude from subscription those who symbolized with the truly admirable St. Augustine, or those who held the theory of prevision, so common among those fathers whose writings Cranmer had so diligently studied. Nor, again, can we imagine that anything would have been put forth markedly offensive to Melancthon, whose very thoughts and words seem embodied in one portion of this Article, as well as in so many of the preceding. Therefore, though Cranmer was strong in condemning those who made God the author of sin, by saying that He enforced the will; though he firmly maintained that Christ died to save all men, and would have all men to be saved; though he and his fellows rejected the Calvinistic tenet of final perseverance; they were yet willing to leave the field fairly open to different views of the Divine predestination, and accordingly worded the Article in strictly Scriptural language, only guarding carefully and piously against the dangers which might befall "carnal and curious persons." After long and serious consideration, I am inclined to think this the true state of the case. I am strongly disposed to believe that Cranmer's own opinions were certainly neither Arminian nor Calvinistic, nor probably even Augustinian; yet I can hardly think that he would have so worded this Article, had he intended to declare very decidedly against either explanation of the doctrine of election.

It seems unnecessary to do more than briefly allude to the painful controversies to which this fruitful subject gave rise in the Church of England, since the Reformation. A sufficient account was given, under Article XVI., of the disputes which led to the drawing up of the Lambeth Articles, which, though accepted by Archbishop Whitgift and a majority of the divines at Lambeth, never had any ecclesiastical authority. The first four of these were designed to express distinctly the *Calvinistic* doctrines of election and reprobation; though the bishops softened down a few of the expressions in Whitaker's original draught, so as to **make**

them a little less exclusive.¹ The Puritan party at Hampton Court wished that these "nine assertions orthodoxal" should be added to the XXXIX. Articles, and also that some of the expressions in the XXXIX. Articles which sounded most against Calvinism should be altered or modified; but their wish was not obtained.² There have ever since continued different views of the doctrine of predestination amongst us, and different interpretations of this XVIIth Article. It were indeed much to be wished that such differences might cease; but from the days of St. Augustine to this day, they have existed in the universal Church; and we can scarcely hope to see them utterly subside in our own portion of it.

SECTION II. — SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

IN investigating the Scriptural doctrine of Election, it is of the utmost consequence to keep close to Scripture itself, and to keep clear of philosophy. The subject of God's foreknowledge and predestination must be full of difficulty, and our question can only be, what is revealed to us, not what may be abstract truth.

¹ The Lambeth Articles, after revision by the bishops, were as follows:—

1. Deus, ab æterno, prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam, quosdam reprobavit ad mortem.

2. Causa movens prædestinationis ad vitam, non est prævisio fidei aut perseverantiæ, aut bonorum operum aut ullius rei quæ insit in personis prædestinatis, sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei.

3. Prædestinatorum definitus et certus est numerus, qui nec augeri nec minui potest.

4. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem necessario propter peccata sua damnabuntur.

5. Vera, viva et justificans Fides, et Spiritus Dei justificantis non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit, in electis, aut finaliter aut totaliter.

6. Homo vere fidelis, *i. e.* fide justificante præditus, certus est, Plerophoria Fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum, et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.

7. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur, non conceditur universis hominibus, qua servari possint, si voluerint.

8. Nemo potest venire ad Christum, nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit. Et omnes homines non trahuntur a Patre, ut veniant ad Filium.

9. Non est positum in arbitrio aut potestate uniuscujusque hominis salvari.

We saw under Article xvi. the alterations introduced by the Lambeth Divines into Propositions 5 and 6, thereby materially modifying the sense. The first proposition expresses a general truth, to which all assent. In the second Whitaker had "Causa efficiens," which the bishops altered to "movens;" for the *moving* cause of man's salvation is not in himself, but in God's mercy through Christ. So, instead of the last words in Whitaker's second Proposition, "*sed sola, et absoluta, et simplex voluntas Dei,*" they put "*sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei,*" because our salvation springs from God's good pleasure and goodness. Yet even so modified (and with such modifications all their original force was lost) the Articles did not approve themselves to the Queen or the best of our then living divines.

² Cardwell's *Conferences*, pp. 178, seq.

The disputes between the Calvinists and Arminians took, unhappily, a metaphysical, almost more than a Scriptural turn. The Calvinists were unable to believe in the contingency of events certainly foreknown, and in the absolute sovereignty of God, if limited by His knowledge of the actions of subordinate beings. The Arminians, truly contending that an action was not made compulsory because it was foreseen, held it inconsistent with the justice of God to destine some to be saved and others to be lost. Both argued from natural religion ; and both gave weighty reasons for their inferences. But both should have seen that there was a limit to all such investigations, which no human intelligence could pass ; and that those very arguments which reduced their adversaries to the greatest difficulties, might often, if pursued further, have told against themselves.

It is quite certain that, if we carry out our investigations on such subjects to their fullest extent, we must at length reach a point which is impassable, but where we are at least as much in difficulty and darkness as at any previous step in our course. Thus, why God, who is all holy and merciful, ever permitted sin to exist, seeing He could have prevented it ; why, when sin came, not only into the creation, but into this world, He did not wholly, instead of partially, remove its curse and power ; why the child derived it from its parent ; why the unsinning brute creation is involved in pain and death, the wages of sin ; why, whereas one half of the infants who are born die before the age of reason and responsibility, yet God does not cause all to die in infancy who, He foresees, will, if they live, live wickedly : — these and like questions, which puzzle us as to the omnipotence, the justice, or the goodness of God, and which neither Scripture nor philosophy will answer, ought to teach us that it is not designed that we should be satisfied on these deep subjects of speculation, concerning which Milton has described even angelic beings as lost in inextricable difficulty.

There is another line of reasoning, which has been taken in this controversy, somewhat more bearing on practical questions, and yet leading us beyond the reach of human intelligence. The Calvinist feels deeply that all must be ascribed to the grace of God, and nothing to the goodness of man. Therefore, he reasons, all holiness must come from an absolute decree ; for, if not, why does one accept grace, another refuse it ? If the grace be not irresistible, there must be something meritorious in him who receives, compared with him who resists. Both indeed may resist God's grace ; but he indeed who resists the least, so as not to quench the Spirit, must

be considered as relatively, if not positively, meritorious. The Arminian, on the contrary, admitting that merit is not possible for man, yet contends that the belief in an irreversible decree takes away all human responsibility, makes the mind of man a mere machine, and deprives us of all motives for exertion and watchfulness. Even these arguments lead us to difficulties which perhaps we cannot solve. We are clearly taught to believe, that sinful man can deserve no good from God, and derives all he has from Him. We are also taught to feel our own responsibility in the use of the grace given us, and the necessity of exerting ourselves in the strength of that grace. There may be some difficulty in harmonizing the two truths; but we have no right to construct a system based upon one of them, and to the exclusion of the other. If we cannot see, as many think they can, that they form parts of one harmonious whole, we must be content to accept them both, without trying to reconcile them.

Now the doctrine of Calvin rests on two premises: 1. That election infallibly implies salvation. 2. That election is arbitrary. The Arminians admit the first premiss, which is probably false, and reject the second, which is probably true. If we would fairly investigate the question, we must begin by a determination not to be biassed by the use of words, nor to suffer ourselves to be led by a train of inductive reasoning. The former is a mistake which prevails extensively on almost all religious questions, and is utterly subversive of candour and truth; the latter is altogether inadmissible on a subject so deep as that under consideration.

To begin with the old Testament, a portion of Scripture too much neglected in this controversy, we read much there of God's election: and it is perhaps to be regretted, that our authorized translation has used the words *choose, chosen, choice*, in the old Testament, and the words *elect* and *election* in the new Testament, whereas the original must be the same in both, and the ideas, contained under both phrases, identical.

Now who are the persons spoken of in the old Testament as God's elect or chosen people? Plainly the seed of Abraham, the children of Israel. Let us then observe, first, the ground of their election; secondly, to what they were elect?

It is quite apparent, from innumerable statements of Moses and the prophets, that the cause or ground of God's election of the people of Israel was not, as on the Arminian hypothesis, foreseen faith, but God's good pleasure, springing from motives unknown to us. It was not for "their righteousness, for the uprightness of their

heart, that they went in to possess the land." The Lord did "not give them the good land to possess for their righteousness: for they were a stiff-necked people" (Dent. ix. 5, 6). "Only the Lord had a delight in their fathers to love them, and He chose their seed after them above all people" (Dent. x. 15). "The Lord will not forsake His people for His great name's sake; because it hath pleased the Lord to make you His people" (1 Sam. xii. 22). "I will be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people . . . I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee" (Jer. xxxi. 1, 3). "I have loved you, saith the Lord, yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord; yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau" (Mal. i. 2, 3): a passage, which, as explained by St. Paul (Rom. ix. 13), clearly expresses God's purpose to choose the seed of Jacob in preference to that of Esau, irrespectively of the goodness of the one or the other.

The Arminian hypothesis, therefore, of foreseen faith is clearly inapplicable to the election spoken of in the books of the old Testament. The cause and ground of it was plainly God's absolute irrespective decree. But then *to what* was the election so often mentioned there? We have discovered its ground; can we discover the correct idea to be attached to the action itself?

It is evident that the whole Jewish nation, and none but they, were the objects of God's election. "O children of Israel . . . you only have I known of all the families of the earth" (Amos iii. 1, 2). "Thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God; the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth" (Dent. vii. 6). "The LORD had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and He chose their seed after them, even you among all people, as it is this day" (Dent. x. 15). "The Lord hath avouched thee this day to be His peculiar people, as He hath promised thee, and that thou shouldst keep all his commandments: and to make thee high above all nations which He hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou mayest be an holy people unto the LORD thy God" (Dent. xxvi. 18, 19). And, "What one nation in the earth is like thy people, like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself? . . . For Thou hast confirmed to Thyself Thy people Israel, to be a people unto Thee for ever: and Thou, LORD, art become their God" (2 Sam. vii. 23, 24). "Blessed is the nation whose God is the LORD, and the people whom He hath chosen for His own inheritance" (Psal. xxxiii. 12). "The LORD hath

chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure" (Psal. cxxxv. 4). "Thou, Israel, art My servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham My friend . . . I have chosen thee and not cast thee away" (Isai. xli. 8, 9). "Yet now hear, O Jacob, my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen" (Isai. xlv. 1). "For Jacob, My servant's sake and Israel Mine elect" (Isai. xlv. 4). "Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, The two families which the Lord hath chosen, He hath even cast them off?" (Jer. xxxiii. 24.)

All these passages tell exactly the same tale, and explain to us the nature and object of God's election, as propounded under the old Testament. Were the Jewish people, who are thus constantly called God's elect, elected to an unfailing and infallible salvation of their souls? Most assuredly not. Nay, they were not elected to *infallible* possession even of all the *temporal* blessings of God's people. Victory over their enemies, entrance into, in the first place, and then quiet possession of, the promised land were made contingent on their obedience to God's will (see Deut. vii., viii. *passim*). But that to which they were chosen, was to be God's "peculiar people," — to be "a holy people," consecrated to the service of God, — to have the covenant and the promises, and to be the Church of God. Yet still, there was "set before them life and death, cursing and blessing:" and they were exhorted to "choose life:" "that they might dwell in the land which the LORD sware to their fathers" (Deut. xxx. 19, 20).

We see therefore, first, that the cause of God's election was arbitrary; secondly, that the election itself was to blessing indeed, but it was the blessing of privilege, not of absolute possession. And even of those chosen to be brought out of Egypt, and to become God's people in the wilderness, by abusing their privileges, all but two perished before they reached the promised land; and those chosen to live in Canaan, as God's Church and people then on earth, were continually provoking God's indignation, and bringing down a curse instead of a blessing upon them.

The seed of Abraham then, the children of Israel, were the only elect people of God at that time upon earth; but their election was to the privilege of being God's Church, the subjects of His Theocratic kingdom, the recipients of His grace, and the depositaries of His truth. This is the whole nature of election, as propounded to us in the Law and the Prophets. If there were any further election, and of what nature it may have been, as far as the old Testament went, was one of the "secret things, which belong to the LORD our God."

Some people indeed argue, that, if one person or body of persons is predestined to light and privilege, and another is debarred from them, it is one and the same thing as if one was predestined to salvation and another to damnation; for, if the one is not certainly saved, the other is certainly lost: and so, if election to glory be not taught, reprobation to damnation is. But this is, first of all, an example of that mode of induction which is so objectionable in questions of this sort. And next, it remains to be proved, either that privilege leads of necessity to salvation, or that absence of privilege leads inevitably to damnation. However, it will, no doubt, be generally conceded that the Jew was placed in a more favourable state for attaining salvation than the Gentile, and *that*, as we have seen, from an arbitrary decree of God. This, it will be said, is as inconsistent with our ideas of justice, as anything in the system of Calvin or Augustine. Admit this, and you may as well admit all. The question, however, still remains the same; not what men are willing to admit, but what the Bible reveals. This election to light and privilege is evidently analogous to those cases which we see in God's ordinary Providence: some born rich, others poor; some nursed in ignorance, others in full light; some with pious, others with ungodly parents; and now too, some in a Christian, others in a heathen land; some with five talents, others with but one. Why all this is, we cannot tell; why God is pleased to put some in a position where vice seems all but inevitable, others where goodness seems almost natural, we know not; nor again, as has been said before, why He does not ordain that all who He foresees will be wicked, should die in infancy. We know and see, that such is His pleasure. The secret motives of His will we are not told, and we cannot fathom. We are left to believe that, though hidden from us, they must be right. What we are taught is, how to avail ourselves of the privileges, whatever they may be, which we have; to escape the dangers, and profit by the advantages of our position. This is practical, and this is revealed truth.

To return to the old Testament. As we have seen, we there read much of election; and it is always election of a certain body of persons, by an arbitrary decree, to the blessings and privileges of being of the Church of God. And we observe another thing, namely, that, whereas none but the Israelites were elected to such privileges then, there were yet many prophecies of a time when other persons, individuals of other nations, should be chosen by God, and made partakers of the same privileges with the Jews,—the same privileges enhanced and exalted. Nay, the Jews are

threatened, as a body, with rejection from privilege for their sins ; a remnant only of them being to be retained in the possession of blessing ; and with that remnant, a host from other nations to be brought in and associated.

When we come to the *new Testament*, we must bear in mind that the Apostles were all Jews, but their mission was to proclaim that the Jewish Church had passed away, and to bring in converts to the Christian Church. Especially St. Paul had to found a Church among the Gentiles, and to bring the Gentiles into the fold of Christ. Nothing therefore could be more natural, or more in accordance with the plan of the Apostles, than, as it were, to apologize to the Jews, and to explain to the Gentiles the new condition which the Almighty had designed for His Church in the world. It would be most natural that they should enlarge upon the truth that in God's eternal counsels there were general purposes of mercy for mankind, to be effected by means of bringing persons into Christ's Church, and therein by the graces of His Spirit conforming them to the likeness of His Son ; that though hitherto His mercy in this respect had been confined to the Jews His further plans having been hid for ages and generations, yet now it was revealed that the Gentiles should with the Jews be fellow-heirs (see Col. i. 25, 26, Eph. iii. 5, 6) ; that, therefore, whereas heretofore the seed of Abraham had been the only chosen people of God, yet now the whole Catholic Church, composed of both converted Jews and Gentiles, were His chosen people ; and God, who, of His good pleasure, for a time elected only the Jews, had, by the same good pleasure, now chosen individuals both of Jews and Gentiles, to be members of His Church and heirs of the grace of life. In thus reasoning, it is most natural that the Apostles should constantly compare the state of Christians with the state of the Jews, and so continually use old Testament language, adopting the very expressions of Moses and the prophets, and simply applying them to the altered condition of the world, and to the enlarged condition of the Church. Thus, were the Jews constantly spoken of as a holy people, as called and chosen of God ? In like manner, St. Paul begins scarce any Epistle without calling the Church addressed in it either holy, called, or elect (see Rom. i. 6, 7 ; ¹ 1 Cor. i. 9, 24 ; 2 Cor. i. 1 ; Eph. i. 1 ; Phil. i. 1 ; Col. i. 2 ; 1 Thess. i. 4 ; 2 Thess. ii. 13 ; 2 Tim. i. 8-10 ; Heb. iii. 1, &c.). Were the Jews spoken of as " a peculiar people, a kingdom of priests, a holy nation " (Exod. xix. 5, 6) ? St. Peter addresses the Christian Church as

¹ κλητοῖς, ἁγίοις, not as in our version, " called to be saints," but, " called, holy," as the Syriac.

“a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people, that they should show forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into His marvellous light; which in times past were not a people, but now are the people of God.”¹ So too, in his very first salutation of the Church, composed as it was of Jewish and Gentile converts, he calls them “strangers or sojourners, scattered abroad, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father” (1 Pet. i. 2); where, like St. Paul, he no doubt uses this expression with special reference to the objection which the Jews made to the calling of the Gentiles. They thought that God’s plan was only to call the children of Israel. But no! the Apostle speaks of the *Church* (a Gentile as well as a Jewish Church) as chosen and preordained, by a foreknown and predestinated counsel of God, kept secret hitherto, but now made manifest.²

This mode of treating the question is nowhere more apparent than in the opening of the Epistle to the Ephesians. There St. Paul is addressing a Gentile Church. Having first saluted its members, as “the holy persons in Ephesus, and the faithful in Christ Jesus,” he at once proceeds to give God thanks for having blessed the Christian Church with all spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus, according as He had chosen that Church in Him before the foundation of the world; the object of such election being, that it might be made holy and without blame before him in love; God having predestinated its members to the adoption of children (as the Jews had of old been children of God), through Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace (Eph. i. 3–6). He then proceeds to speak of the Church’s blessing in having redemption through the Blood of Christ, and says, that now God has made known His hitherto hidden will, that in the dispensation of the fulness of time all things were to be collected together under one Head in Christ, both things in heaven and things on earth (vv. 9, 10). And he continues, that in Him “we (that is, those who have believed from among the Jews) have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to His purpose,” &c. “In whom ye also (ye Gentile Christians) trusted, after that ye heard of the word of truth” (vv. 11–13).³

¹ 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10. St. Peter has here adopted the very words addressed to the Jewish people in Exod. xix. 5, 6, xxiii. 22, as rendered by the LXX. Ἐσσεθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν . . . ἡμεῖς; ἃ ἐξεσθέ μοι βασιλείων ἰερατεύματα καὶ ἔθνος ἕγιον.

² Comp. 1 Pet. v. 13; where he speaks of the *whole Church* at Babylon as “elect together with” those churches to whom he writes.

³ The force of the 14th verse is almost lost in our translation; its peculiarity consisting in its use and adaptation of the

The Apostle next proceeds to give thanks for their conversion and faith, and to pray for their further grace and enlightenment (Eph. i. 15, 16; ii. 10). He reminds them of their former Gentile state, when they were without Christ, and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel (ii. 11, 12); and tells them, that now they are brought nigh by Christ, who hath broken down the partition wall between Jews and Gentiles, and reconciled both Jews and Gentiles to God in one body, preaching peace to the Gentiles, who were far off, and to the Jews, who were nigh (vv. 13–17). He says, that they are therefore now no longer far off from God, but are made fellow-citizens of the same city, the Church, with the saints, and of the same household of God, and are built on the same foundation, and all grow together to one holy temple in the Lord (vv. 18–22). All this was a mystery, in other ages not made known, but now revealed to apostles and prophets by the Spirit, namely, that it had been part of God's eternal purpose of mercy that Gentiles should be fellow-heirs with Jews, both members of the same body, the Church, and partakers of the same promise in Christ by the Gospel (iii. 3–6).

The Churches, which the Apostles thus addressed as elect, and on which they impress the blessings and privileges of their election, are still treated by them as in a state of probation, and their election is represented, not merely as a source of comfort, but also as full of responsibility. Thus, to the Ephesians, of whose election we find St. Paul spoke so strongly in the first chapter, he says, "I . . . beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called" (Ephes. iv. 1). And he thenceforth continues through the whole of the remainder of the Epistle, teaching them how to live, so as not to forfeit their blessings — not to be "like children tossed to and fro" (iv. 14) — not to "walk henceforth as other Gentiles" (17) — not to grieve the Spirit (30) — not to be partakers with fornicators and unclean livers, who have no inheritance in God's kingdom (v. 1–7) — to "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness" (11) — to "walk circumspectly, not

old Testament language to the Christian Church. The words rendered in our version, "until the redemption of the purchased possession," mean more likely "with reference to the ransom of God's peculiar people, or, of the people whom God hath made His own:" *εις ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως*. See Exod. xix. 5, 6; xxiii. 22. So the LXX. read Malachi iii. 17, where it appears prophetic of the Gentile Church. Compare the language of St. Peter, quoted in the last note but

one, who calls the Church *λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν*. St. Paul, (Acts xx. 28.) speaking to the Ephesians, calls them the Church of God, *ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*. The expression appears to mean "the people whom God made His own," so first applied to the Jewish, afterwards to the Christian Church. See Schleusner on this word, Hammond, Rosenmüller and Macknight on Ephes. i. 14, and on 1 Pet. ii. 9.

as fools, but as wise" (15) — not to be "drunk with wine, but to be filled with the Spirit" (18) — to "put on the whole armour of God, that they might be able to stand against the wiles of the devil," knowing that they had a contest against wicked spirits; that so they might "be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand" (vi. 11, 12, 13).

Just similar is his language to other Churches. Thus, the Philippians, whom he calls "saints," he bids to "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling" (Phil. ii. 12; compare iii. 12-16). The Colossians, whom he speaks of as having been "translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son," he bids "to put on, as the elect of God, holy and beloved," all Christian graces (iii. 12-17); and to avoid all heathen vices (iii. 5-9); and *that* on the very principle that they were to consider themselves as brought into a new state in Christ (iii. 9, 10). The Thessalonians, whom he tells that he "knows their election of God" (1 Thess. i. 4), he warns against sloth and sleep (1 Thess. v. 6), urges them to put on Christian armour (v. 8, 9), exhorts them not to "*quench* the Spirit" (v. 19). And to Timothy he says of himself, that he "endures all things for the elect's sake;" and *that, not* because the elect are *sure* of salvation, but in *order that* "they may *also obtain* the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory" (2 Tim. ii. 10).

In exactly the same manner, St. Peter, as we have seen, addresses those to whom he writes as "elect," and whom he calls "an elect generation," (1 Pet. i. 2; ii. 9): but he still urges them to "abstain from fleshly lusts," (ii. 11); to "pass the time of their sojourning here in fear," (i. 17); to be "sober and watch unto prayer" (iv. 7); to "give diligence to make their calling and election sure" (2 Pet. i. 10); to "beware lest, being led away with the error of the wicked, they fall from their own steadfastness" (2 Pet. iii. 17).

All this is in the same spirit and tone. It is, allowing for the change of circumstances, just as the prophets addressed the Jews. The prophets addressed the Jews, and the apostles addressed Christians, as God's chosen people, as elect, predestinated to the Church, to grace, to blessing. But then, they urge their blessings and election as motives, not for confidence, but for watchfulness. They speak to them as having a conflict to maintain, a race to run; and they exhort them not to quench the Spirit, who is aiding them, to beware lest they fall from the steadfastness of their faith, to be sober and watch to the end.

Let us turn next to the Epistle to the Romans. In the ninth chapter more especially, St. Paul considers the question of God's rejecting the unbelieving Jews, and calling into His Church a body of persons elected from among Jews and Gentiles. The rejection of his fellow-countrymen he himself deeply deploras; but there was a difficulty and objection arising, which he sets himself directly to solve. God has chosen Israel for His people. He had given them "an everlasting covenant, even the sure mercies of David." Could then the rejection of the Jews be explained consistently with God's justice, His promises, and His past dealing with His people? Objections of this kind the Apostle replies to. And he does so by showing that God's dealings now were just as they had always been of old. Of old He gave the promise to Abraham, but afterwards limited it to his seed in Isaac. Then again, though Esau and Jacob were both Isaac's children, He gave the privileges of His Church to the descendants of Jacob, not to those of Esau; and that with no reference to Jacob's goodness; for the restriction of the promise was made before either Jacob or Esau were born; exactly according to those words by Malachi, where God, speaking of His calling of the Israelites, says, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." (Rom. ix. 6-13.) This restriction therefore of God's promises, first to Isaac, and then to Jacob, corresponded exactly with His purposes now revealed in the Gospel, namely, to bring to Christian and Church privileges that *portion* of the Jews who embraced the Gospel, and to cast off the rest who were hardened in unbelief. From verse 14 to verse 19, St. Paul states an objection to this doctrine of God's election, which he replies to in verse 20. The objection he states thus, "Shall we say then that there is injustice with God?" For the language of Scripture seems to imply that there is, God being represented as saying, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," which shows that it is of God's mercy, and not of man's will. Again, it is said to Pharaoh, "For this cause have I raised thee up, that I might shew My power in thee." So that it seems to be taught us, that God shows mercy on whom He will, and hardens whom He will. It may therefore be reasonably said, why does He yet find fault with the sinner; "for who hath resisted His will?" (vv. 14-19). This objection to God's justice the Apostle states thus strongly, that he may answer it the more fully. His reply is, that such complaints against God for electing the Jewish people, and placing Pharaoh in an exalted station, and bearing long with his wickedness, are presumptuous and arrogant. "Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against

God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour?" (vv. 20, 21).¹ Shall man complain because God ordained the Jews for a place of eminence in His Church, or raised Pharaoh as king of Egypt to a position of honour, and yet a position in which he would only the more surely exhibit his wickedness? We know not the secret motives of God's will. What if the real reason of all this were, that "God, willing to manifest His wrath, and to make His power known," as He did with Pharaoh, so now also has endured with much long-suffering the unbelieving Israelites, who are "vessels of wrath" already "fitted to destruction," in order "that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy, which He had afore prepared for a position of honour, even on us, who are that Church of Christ, which He hath now called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?" (vv. 20-24).

If we will cast aside preconceived doctrines and conventional phraseology, it will surely appear that such is the plain meaning of this memorable chapter. The Apostle is explaining the justice of God's dealings, in having long borne with the Jewish race, and now casting them off and establishing a Church composed partly of the remnant of the Jews, partly of Gentile converts. Herein He only acted as He had ever done, calling first the seed of Abraham His chosen, then the seed of Isaac, elected from the elect, and again (elected once more out of them) the seed of Jacob; and as He had borne long with Pharaoh's wickedness, that He might make him the more signal monument of His vengeance, so perhaps it was with the Jews. He had borne long with them, partly in

¹ See Jer. xviii. 2-10. "The scriptural similitude of the potter and the clay is often triumphantly appealed to as a proof that God has from eternity decreed, and what is more, has revealed to us that He has so decreed the salvation or perdition of each individual, without any other reason assigned than that such is His will and pleasure: 'we are in His hands,' say these predestinarians, 'as clay is in the potter's, who hath power of the same lump to make one vessel to honour and another to dishonour,' not observing, in their hasty eagerness to seize on every apparent confirmation of their system, that this similitude, as far as it goes, rather makes against them; since the potter never makes any vessel for the express purpose of being broken and destroyed. This comparison accordingly agrees much better with the view here

taken; the potter, according to his own arbitrary choice, makes 'of the same lump one vessel to honour, and another to dishonour,' i. e., some to nobler and some to meaner uses; but all for *some* use; none with the design that it should be cast away and dashed to pieces: even so the Almighty, of His own arbitrary choice, causes some to be born to wealth or rank, others to poverty and obscurity; some in a heathen and others in a Christian country; the advantages and privileges bestowed on each are various, and, as far as we can see, arbitrarily dispensed; the final rewards or punishments depend, as we are plainly taught, on the use or abuse of these advantages." — Archbp. Whately, *Essays on the Writings of St. Paul*. Essay III. on Election, an essay full of clear and thoughtful statements and elucidations.

mercy, and partly that He might magnify His power, and show the severity of His justice.

The same subject is kept in view, more or less, throughout the two following chapters. In the 11th he again distinctly recurs to the bringing of a portion of the Jewish race into the Church of Christ, not indeed the whole nation — but restricted again, as it once was in Isaac, and afterwards in Jacob. He instances the case in which all Israel seemed involved in one common apostasy, and yet God told Elias that there were seven thousand men who had not bowed the knee to Baal. Even so it was at the time of the Gospel. All Israel seemed cast off, but it was not so; a remnant remained, a remnant was called into the Church, chosen or elected into it by the grace of God. “Even so at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.” Rom. xi. 5.

We may now proceed to the passage which, even more than any of the preceding, may be considered as the stronghold either of the Calvinist or the Arminian. Each claims it as unquestionably his own. The passage is Rom. viii. 29, 30: “For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified.”

The Calvinist contends that the passage plainly speaks of predestination to eternal glory; the various clauses showing the progress, from the first purpose of God, through calling and justifying, to the final salvation of the elect soul. The Arminian replies, that, though it is true that the passage speaks of predestination to eternal glory, yet it is evidently on the ground of foreseen faith; for it begins with the words “whom He did foreknow;” showing that His foreknowledge of their acceptance of His grace was the motive of His predestination of their glory. That the Arminian has scarcely ground for this argument seems clear from the use of this word “foreknew” in Rom. xi. 2; where “God hath not cast away His people whom He foreknew,” can scarcely mean otherwise than “whom He had predestinated to be His Church of old.” But then, though it seems that the passage speaks of an *arbitrary purpose*, yet it cannot be proved to have any *direct* reference to *future* glory. The verbs are all in the *past* tense, and none in the *future*, and therefore cannot certainly be translated *as future*. Either “whom He hath justified, them He hath glorified,”¹ or “whom

¹ οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασε.

He *justifies*, them He also *glorifies*," would correctly render it; since the aorist expresses either a *past* or a *present*. Hence the passage was uniformly understood by the ancients as referring not to *future* glory of Christians in the world to come, but to that *present* glorification of the elect, which consists in their participation in the high honour and privilege bestowed by God upon His Church.¹ And, as they viewed it, so grammatical accuracy will oblige us to understand it. And if so, then we must interpret the passage in correspondence with the language in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and in the chapter already considered in the Epistle to the Romans. "Those whom God in His eternal counsels chose before the foundation of the world, His elect people, the Church, He designed to bring to great blessings and privileges; namely, conformity to the likeness of His Son, calling into His Church, justification, and the high honor and glory of being sons of God and heirs of the kingdom of heaven."²

It would exceed our limits, if we were to consider all the passages bearing on this doctrine in the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles. The parable of the vineyard (Matt. xx. 1-16), and of the wedding feast (Matt. xxii. 1-14), evidently speak the language of ecclesiastical election, the calling of the Jews, and then the election of the halt and maimed heathen from the highways and hedges into the Christian Church.³

In the Acts, we read of God's "adding to the Church such as should be saved," (τοὺς σωζομένους, those who were being saved,) where the words plainly mean that God brought into His Church those whom He chose to the privileges of a state of salvation⁴ (Acts ii. 47).

¹ See Faber, *Prim. Doct. of Election*, who quotes, from Whitby, Origen, Chrysostom, Ecumenius, Theodoret, Theophylact, pseudo-Ambrosius, and Jerome, as concurring in this interpretation of "glorified."

² I have myself little doubt that this is the meaning of the passage, divested of conventional phraseology, which cramps our whole mind in these inquiries. But I should wish to guard against dogmatizing too decidedly on such passages. I think this passage and one other (John vi. 37-39) to be the strongest passages in favour of the theory of St. Augustine; and their full weight ought to be given them. Some sound and learned divines have thought, that the new Testament evidently speaks of election to grace, and that most of the passages on the subject

relate to this, but that there are also passages which relate to a further election out of the elect, to glory.

³ The words with which these two parables end, seem, at first sight, an exception to the use of the word *elect* in the Scriptures; namely, "Many are called, but few chosen:" πολλοὶ μὲν κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί. It is, however, merely a different application of the same term. Many are called to Christian privileges, but only those who make a good use of them are chosen to salvation. Notwithstanding, then, a different application of the word *chosen*, the principle laid down appears to be precisely the same.

⁴ τοὺς σωζομένους. Dr. Hammond (on Luke xiii. 23, and 1 Pet. ii. 6, in which he is followed by Lowth on Isaiah i. 9, Ezek. vii. 6) considers this expression

In Acts xiii. 48, we hear of persons "believing, as many as were ordained to eternal life," which sounds at first much like the doctrine of Calvin. But in the first place, the word here rendered *ordained*, is nowhere else employed in the sense of *predestinated*; and if it is to be so interpreted here, we must perforce understand it as meaning, that they were predestinated to the reception of that Gospel which is itself the way to eternal life, and which, if not abused, will surely lead to it. Otherwise the passage would prove, that all those who heard the Apostles and embraced the Gospel and the Church, must have been finally saved; a thing in the highest degree improbable, and wholly inconsistent with experience.¹

In the Gospel of St. John we have two or three passages, supposed to speak markedly the language of Calvinism.

1. "All that the Father giveth Me shall come to Me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out" (John vi. 37).

2. "And this is the Father's will which hath sent Me, that of all which He hath given Me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day" (John vi. 39).

3. "Have not I *chosen* you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" (John vi. 70).

4. "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of My hand. My Father, which gave them Me, is greater than all; and no (man) is able to pluck them out of My Father's hand" (John x. 27-29).

5. "Because ye are not of the world, but I have *chosen* you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (John xv. 19).

6. "Holy Father, keep through Thine own Name those whom thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as We are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in Thy Name: those that Thou gavest Me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the Scripture might be fulfilled" (John xvii. 11, 12).

Some of these passages, taken by themselves, undoubtedly bear a very Calvinistic aspect, especially the second and the fourth. But if we take them altogether, they explain each other. The whole then seems a connected scheme. The Father gives a Church of disciples to His Son; who also Himself chooses them

as synonymous with the "remnant" or "escaped," מִן־הַיָּדָיִם, so often spoken of in the old Testament. The Syriac renders

the words by ܣܘܠܬܐ ܕܚܝܝܝܢ qui salvi fiebant in cœtu vel ecclesia.

³ See Hammond on this verse, and

from the world. Those that the Father thus gives to the Son, assuredly come to Him, and are joined unto his fellowship.¹ It is not the will of God that any of these should perish. "He willeth not the death of a sinner." "It is not the will of the Father that one of these little ones should perish." Whilst our blessed Lord was on earth with His Church, He preserved and guarded it by His presence; and when He left it, He prayed the Father that He would guard and support His disciples, "not taking them from the world, but keeping them from the evil" (John xvii. 15). The faithfulness of God is pledged to support His tempted servants, and His greatness secures them against all dangers, and assures them, that none shall be able to take them out of Christ's hands. Yet that their final perseverance and salvation are not so certainly secured, as that, because they have been given to Christ they can never at last be condemned, is evidenced by the case of Judas Iscariot, who, in the third and sixth of the above passages, is numbered with Christ's elect,² and with those whom the Father had given Him; yet still is mentioned, as one who, notwithstanding Christ's own presence and guidance, had fallen away and perished. He, like the rest, had been of Christ's sheep, elect to discipleship and grace; but, having quenched the Spirit, and been unfaithful, he was not chosen to salvation.³

Whatever then be philosophically true concerning man's freedom and God's sovereignty and foreknowledge; the question which is practical to us is, How far has God revealed in His word the grounds of His dealings with us? If the foregoing investigation has been fairly conducted, we must conclude, that the revelation which has been given us concerns His will and purpose to gather together in Christ a Church chosen out of the world, and that to this Church and to every individual member of it He gives the means of salvation. That salvation, if attained, will be wholly due to the grace of God, which first chooses the elect soul to the blessings of the baptismal covenant, and afterwards endues it with

also his notes on Luke xiii. 23; 1 Pet. ii. 6.

¹ Compare John x. 16: "Other sheep I have, that are not of this fold" (Gentiles, not Jews): "them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice: and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd."

² Compare, "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen," (meaning Judas). John xiii. 18.

³ I cannot see that any force is put upon the passages from St. John by the explanation and paraphrase in the text.

It seems to me that, when all are compared together, no other sense can be attached to them. Yet, as above noted, the passages marked 2 and 4, and Romans viii. 29, 30, are the passages most favourable to the theory of St. Augustine. And it is so fearful a thing to put a strained interpretation on the words of Christ, in order to adapt them to a system, that I would not willingly err, by pressing on others those interpretations which seem to me to be undoubtedly true.

power to live the life of faith. If, on the other hand, the proffered salvation be forfeited, it will be in consequence of the fault and wickedness of him that rejects it. Much is said of God's will, that all should be saved, and of Christ's death as sufficient for all men; and we hear of none shut out from salvation, but for their own faults and demerits. More than this cannot with certainty be inferred from Scripture; for it appears most probable that what we learn there concerns only predestination to grace, there being no revelation concerning predestination to glory.

The old Testament, our blessed Lord, St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John, and after them the earliest Christian Fathers, seem thus in perfect harmony to speak of God's election of individuals to His Church. Of any further election we cannot say that they did speak. New and more subtle questions were brought in by philosophers, like Clement and Origen, which were more fully worked out by the powerful intellect of St. Augustine, whose contact with philosophic heretics tempted him to philosophic speculations. In later times the disputations of the schoolmen still mingled metaphysics with theology; till the acute but over-bold mind of Calvin moulded into full proportion a system, which has proved the fertile source of discord to all succeeding generations. In the hands of the great Genevan divine it was not allowed to be quiet and otiose, but became the basis and groundwork of his whole scheme of theology. Much of that scheme was sound and admirable; but it was so made to bend and square itself to its author's strong view of predestination, that it lost the fair proportions of Catholic truth.

Deep learning and fervent piety have characterized many who have widely differed in these points of doctrine. It is well for us, disregarding mere human authority and philosophical discussions, to strive to attain the simple sense of the Scriptures of God. But it is not well, when we have satisfied ourselves, to condemn those who may disagree with us; nor, because we see practical dangers in certain doctrines, to believe that all who embrace those doctrines must of necessity fall into evil, through the dangers which attach to them. Discussions on subjects such as this do not, perhaps, so much need acuteness and subtilty, as humility and charity.

ARTICLE XVIII.

Of obtaining Eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ.

De sperandâ æterna salutē tantum in nomine Christi.

THEY also are to be had accursed that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

SUNT et illi anathematizandi, qui dicere audent unumquemque in lege aut secta quam profitetur esse servandum, modo juxta illam et lumen naturæ accurate vixerit, cum sacræ literæ tantum Jesu Christi nomen prædicent, in quo salvos fieri homines oporteat.

SECTION I. — HISTORY.

THE early fathers with great unanimity assert, that salvation is only to be had through Christ, and in the Church of Christ. So Ignatius says, “Let no one be deceived. Even heavenly beings and the glory of angels and principalities, visible and invisible, unless they believe in the Blood of Christ, even for them is condemnation.”¹ “If any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God.”²

Irenæus says, “The Church is the entrance to life, all who teach otherwise are thieves and robbers.”³ “They are not partakers of the Spirit who do not come into the Church, but they defraud themselves of life.”⁴

Origen says, “Let no one deceive himself; out of this house, *i. e.* the Church, no one is saved.”⁵

Cyprian, in speaking of the unity of the Church, says, that “Whoever is separated from the Church is separated from the

¹ Μηδεις πλανασθω· και τα επουρανια, και η δόξα των αγγελων, και οι αρχοντες ορατοι τε και αορατοι, εν μη πιστευσωσιν εις το αιμα Χριστου, κακεινους κρισις εστιν. — *Ad. Smyrn.* vi.

² Εάν μη τις η εντος του θυσιαστηριου, υπερειται του αρατου του Θεου. — *Ad. Ephes.* v.

³ “Hæc (h. e. ecclesia) est enim vitæ introitus; omnes autem reliqui fures sunt et latrones.” — *Adv. Hæc.* III. 4.

⁴ “Spiritus; cujus non sunt participes omnes qui non concurrunt ad ecclesiam, sed semetipsos fraudant a vita . . . ubi enim ecclesia ibi et Spiritus Dei.” — *Ibid.* III. 40. See the whole chapter.

⁵ “Nemo ergo sibi persuadeat, nemo seipsum decipiat; extra hanc domum, id est, extra ecclesiam, nemo salvatur.” — *Homil. in Jesum Nave,* III. num. 5

promise of the Church ; that if a man have not the Church for his mother, he hath not God for his father ; and that, as to be saved from the deluge it was needful to be in the ark, so to escape now, we must be in the Church.”¹

Lactantius writes that, “if a person have not entered into, or have gone out of the Church, he is apart from salvation.”²

Statements in great number to the same purport might be quoted. The necessity of cleaving to Christ, of being baptized, and of belonging to the Church, is much and constantly dwelt upon ; and so the rejection of baptism is often spoken of as excluding from life.

In the Recognitions of Clement, a spurious but still a very early work, we find it argued from St. Matthew, that “if a person is not baptized, not only will he be deprived of Heaven, but will not be without danger in the resurrection, however good his life may have been.”³

St. Cyril of Jerusalem says, “No one can be saved without baptism except the martyrs.”⁴

St. Gregory Nazianzen held, that infants who die without baptism “will neither be glorified, nor yet be punished.”⁵

And so the pseudo-Athanasius says, “it is clear that baptized children of believers go spotless and as believers into the kingdom. But the unbaptized and heathen children neither go to the kingdom nor yet to punishment, seeing they have not committed actual sin.”⁶

When the Pelagian controversy had arisen, the question was considerably agitated, as to how far it was possible for the unbaptized to be saved. And as the Pelagians underrated baptism, their opponents naturally insisted on it more strongly.

St. Augustine, the great anti-Pelagian champion, denounces, as

¹ “Quisquis ab ecclesia segregatus adulteræ jungitur, a promissis ecclesiæ separatur. Nec pervenit ad Christi præmia, qui relinquit ecclesiam Christi. Alienus est, profanus est, hostis est. Habere jam non potest Deum Patrem, qui Ecclesiam non habet matrem. Si potuit evadere quisquam qui extra arcam Noe fuit, et qui extra ecclesiam foris fuerit, evadet.” — *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*. Oxf. 1682, p. 109.

² “Sola Catholica ecclesia est quæ verum cultum retinet. Hic est fons veritatis, hoc est domicilium fidei, hoc templum Dei : quo si quis non intraverit, vel a quo si quis exierit, a spe vitæ ac salutis æternæ alienus est.” — Lactant. Lib. IV. c. 30 ; see Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 350.

³ “Si quis Jesu Baptisma non fuerit

consecutus, is non solum cælorum regno fraudabitur, verum et in resurrectione mortuorum non absque periculo erit etiamsi bonæ vitæ et rectæ mentis prærogativa muniatur.” — Coteler. I. p. 501, c. 55 ; see also p. 551, c. 10.

⁴ εἰ τις μὴ λάβῃ τὸ βάπτισμα, σωτηρίαν οὐκ ἔχει πλὴν μόνου μαρτύρου, οἱ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ὕδατος λαμβάνουσι τὴν βασιλείαν. — *Cateches.* III. 7.

⁵ τοὺς δὲ μήτε δοξασθῆσθαι, μήτε κολασθῆσθαι περὶ τοῦ δικαίου Κριτοῦ, ὡς ἀσφραγίστους μὲν, ἀπονήρους δὲ, ἀλλὰ παθόντας μᾶλλον τὴν ζημίαν ἢ δρασάντας. — *Oratio XL.* Tom. I. p. 653. Colon.

⁶ τὰ δὲ ἀβάπτιστα καὶ τὰ ἐθνικὰ, οὐτε εἰς βασιλείαν εἰσέρχονται· ἀλλ’ οὐτε πύλιν εἰς κόλασιν. ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔπραξαν. — *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, Quæst. CXLV.

a Pelagian error, the opinion that unbaptized infants could be saved.¹ He denies that any can be saved without Baptism and the Eucharist.² The Pelagians seem to have promised to infants unbaptized a kind of mean between Heaven and Hell. This Augustine utterly condemns;³ and he himself positively asserts that no one apart from the society of Christ can be saved.⁴ Baptized infants, he says, at death passed into eternal life, unbaptized into death.⁵

In the work of the pseudo-Ambrosius, which is generally attributed to a writer of the name of Prosper, who is evidently a follower of St. Augustine, we read of some infants as regenerate to eternal life, others, unregenerate passing to perpetual misery.⁶

The earlier fathers, however, though, as we have seen, strongly stating that baptism, faith in Christ, union with the Church, are the only appointed means of safety, held language far less severe than St. Augustine's on the possibility of salvation to the heathen and the unbaptized. Justin Martyr, for instance, appears to have had the notion that ancient philosophers received some revelation from the Son of God, and so were led to oppose Polytheism.⁷ Similar views must have occurred to Tertullian, who looked on Socrates as having some insight into Divine truth;⁸ and thought that a kind of inspiration had reached the ancient philosophers.⁹ Yet he seems to have believed the heathen generally under the dominion of the powers of darkness; and Bishop Kaye thinks his opinion of the necessity of baptism must, if he had entertained the question at all, have led him to decide against the salvability of the heathen.¹⁰ There may, however, exist a strong persuasion of the necessity of baptism, without a decided dogmatizing on the condition of those to whom it has not been offered; and, in any case, on subjects so profound as this, we cannot always insist that any author shall be consistent with himself. Clement of Alexandria,

¹ See *De Gestis Pelagii*, c. xi. Tom. x. p. 204.

² *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*, Tom. x. p. 15.

³ *De Anima et ejus origine*, c. 9, Tom. x. p. 343.

⁴ *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*, c. 11, Tom. x. p. 80.

⁵ *De Dono Perseverantiæ*, c. 30, 31, Tom. x. p. 837.

⁶ *De Vocazione Gentium*, Lib. i. cap. 7; Lib. ii. cap. 8. Vossius attributes it to Prosper, bishop of Orleans in the sixth century, not to Prosper of Aquitaine, the disciple of St. Augustine.

⁷ Οὐ γὰρ μόνον Ἑλλῆσι διὰ Σωκράτους

ὑπὸ λόγου (i. e. ratione) ἠλέγχθη ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν βαρβάρους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου μορφωθέντος καὶ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κληθέντος. — *Apol.* i. p. 56. *Comp. Dial.* pp. 218, 220.

⁸ "Idem (Socrates) et quum aliquid de veritate sapiebat, deos negans," &c. — *Apoloq.* c. 46.

⁹ "Taceo de philosophis, quos superbia severitatis et duritia disciplinæ ab omni timore securos, nonnullus etiam afflatus Veritatis adversus Deos erigit." — *Ad Nationes*, Lib. i. c. 10. See Bishop Kaye's *Tertullian*, pp. 174, 345.

¹⁰ See as above, p. 345.

whose sympathies were strong with the ancient philosophers, speaks of the Law as given to the Jews, and philosophy to the Greeks, before the coming of Christ. He considers philosophy as having borrowed much from Revelation, and thinks it was capable by God's appointment of justifying those who had no opportunity of knowing better.¹

This charitable hope concerning the salvability of the heathen, though naturally less entertained by divines who, like Augustine, were engaged in opposing Pelagianism, is not confined to the earliest fathers. St. Chrysostom, in commenting on St. Paul's argument in the second chapter of Romans, verse 29, evidently implies, that the religious and virtuous Gentile might have been saved, whilst the ungodly Jew would be condemned.² On the contrary, St. Augustine, with reference to the same passage, understood by the Gentile which does *by nature* the things of the Law, not the uninstructed heathen, but the Gentile Christian, who does *by grace* the things of the Law.³

We have seen that Gregory Nazianzen and the pseudo-Athanasius believed in an intermediate state between Heaven and hell for heathens and infants unbaptized. In this they are followed by Pope Innocent III., and some of the schoolmen: and, no doubt, out of this arose the belief in a *limbus* for those children who die before baptism and before the commission of actual sin.

To proceed to the period of the Reformation: the Council of Trent anathematizes all who deny that baptism is necessary to salvation; ⁴ which however is not the same thing as deciding on the state of the unbaptized.

Among the foreign reformers, Zuinglius believed that all infants and heathens might partake of God's mercies in Christ.⁵ Luther denies in plain terms remission of sins to any without the Church.⁶ But the Lutheran Confessions do not appear to say much on this head. Calvin, though appearing to think baptism the only means whereby elect infants could be regenerate and so saved, if they died,⁷ yet argues forcibly against such as consign all unbaptized infants to damnation.⁸ Still he says of the visible Church, that we

¹ Ἦν μὲν οὖν πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίας εἰς δικαιοσύνην Ἑλλησιν ἀναγκαία φιλοσοφία. — *Strom.* i. p. 331. φιλοσοφία δὲ ἡ Ἑλληνική, οἷον προκαθίρει καὶ προεθίζει τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς παραδοχὴν πίστεως. — *Strom.* vii. p. 839. εἰκότως οὖν Ἰουδαίους μὲν νόμος, Ἑλλησι δὲ φιλοσοφία μέχρι τῆς παρουσίας, ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἡ κλήσις ἡ καθολικὴ εἰς περιούσιον δικαιοσύνης λαόν. — *Strom.* vi. p. 823.

² Chrysost. *Hon.* vi. in *Epist. ad Rom.*

³ *De Spiritu et Litera*, § 48, Tom. x. p. 108. *Comp. Contra Julianum*, Lib. iv. 23, 24, 25, Tom. x. p. 597.

⁴ Sess. vii. Can. v. *De Baptismo*.

⁵ See on this subject under Art. xvii. *Catechismus Major*. Op. Tom. v. p. 629.

⁷ *Institut.* iv. xvi. 17.

⁸ *Ibid.* iv. xvi. 28.

have no entrance into life, unless she, our Mother, conceives us in her womb; and without her bosom is no remission of sins or salvation to be hoped for.¹

Cranmer's Catechism was published by him A. D. 1548. It was translated from the Latin of Justus Jonas, a Lutheran divine. Sometimes in the translation alterations were introduced by Archbishop Cranmer, or under his direction, which are peculiarly calculated to show his own opinions. One strong passage on the subject of this Article is translated literally and with all the force of the original: "If we should have heathen parents and die without baptism, we should be damned everlastingly."² But another passage, which cannot be considered stronger, if so strong, is left out in the translation, apparently because Cranmer was unwilling so decidedly to dogmatize on this question.³

In the first Book of Homilies we read, "If a heathen man clothe the naked, feed the hungry, and do such other like works; yet because he doth them not in faith for the honour and love of God, they be but dead, vain, and fruitless works to him. Faith it is that doth commend the work to God; for, as St. Augustine saith, whether thou wilt or no, that work which cometh not of faith is nought; where the faith of Christ is not the foundation, there is no good work, what building soever we make."⁴

Noel's Catechism is a work drawn up long after the putting forth of the Articles, and therefore not, like the writings of Cranmer and Ridley or the first Book of Homilies, historically calculated to elucidate the Articles; yet from the approbation it received in the reign of Elizabeth, it has been looked on as of high authority in the Church of England. Its words on this subject are:—

"M. Is there then no hope of salvation out of the Church?

¹ "Non alius est in vitam ingressus nisi nos ipsa (h. e. visibilis ecclesia) concipiat in utero, nisi nos pariat, &c. Extra ejus gremium nulla est speranda peccatorum remissio, nec ulla salus." — IV. i. 4.

² Cranmer's *Catechism*, Oxford, 1829, p. 39 of the Latin, p. 51 of the English. See Preface, p. xvi.

³ The passage is in the Latin, p. 106. "Et ut firmiter credamus has immensas, ineffabiles, infinitas opes et thesauros veros, primitias regni cœlorum et vitæ æternæ, tantum in ecclesia esse, nusquam alibi, neque apud sapientes et philosophos gentium, neque apud Turcicam illam tot millium hominum colluviem,

neque apud papisticam illam et titulo tenus ecclesiam inveniri." These words are omitted in page 125 of the English; yet the following words occur in the same page: "Without the Church is no remission of sin." In the Confutation of Unwritten Verities (*Works*, IV. p. 510) Cranmer says, "To that eternal salvation cometh no man but he that hath the Head Christ. Yea, and no man can have the Head Christ which is not in His Body the Church."

⁴ First Part of *Homily on Good Works*. Compare the language of St. Augustine, *Contra Julianum*, Lib. IV. quoted under Art. XIII. p. 332.

“A. Without it there can be nothing but damnation and death.”¹

The above-cited passages show, that the English reformers strongly held the doctrine that without Christ, without baptism, apart from the Church, no salvation is offered to man, and that if we reject them, we have no right to look for it. It might even seem that they took the strong views of St. Augustine against the salvability of the heathen or of infants unbaptized, under any circumstances. Yet there are some indications of reluctance to assume so decided a position. It has already been observed, that it is very possible to assert strongly that no other means of salvation are *offered*, that no other hope is *held out*, without determining positively that all who are cut off from the means of grace, inevitably perish. Many of the fathers appear to have thought this a consistent view of the case. Calvin, as we have seen, denied salvation out of the visible Church, and yet would not allow that all unbaptized infants perish. And so Cranmer, though translating one strong passage from Justus Jonas, has left another out of his Catechism, probably because he would not pronounce definitely on the state of heathens and persons in ignorance.

As to the wording of the Article itself, it comes naturally and properly between the Article on God's election of persons into His Church, and the Article which defines the Church itself. It condemns that latitudinarianism which makes all creeds and all communions alike, saying that all men may be saved by their own sect, so they shape their lives according to it, and to the law of nature. The ground on which it protests against this view of matters is, that the Scriptures set forth no other name but Christ's whereby we may be saved. . The opinion here condemned therefore is, not a charitable hope that persons who have never heard of Christ, or who have been bred in ignorance or error, may not be inevitably excluded from the benefit of His atonement; but that cold indifference to faith and truth which would rest satisfied and leave them in their errors, instead of striving to bring them to faith in Christ and to His Body the Church, to which alone the promises of the Gospel are made, and to which by actual revelation God's mercies are annexed.

¹ *M. Nullane ergo salutis spes extra damnatio exitium atque interitus esse Ecclesiam? A. Extra eam nihil nisi potest.*”

SECTION II. — SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE teaching of the Article will be sufficiently established, if we show:—

I. That Holy Scripture sets out to us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men may be saved.

II. That salvation is therefore offered only in the Church.

III. That accordingly, we have no right to say that men shall be saved by their own law or sect, if they be diligent to frame their life according to that law and the light of nature.

I. The first proposition appears from such passages as these, “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him” (John iii. 36). “No man cometh unto the Father, but by Me” (John xiv. 6). “Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. iii. 11). “There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all” (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6). “He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (1 John ii. 2). “This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life” (1 John v. 12). Compare Mark xvi. 15, 16; John i. 29; iii. 14, 15, 17; v. 40; x. 9; xx. 31; Acts xiii. 38; Rom. vii. 24, 25; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; 2 Tim. i. 10; Heb. v. 9; xi. 6; xii. 2. “Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts iv. 12). “To Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins” (Acts x. 43). “Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house” (Acts xvi. 30, 31).

II. The second proposition appears from this:—

When our Lord had offered the propitiation, by which He

became the Saviour of mankind, He commissioned His Apostles to preach the Gospel and to found the Church ; and “ He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature : He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be damned ” (Mark xvi. 15, 16).

Accordingly, when St. Peter’s sermon at the feast of Pentecost had produced a wonderful effect on those that heard it, so that they cried, “ Men and brethren, what shall we do ? then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins ” (Acts ii. 37, 38). And so, in like manner, whensoever persons were converted to the faith, they were at once baptized into the Church. Compare Acts viii. 12, 13, 36, 38 ; ix. 18 ; x. 47, 48 ; xvi. 33 ; xix. 5, xxii. 16, &c.

Hence, St. Peter (1 Pet. iii. 21) speaks of baptism as saving us, like the ark of Noah ; for baptism places us within the Church, which, like Noah’s ark, is the place of refuge for Christ’s disciples in the flood of ungodliness around it. And St. Paul tells us, that, “ As many as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ ” (Gal. iii. 27). And as thus baptism, by placing us within the Church, puts us in a place of safety, a state of salvation, so it is the Church only which is said to be saved. Christ is called “ the Head of the body the Church ” (Col. i. 18), and so is said to be “ the Saviour of the body ” (Ephes. v. 23), of which He is the Head. He represents Himself as the Vine, and all members of His Church as branches of that Vine ; and then says, “ I am the Vine, ye are the branches : he that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit : for without Me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered ” (John xv. 5, 6).

Again we read, that “ Christ loved the *Church*, and gave Himself for it ; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church : ” &c. (Ephes. v. 25, 26, 27). And accordingly, when first God’s grace by the preaching of the Apostles was bringing men to Christ, and to the Christian faith, we are told that “ the Lord added unto the Church daily such as were being saved ” (τοὺς σωζομένους) (Acts ii. 47).

III. As to believe in Christ, to be baptized into His Name, and incorporated into His Church, are the appointed means to

salvation ; so to reject Him and continue in unbelief is the way to be lost. When the Gospel was to be preached, our Lord promised that those who believed so as to be baptized should be saved, or placed in a state of salvation ; but He added, “ He that believeth not shall be damned ” (Mark xvi. 16). So He said of those that rejected Him, “ He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the Name of the only-begotten Son of God ; and this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil ” (John iii. 18, 19). “ He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My words, hath one that judgeth him ; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day ” (John xii. 48). And to St. John He declared that “ the unbelieving . . . shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone ” (Rev. xxi. 8).

It is unnecessary to multiply proofs, that, as there is no salvation offered but by Christ and to those who believe and are baptized in His Name, so those who reject Him shall be rejected ; and that therefore we cannot hold out the hope of salvation to those who adhere to another sect or law, as though they might be saved by that, if only they lived up to its requirements. If it were necessary to add more, we might refer to those passages in which it is declared that, after the Gospel was come, the Law of Moses, being done away, could never give salvation to those who lived under it, (see Rom. iii. 9, 23 ; ix. 31, 32 ; Gal. ii. 16, 21 ; iii. 21, 22 ; v. 2, 4, &c.) If the Law of Moses could not justify, a law which did come from God ; much less can we believe that any other creed, of man’s device, could be safe for any to abide in.

The question concerning the salvability of the heathen need hardly be discussed. It is quite certain that Scripture says very little about them. Its words concern and are addressed to those who can hear and read them, not to those who hear them not. The fact appears to be, that no religion but Christ’s, no society but His Church, is set forth as the means of our salvation. Those who have these means proposed to them, and wilfully reject them, must expect to be rejected by Christ. Whether there be any mercy in store for those who, nursed in ignorance, have not had the offer of this salvation, has been a question ; and it is not answered in this Article. If we have some hope that they may be saved, still we must certainly conclude, *not that their own law or sect will save them*, but that Christ, who tasted death for every man,

and is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, may have mercy on them, even though they knew Him not.¹

¹ Passages, such as Psalm ix. 17, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God," are brought forward as proving that all heathen nations shall be damned. Yet *hell* in this case is *Hades*, not *Gehenna*; and on the other hand, Rom. ii. 11-16, Acts xvii. 26, 27, 30, appear to prove that it is not impossible heathens may be capable of salvation. No doubt the reason why so little is said about them is, that it is impossible that what is said can reach them.

"I hold it to be a most certain rule of interpreting Scripture that it never speaks of persons, when there is a physical impossibility of its speaking to them. . . . So the heathen, who died before the word was spoken, and in whose land it was never preached, are dead to the word; it concerns them not at all; but, the moment it can reach them, it is theirs, and for them."—Dr. Arnold's *Life and Correspondence*, Letter Lxv.

ARTICLE XIX.

Of the Church.

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also, the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

De Ecclesia.

Ecclesia Christi visibilis est cœtus fidelium, in quo verbum Dei purum prædicatur, et Sacramenta quoad ea quæ necessario exiguntur juxta Christi institutum recte administrantur. Sicut erravit Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Alexandrina, et Antiochena; ita et erravit Ecclesia Romana, non solum quoad agenda, et cæremoniæ ritus, verum in his etiam quæ credenda sunt.

SECTION I.—HISTORY.

AFTER speaking of God's election, probably meaning thereby election to the blessings of His Church; after declaring that the promise of salvation is not to be held out to all persons of all sects and religions; the Articles proceed to define the Church itself, into which God predestinates individuals to be brought, and which is appointed as the earthly home of those who embrace the Gospel and would be saved.

A distinct definition was naturally called for at the Reformation, when great schisms were likely to arise, and when the Church of Rome claimed to be the only true Church of God, and made communion with the Pope a necessary note of the Church. Such distinct definitions we may not always meet with in earlier times.

Ignatius calls the Church, "the multitude or congregation that is in God;"¹ says of the three orders of clergy, that "without these there is no Church;"² and, "wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the multitude also be; as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church."³

Justin Martyr identifies the Church with those called Chris-

¹ τὸ ἐν Θεῷ πλῆθος. — *Trall.* 8.

² χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται. — *Ibid.* 8.

³ ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω ὡσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. — *Smyrn.* 8.

tians, partakers of the name of Christ; speaks of it as one synagogue and one assembly; and says, it is as the daughter of God.¹

Irenæus speaks of the Church as consisting of "those who have received the adoption; for this is the synagogue of God, which God the Son has assembled by Himself."² It is the Paradise of God planted in the world; and the fruits of the garden are the Holy Scriptures.³ It is spread throughout the world, sown by Apostles and their followers, holding, from them, the one faith in the Trinity, Incarnation, Redemption, and General Judgment.⁴ It is one, though universal.⁵ Its Head is Christ.⁶ It is a visible body, animated by one Spirit, everywhere preaching one and the same faith, one and the same way of salvation.⁷ The tradition, or doctrine of the Apostles is carefully preserved in the Church, and the succession of pastors and bishops from the Apostles.⁸ He says, the successors of the first bishops might be enumerated in many Churches; and singles out more particularly the Churches of Rome and Smyrna, giving a catalogue of the bishops of Rome from St. Peter and St. Paul.⁹

Tertullian speaks of the Church as composed of all the Churches founded by Apostles, or offsprings of Apostolic Churches, and living in the unity of the same faith and discipline.¹⁰

The Church, according to Clement of Alexandria, is the assembly of the elect,¹¹ the congregation of Christian worshippers; ¹² the devout Christians being, as it were, the spiritual life of the body of Christ, the unworthy members being like the carnal part.¹³

Origen says, the Church is the body of Christ, animated by the Son of God, the members being all who believe in Him.¹⁴ The

¹ Ὅτι τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύουσιν, ὡς οὐαὶ μὴ ψυχὴ καὶ μὴ συναγωγὴ, καὶ μὴ ἐκκλησία ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς θυγατρὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ γενομένη, καὶ μετασχούσῃ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ (Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ πάντες καλούμεθα), κ. τ. λ. — *Dial.* p. 287.

² *Hær.* III. 6.

³ v. 20.

⁴ I. 2 (where the faith of the Church is given nearly in the words of the Creed); v. 20.

⁵ I. 3; III. 11; v. 20.

⁶ III. 18; v. 18.

⁷ τούτο τὸ κήρυγμα παρεληφθῆναι, καὶ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν, ὡς πρόεφαμεν, ἡ ἐκκλησία καίπερ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη, ἐπιμελῶς φυλάσσει, ὡς ἐνα οἶκον οἰκοῦσα, καὶ ὁμοίως πιστεύει τούτους ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα καρδίαν, καὶ συμφώνως ταῦτα κηρύσσει, καὶ διδάσκει, καὶ παραδίδωσιν, ὡς ἐν στόμα κεκτημένη. — *Lib.* I. cap. 3; also *Lib.* v. cap. 20.

⁸ *Lib.* III. cap. 3.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *De Præscript. Hæretic.* 20, 21.

¹¹ Οὐ νῦν τὸν τόπον ἀλλὰ τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν, ἐκκλησίαν καλῶ. — *Strom.* VII. p. 846.

¹² τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ταῖς εὐχαῖς ἀνακειμένων. "The congregation of those who dedicate themselves to prayer." — *Strom.* VII. p. 848.

¹³ Σῶμα δὲ ἀλλαγρεῖται ἡ ἐκκλησία Κυρίου, ὁ πνευματικὸς καὶ ἄγιος χορὸς· ἐξ ὧν οἱ τὸ ὄνομα ἐπικεκλημένοι μόνον, βιούντες δὲ οὐ κατὰ λόγον, σάρκες εἰσὶ. — *Strom.* VII. p. 885.

¹⁴ Λέγομεν ὅτι Σῶμα Χριστοῦ φασὶν εἶναι οἱ θεῖοι λόγοι, ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ψυχνύμενον, τὴν πᾶσαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν, μὴλη δὲ τούτου τοῦ Σώματος εἶναι ὡς ὅλον τοὺς δὲ τίνας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. — *Contra Celsum,* VI. 48.

visibility of the Church he expresses by saying that we should give no heed to those who say, “‘There is Christ,’ but show Him not in the Church, which is full of brightness from the East to the West, and is the pillar and ground of the truth.”¹

Cyprian calls the Church the Mother of all the children of God; compares it to the ark of Noah, in which all, who would be saved, should take refuge; and says that, whilst it puts forth its rays through all the world, yet it is but one light.²

Athanasius we find speaking of Christ as the foundation of the Church;³ and of unfaithful Christians as the tares among the good seed.⁴

Cyril of Jerusalem says, The Church is called *Ecclesia* (assembly), because it calls out and assembles together all; just as the Lord says, “Assemble all the congregation to the door of the tabernacle of witness” (Lev. viii. 3). The Church is called Catholic, because it is throughout all the world; because it teaches universally all truth; because it brings all classes of men into subjection to godliness; because it cures all spiritual diseases, and has all sorts of spiritual graces. It is distinguished from sects of heretics, as the Holy Catholic Church, in which we ought to abide, as having been therein baptized.⁵

Gregory Nazianzen calls it a Vineyard, into which all are summoned as to their place of work, as soon as they are brought to the faith; into which, however, they actually enter by baptism.⁶

St. Ambrose says, The faith is the foundation of the Church; not St. Peter, but St. Peter’s faith; for the Church is like a good ship beat against by many waves; but the true faith, on which the Church is founded, should prevail against all heresies.⁷

As the remains of the great fathers, who flourished late in the fourth and early in the fifth century, are far more voluminous than those of their predecessors; so also the increase of heresies, and

¹ “Non debemus attendere eis qui dicunt, *Ecce hic Christus*, non autem ostendunt Eum in Ecclesia, quæ plena est fulgore ab oriente usque ad occidentem, quæ plena est lumine vero, quæ est columna et firmamentum veritatis.” — *Comm. in Matthæ.* c. xxiv. See Palmer *On the Church.* I. pt. I. ch. III.

² “Ecclesia Domini luce perfusa per orbem totum radios suos porrigit, unum tamen lumen est. . . . Habere jam non potest Deum Patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem. Si potuit evadere quisquam qui extra arcam Noe fuit; et qui extra ecclesiam foris fuerit, evadet,” &c. — *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, pp. 108, 109, Fell.

³ *Contra Arian.* III. p. 444, Colon.

⁴ *De Semete*, p. 1064.

⁵ *Cateches.* XVIII. 11, which see at length.

⁶ *Oratio Quadragesima*, p. 650, Colon.

⁷ “Fides ergo est Ecclesiæ fundamentum. Non enim de carne Petri, sed de fide dictum est, quia portæ mortis ei non prævalebunt: sed confessio vincit infernum. Nam cum Ecclesia multis tanquam bona navis fluctibus sæpe tundatur, adversus omnes hæreses debet valere Ecclesiæ fundamentum.” — *De Incarnationis Sacramento*, cap. v.

especially the schism of the Donatists, led to their speaking oftener and more fully of the Church and its blessings; and this is observable more in the Latin than in the Greek writers.

With Chrysostom, the Church is Christ's Body, and the thought of this ought to keep us from sin. And though the Head is above all principality and power, yet the body is trampled on by devils — so unworthy are members of Christ.¹ This body consists of all believers, some honourable, some dishonourable members.² It is both one and yet many; and the regenerating Spirit is given to all in baptism.³

With Rufinus, the true Church is that in which there is one faith, one baptism, and a belief in one God, Father, Son, and Spirit; and the Church, thus pure in the faith, is spotless.⁴

With Jerome and Augustine, the Church is the ark of Noah, which St. Peter said was a type of our salvation by baptism. But, as there were evil beasts in the ark, so bad Christians in the Church.⁵ The meaning of *Church* (*Ecclesia*) is, according to Jerome, *congregation*.⁶ It is not held together by walls, but by the truth of its doctrines. And where the true faith is, there is the Church.⁷ Its head is in Heaven, but its members upon earth.⁸ It is built on prophets and apostles;⁹ and there is no Church without a priesthood.¹⁰

Augustine says, "The Church (*Ecclesia*) is so named from vocation or calling."¹¹ It is the New Jerusalem;¹² the Robe of Christ;¹³ the City of the Great King;¹⁴ the City of God.¹⁵ It is the field of God;¹⁶ in which, however, spring both tares and wheat.¹⁷ It is not only visible, but bright and conspicuous. It is a city set on a hill, which cannot be hid.¹⁸ It may be as clearly known, and as certainly recognized, as was the risen Body of

¹ Hom. III. *In Epist. ad Ephes.*

² Hom. x. *In Ephes.*

³ Hom. xxx. *In 1 Corinth.*

⁴ *Expositio in Symbolum Apostol. Art Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam.*

⁵ Hieronym. *Adv. Lucifer.* Tom. iv. p. 302; August. *Enarr. in Psalm. xxiv.* Tom. iv. p. 131.

⁶ *Comment. Lib. III. in Proverb. c. xxx. ; Ecclesia enim congregatio vocatur.* Tom. v. p. 590.

⁷ "Ecclesia non parietibus consistit, sed in dogmatum veritate; Ecclesia ibi est, ubi fides vera est." — *Comm. in Psalm. cxxxiii.* Tom. II. Append. p. 472.

⁸ "Caput in cælo, membra in terra." — *Ps. xc.* Tom. II. App. p. 361.

⁹ *Comment. in Ps. xvii.* Tom. II. Appendix, p. 393.

¹⁰ "Ecclesia non autem, quæ non habet sacerdotes." — *Adv. Lucifer.* Tom. iv. p. 302.

¹¹ "Ecclesia ex vocatione appellata." *In Epist. ad Roman. Inchoata Expositio,* Tom. III. pt. II. p. 925.

¹² *De Civitate Dei,* Tom. VII. p. 594.

¹³ *Ibid.* p. 452.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 479.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 335, 510.

¹⁶ *Enarr. in Ps. cxxxiv.* Tom. IV. p. 1497.

¹⁷ *Serm. xv. de 8 v. Psalm xxv.* Tom. v. p. 89; *Serm. cxxiii. In Vigiliis Paschæ,* Tom. v. p. 967.

¹⁸ *Enarr. in Psalm. lvii.* Tom. IV. p. 547; *Serm. xxxviii. De Proverb. cap. xxxi.* Tom. v. p. 181.

Christ by St. Thomas.¹ The Church below consists of all believers; the Church above, of the angels of heaven.² The Church is not all pure and free from stain; the just are mingled with the unjust.³ The Church indeed now is washed with water by the word (Eph. v. 26); yet not to be “without spot or wrinkle” (Eph. v. 27), till the Resurrection.⁴ After the Resurrection, the bad members shall be taken away, and there shall be none but the good.⁵ No doubt, baptism cleanses those who receive it from all sin; but after baptism fresh sins may be committed; and therefore, from that to the Judgment, there is constant need of remission.⁶ So essential are the Sacraments to the existence of the Church, that Augustine says the Church is formed by the two Sacraments, which flowed from the side of Christ, just as Eve was formed out of the side of Adam, who was a type of Christ.⁷

It naturally strikes us, that the above and similar statements of the fathers concerning the Church are not, for the most part, of the nature of logical definitions. They are essentially practical, and even devotional in their character. Yet by comparing them together, we may find that the very definitions of our own Article are implicitly given by them. Thus we have heard their teaching, — that the Church is a visible body, capable of being known and recognized, — that the very word Church means congregation, — that it is a congregation of believers, or of the faithful, — that its great support and characteristic is the true faith preserved by it, — that baptism admits to it, — that it is essential to its existence to have a rightly ordained ministry, who are able to minister the Sacraments, which Sacraments are even spoken of as forming the Church.⁸

The Creeds do not exactly define, but give titles to distinguish the Church. The Apostles' Creed calls it the Holy Catholic Church; and the Constantinopolitan Creed calls it One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. Its *unity* depends on unity of founder,

¹ *Enarr. in Ps. cxlvii.* Tom. iv. p. 1664.

² “Ecclesia deorsum in omnibus fidelibus, Ecclesia sursum in angelis.” — *Enarr. in Psalm. cxxxvii.* Tom. iv. p. 1527.

³ *De Civitate Dei*, i. 35; xviii. 48, 49; Tom. vii. pp. 30, 531.

⁴ *De Perfectione Justitiæ*, Tom. x. p. 183.

⁵ *Serm. cclii. In Diebus Pasch.* Tom. v. p. 1041.

⁶ *De Gestis Pelagii*, Tom. x. p. 206.

⁷ “Quod latus lancea percussus in terra sanguinem et aquam manat; procul

dubio sacramenta sunt quibus formatur Ecclesia, tanquam Eva facta de latere dormientis Adam, qui erat forma futuri.” — *Serm. cccix. cap. 14, In Vigiliis Paschæ*, Tom. v. p. 962. The same idea is expressed by St. Chrysostom, *Homil. in Johan. 85*, Tom. ii. p. 915. See under Art. xxv.

⁸ When St. Augustine says that the Church is formed by the Sacraments, he means that we are first joined to the Church by baptism, and preserved in spiritual life and church-communion by the Eucharist.

unity of faith, unity of baptism, unity of discipline, unity of communion. Its *holiness* springs from the presence of Christ, the sanctification of the Holy Spirit, the graces conferred upon its members by partaking of its Sacraments and living in its communion. Its *apostolicity* results from its being built on the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, continuing in the doctrine and fellowship of the Apostles, holding the faith of the Apostles, governed and ministered to by a clergy deriving their succession from the Apostles.

The designation *Catholic*, used in all the Creeds and throughout the writings of the fathers, originated probably in the universality of the Christian Church, as distinguished from the local nationality of the Jewish synagogue. The same Christian Church, one in its foundation, in its faith, and in its Sacraments, was spread universally through all nations. But, as sects and heresies separated by degrees from the one universal Church, forming small and distinct communions among themselves; the term Catholic, which at first applied to all who embraced the religion of Jesus, was afterwards used to express that one holy Church which existed through all the world, undivided, and intercommunicating in all its branches, as contradistinguished from heretics and schismatics. Hence Catholic, in one view of the term, became nearly identified with orthodox. And so, whilst the one Catholic Church meant the true Church throughout the world, yet the true and sound Church in a single city would be called the Catholic Church of that city,¹ its members would be called Catholic Christians, and the faith which they held in common with the universal Church, was the Catholic faith. Accordingly, St. Cyril admonishes his people, that, if ever they sojourned in any city, it was not sufficient to inquire for the Church, or the Lord's house; for Marcionists and Manichees, and all sorts of heretics, professed to be of the Church, and called their places of assembly the House of the Lord; but they ought to ask, Where is the Catholic Church? For this is the peculiar name of the Holy Body, the Mother of us all, the Spouse of the Lord Jesus Christ.²

The unity and catholicity of the Church were imminently perilled by the schism of the East and West, when the entire Latin Church ceased to communicate with the entire Eastern Church. From that time to this there has been no communion between them; though possibly neither branch has utterly rejected the

¹ Thus Constantine writes to the Church of Alexandria: "Constantine the Great, Augustus, to the people of the Catholic Church of Alexandria." —

See Athanasii *Opera*, I. 772, 773, 779; Colon. Suicer, II. 14.

² *Cateches.* XVIII. 12.

other from a share in the unity of the Church and of the faith.¹

The gradual corruption in the Western Church perilled still further unity and catholicity. The unity of communion was preserved through the West of Europe ; but important points of faith and practice were corrupted and impaired. Hence the many protests and divisions in Germany, England, and other parts of Europe, ending in that great disruption known as the general Reformation.

At that period, some even of those who were sensible of the corruptions, felt that to adhere to the communion of Rome was essential, if they would abide in the fellowship of the Apostles and the unity of the Catholic Church. Others, as Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, held that sound faith and purity of doctrine were more essential to catholicity than undivided communion even with the bishops and existing Church of their own land ; arguing that a Church could not be Catholic which did not soundly hold the Catholic faith, and duly administer the holy Sacraments. Luther indeed never wished to separate from the Church, but ever appealed to a true general council ; and the Confession of Augsburg declared that the Lutherans differed in no Article of faith from the Catholic Church,² holding that the Churches ought *jure divino* to obey their bishops. Bishops, it is said, might easily retain their authority, if they would not command things contrary to good conscience. All that was sought was that unjust burdens should not be imposed, which were novel, and contrary to the custom of the Catholic Church.³

Our own reformers had a less difficult part to play, for though, in order to return to primitive purity of faith, they were obliged to separate from most of the continental Churches, they were themselves, for the most part, the bishops and clergy of the national Church ; and there was therefore no internal secession from the jurisdiction of the Episcopate, though there was necessary alienation from the great body of the Church.

In this unhappy state of things, the Church, which remained in communion with Rome, arrogated to itself the name (too often since conceded to it) of the Catholic Church ; maintaining, that she was the one true Church, from which all others had separated off, — that communion with the see o^c St. Peter was essential to

¹ On this subject consult Palmer, *On the Church*, i. pt. i. ch. ix. sect. 2.

² *Confess. August.* A. D. 1531, Art. xxi. *Sylloge*, p. 133.

³ *Syll.* p. 157. See also Palmer, i. pt. i. ch. xii. § 1, p. 361.

the unity, catholicity, and to the very existence of the Church, and that all who were separated from that communion were heretics and schismatics.

This led naturally to definitions of the Church on the part of the reforming clergy and the reformed Churches. The VIIth Article of the Confession of Augsburg is evidently the origin of the XIXth Article of our own Church. There we find it said, that "There is one Holy Church to abide forever. And the Church is a congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught, and the Sacraments rightly administered."¹

Luther, in commenting on the Article in the Creed concerning the Holy Catholic Church, says, "Church, or *Ecclesia*, means properly the congregation or communion of Christians;" and expounds that Article of the Creed thus, "I believe that there is a certain congregation and communion of saints on earth, gathered together of holy men under one Head, Christ; collected by the Holy Spirit, in one faith and one sentiment, adorned with various gifts, but united in love, and accordant in all things, without sects or schism. . . . Moreover, in this Christianity we believe that remission of sins is offered, which takes place by means of the Sacraments and absolution of the Church."²

Calvin defines the Visible Church as "the multitude of men diffused through the world, who profess to worship one God in Christ; are initiated into this faith by baptism; testify their unity in true doctrine and charity by participating in the Supper; have consent in the Word of God, and for the preaching of that Word maintain the ministry ordained of Christ."³

The English reformers have given, in works of authority, some definitions of the Visible Church, besides that contained in this Article. The second part of the Homily for Whitsunday (set forth early in Elizabeth's reign, therefore, after the Articles of 1552, but before the final sanction of the XXXIX. Articles by the Convocation of 1562 and 1571) gives the following, as the notes of the Church: "The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner-stone, Ephes. ii. And it hath always these notes or marks

¹ *Conf. August. Art. vii. Sylloge*, p. 125, also p. 171.

² *Catechismus Major. Opera*, Tom. v. p. 628.

³ "Universalem hominum multitudinem in orbe diffusam quæ unum se Deum et Christum colere profitetur; Baptismo

initiatum in Ejus fidem: cœnæ participatione unitatem in vera doctrina et caritate testatur: consensionem habet in verbo Domini, atque ad ejus prædicationem ministerium conservat a Christo institutum." — *Institut. Lib. 1. s. 7.*

whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the Sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline."

Very similar are the statements of the Catechism of Edward VI. A. D. 1553, the year after the first draught of the Articles. "The marks of the Church are, first, pure preaching of the Gospel: then brotherly love: thirdly, upright and uncorrupted use of the Lord's Sacraments, according to the ordinance of the Gospel: last of all, brotherly correction and excommunication, or banishing those out of the Church that will not amend themselves. This mark the holy fathers termed discipline."¹

Noel's Catechism also enumerates, first, sound doctrine and right use of the Sacraments, and then the use of just discipline.²

Bishop Ridley gave a definition exactly conformable to the above: "The holy Catholic or universal Church, which is the communion of saints, the house of God, the city of God, the spouse of God, the body of Christ, the pillar and stay of the truth; this Church I believe, according to the Creed: this Church I do reverence and honour in the Lord. The marks whereby this Church is known unto me in this dark world, and in the midst of this crooked and froward generation, are these, — the sincere preaching of God's Word; the due administration of the Sacraments; charity; and faithful observances of ecclesiastical discipline, according to the Word of God."³

The difference which strikes us between these definitions and that of the Article is, that in them there is added to the notes in the Article, "the observance of ecclesiastical discipline," or, as the Homily terms it, of "the ecclesiastical keys." Now it is probable that the compilers of the Articles, who elsewhere made this use of the keys one note of the Church, omitted it in the Article itself, as considering that it was implied in the due administration of the Sacraments. For what is the power of the keys and the observance of discipline, but the admission of some to, and the rejection of others from, the Sacraments and blessings of the Church? Where, therefore, the Sacraments are duly ministered, there too discipline must exist.⁴

¹ *Enchirid. Theologicum*, i. p. 26.

² *Ibid.* i. p. 276.

³ Conferences between Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer, Ridley's *Works*, Parker Society edition. p. 123.

⁴ The definition of the Church by the Roman Catholic divines does not materially differ from those of the Reformers, except in one important point. Bellarmine gives it as follows: "Nostra

sententia est ecclesiam unam tantum esse, non duas, et illam unam et veram esse cœtum hominum ejusdem Christianæ fidei professione et eorundem sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimum pastorum, ac præcipue unius Christi in terris Vicarii Romani pontificis." — *Controvers. General.* Tom. II. p. 108, Lib. III. *De Ecclesia*, c. 2.

It may be right to say something of the *invisible* Church. The Article says nothing of the *invisible* Church; but as it uses the term "*visible* Church," it implies a contradistinction to something invisible. Now "*invisible Church*" is not a Scriptural term, but a term of comparatively late origin; and there are two different views of its meaning. Some persons by it understand the saints departed, who, in Paradise or the unseen place (Hades), are no longer militant and visible, but form part of the true Church of God,—the Church in fact in its purified and beatified condition, freed from its unsound members, and "without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing."

Others, however, (and the Reformers were mostly of this opinion,) believed that within the visible Church we might conceive to exist a body of true saints, persons not only communicating with the outward Church, but, moreover, really sanctified in heart, who not only now partook of Church-privileges, but would forever reign with Christ. These formed the invisible Church, whom none knew but God; whereas the visible Church was composed of faithful and unfaithful, of tares and wheat.¹

It is however certain, that the Article confines itself to the consideration of the visible Church, and gives us no authoritative statement concerning the invisible Church. And, indeed, the reformers themselves vary considerably in their statements on the subject, though the sad corruptions in the visible Church in their days led them naturally to apply some of the promises in Scripture to a secret body, and not to the universal Church. There does not appear anything in the Liturgy or formularies of the Church which specially alludes to this distinction of the visible and invisible Church. The Church spoken of there is the Body of Christ, the ark of Christ's Church, and still the congregation of all who profess and call themselves Christians, the congregation of Christian people dispersed through the world, built on the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, the blessed company of all faithful people, into which a child is incorporated by baptism, of fellowship with which the

¹ Calvin expounds this doctrine at length, *Inst.* Lib. iv. cap. i. It may be seen in the writings of the English Reformers, e. g. *The Institution of a Christian Man*. See *Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII.* p. 52; Edward VI. *Catechism, Enchir. Theol.* p. 24; Noel's *Catechism*, *Ibid.* p. 272; Cranmer's *Works*, III. p. 19; Ridley's *Works*, p. 126.

The fathers do not appear to have rec-

ognized this distinction, although in St. Augustine and some others there are frequent and evident allusions to the difference of the body of the really faithful and the mere outward communion of the Church. St. Augustine mentions it as an error of the Pelagians, that they looked on the Church as composed of perfectly holy persons, *Hæres.* 88. And afterwards, Calvin attributes the same opinion to the Anabaptists, *Inst.* iv. i. 13.

adult is assured by communion, and for all members of which we pray that they may be led into the way of truth, and so walk in the light of truth, that at last they may attain to the light of everlasting life. And so we pray "for all estates of men in God's Holy Church, that every member of the same, in his vocation and ministry, may truly and godly serve Him,"¹ that is, may be faithful, not unworthy members of the Body.

II. The latter part of the Article concerns the errors of one portion of the Church, the Church of Rome.

The Church of Rome claimed to be the whole Catholic Church. Here we declare our belief that she is but one branch or portion of the Catholic Church, and that an erring branch, erring not only in practice and discipline, but in matters of faith. This is illustrated by reference to the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, all of which are said to have erred in doctrine as well as discipline; and, like them, the Church of Rome is said to have erred. In what points Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch may be considered as having erred in matters of faith is a question which has been mooted by expositors of this Article. Dr. Hey thinks it was in favouring Arianism and condemning Origen. The great point on which the Western Church separated from the

¹ Collect for Good Friday.

The following are the other principal expressions in the Liturgy and Prayers concerning the Church:—

"That it may please Thee to rule and govern Thy holy Church universal in the right way," &c. (Litany). "More especially we pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church, that it may be so guided and governed by Thy good Spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth," &c. (Prayer for all Conditions of Men). "Who hast purchased to Thyself an universal Church by the precious Blood of Thy dear Son. . . . Who of Thy Divine Providence hast appointed divers orders in Thy Church" (Prayers for Ember Weeks). "Merciful Lord, we beseech thee to cast Thy bright beams of light upon Thy Church, that it being enlightened by the doctrine of thy blessed Apostle and Evangelist St. John, may so walk in the light of Thy truth that it may at length attain to the light of everlasting life" (Collect for St. John's day). "O Almighty God, who hast knit together thine elect in one communion and fellowship in the mystical Body of Thy Son Christ our Lord" (Collect for All

Saints). "O Almighty God, who hast built Thy Church upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner-stone" (Collect for St. Simon and St. Jude). The Prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth" is a prayer for all states of men, kings and councils, bishops and curates, all the people in health or sickness. The first prayer for the child to be baptized asks, "that he, being delivered from Thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church." And after the baptism we thank God that He hath "incorporated him into His holy Church." So in the Post-Communion we thank God for feeding us in the Sacrament, thereby assuring us that we are very members "incorporate in the mystical Body of His Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people." In the bidding prayer ministers are enjoined to move the people to join them in prayer in this form: "Ye shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland and Ireland," &c. (Canon 55).

Eastern was the doctrine of the procession of the Third Person of the Trinity. It was an acknowledged fact in the West, that on this point the Eastern Churches had erred. When therefore the Article, writing in condemnation of errors in the Church of Rome, speaks first of the errors of the Eastern Churches, perhaps it specially alludes to that point in which the Church of Rome would hold, in common with the Church of England, that these Churches had erred. So the statement would be a kind of *argumentum ad hominem*, a premise sure to be granted. But this part of the Article is directed against Romanist, not against Eastern or Alexandrian errors, which are only introduced *obiter*. Some might expect the Article to have denounced the Church of Rome, not as a Church in error, but as the synagogue of Antichrist, an antichristian assembly, not an erring Church. No doubt, at times, such is the language of the reformers, who, in their strong opposition to Romanist errors, often use the most severe terms in denouncing them. But in their most sober and guarded language, not only our own, but Luther, Calvin, and other continental reformers, speak of the Church of Rome as a Church, though a fallen and corrupt Church.

Thus Luther says, "We call the Church of Rome holy, and the bishops' sees holy, though they be perverted and their bishops impious. In Rome, though worse than Sodom and Gomorrha, there are still Baptism and the Sacrament, the Gospel, the Scripture, the ministry, the name of Christ and God. Therefore the Church of Rome is holy." "Wherever," he adds, "the Word and Sacraments substantially remain, there is the holy Church, notwithstanding Antichrist reigns there, who, as Scripture witnesseth, sits not in a stable of demons or a pigsty, or an assembly of infidels, but in the most noble and holy place, even the temple of God."¹

Calvin, writing to Lælius Socinus, maintains the validity of Popish baptism, and says that he does not deny some remains of a Church to the Papists.² In another epistle to the same he writes, "When I allow some remains of a Church to the Papists, I do not confine it to the elect who are dispersed among them; but mean, that some ruins of a scattered Church exist there; which is confirmed by St. Paul's declaration, that Antichrist shall sit in the temple of God."³

¹ *Comment. in Galat.* i. 2; Opp. Tom. v. pp. 278, 279.

² Calv. *Zozino Epistolæ*, p. 51, Amstelod. 1667.

³ "Quod ecclesiæ reliquias manere in papatu dico. non restringo ad electos qui illic dispersi sunt: sed ruinas dissipatæ ecclesiæ illic extare intelligo. Ac ne

As to the writings of our reformers, to begin with the reign of Henry VIII., the *Institution of a Christian Man* has, "I do believe that the Church of Rome is not, nor cannot worthily be called the true Catholic Church, but only a particular member thereof" . . . "and I believe that the said Church of Rome, with all the other particular Churches in the world, compacted and united together, do make and constitute but one Catholic Church or body."¹ So the *Necessary Doctrine*, "The Church of Rome, being but a several Church, challenging that name of *Catholic* above all other, doeth great wrong to all other Churches, and doeth only by force and maintenance support an unjust usurpation."²

In Cranmer's Catechism, after a denunciation of the great sin of worshipping images of the saints, it is said: "Thus, good children, I have declared how we were wont to abuse images; not that I herein condemn your fathers, who were men of great devotion, and had an earnest love towards God, although their zeal in all points was not ruled and governed by true knowledge; but they were seduced and blinded partly by the common ignorance that reigned in their time, partly by the covetousness of their teachers,"³ &c. Here the members of the Church before the Reformation are spoken of as pious, though ignorant and misled. So Cranmer frequently charges popery, not on the people, but on the Pope and the friars who deluded them.⁴ In his appeal at his degradation, he says, "Originally the Church of Rome, as it were the lady of the world, both was and also was conceited worthily, the mother of other Churches." He then proceeds to speak of corruptions introduced into the Roman and afterwards into other Churches, "growing out of kind into the manners of the Church their mother;" he says, there is no hope of Reformation from the Pope, and therefore from him appeals to a "free general council" of the whole Church; and adds, that he is "ready in all things to follow the judgment of the most sacred word of God, and of the holy Catholic Church."⁵

So then, although the English, like the foreign reformers, frequently called the papal power Antichrist, the Man of sin, the Beast, &c., deplore and condemn the idolatrous state of the Church

mihi longis rationibus disputandum sit, nos Pauli auctoritate contentos esse decet, qui Antichristum in templo Dei sesurum pronunciat.—*Epist.* p. 57. See also *Institut.* iv. ii. 12.

¹ *Formularies of Faith*, p. 56.

² p. 247.

³ *Catechism*, pp. 26, 27.

⁴ *Works*, III. p. 365. "I charge none with the name of papists but that be well worthy thereof. For I charge not the hearers, but the teachers, not the learners, but the inventors of the untrue doctrine."

⁵ *Works*, IV. pp. 125, 126, 127.

before the Reformation, and of the Church which continued in union with Rome after the Reformation, and in consequence often use language which appears to imply that the Church of Rome was no true Church at all; still they often speak, as this Article does, of the Church of Rome as yet a Church, though a corrupt, degenerate, and erring Church. Accordingly, the XXXth Canon declares: "So far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things that they held or practised, that, as the *Apology of the Church of England* confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders."

The tone and temper of the Church of England appears therefore to be that of a body earnestly and steadfastly protesting against Romanism, against all the errors, abuses, and idolatries of the Church of Rome, and the usurpation of the See of Rome; but yet acknowledging that, with a fearful amount of error, the Churches of the Roman communion are still branches, though corrupt branches of the universal Church of Christ.

The divine who has been commonly considered as the most accredited exponent of the principles of the Church of England, thus speaks in her behalf: "In the Church of Christ we were (*i. e.* before the Reformation), and we are so still. Other difference between our estate before and now we know none, but only such as we see in Judah; which, having some time been idolatrous, became afterwards more soundly religious by renouncing idolatry and superstition. . . . The indisposition of the Church of Rome to reform herself must be no stay unto us from performing our duty to God; even as desire of retaining conformity with them could be no excuse if we did not perform our duty. Notwithstanding, so far as lawfully we may, we have held and do hold fellowship with them. For even as the Apostle doth say of Israel, that they are in one respect enemies, but in another beloved of God (Rom. xi. 28); in like sort with Rome we dare not communicate touching her grievous abominations, yet, touching those main parts of Christian truth wherein they constantly still persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ."¹

¹ Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* III. i. 10.

This is not the language of one great man ; but most consistent with it have been the sentiments of almost all those eminent writers of our Church, who are known and revered as the great types of Anglican piety, learning, and charity.¹ It is infinitely to be desired that there should be no relaxation of our protest against error and corruption ; but the force of a protest can never be increased by uncharitableness or exaggeration. Let Rome throw off her false additions to the Creed, and we will gladly communicate with her ; but, so long as she retains her errors, we cannot but stand aloof, lest we should be partakers of her sins.

SECTION II.—SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE word *ἐκκλησία*, rendered *Church*, should, according to its derivation, signify persons called out from among others for some purpose. At Athens, the *Ecclesia* was the general assembly of the people, convened by the crier for legislation. In the old Testament, the word is often used by the LXX. to translate the Hebrew *קָהָל*, which commonly expresses the assembly or congregation of the people of Israel.² Accordingly, when adopted in the new Testament, it is used to signify the whole assembly or congregation of the people of God under the Gospel, as it had been before to signify the congregation of the people of God under the Law. And as *συναγωγή*, *Synagogue*, was the more frequent word for the congregation of the Jews ; so perhaps our Lord and his Apostles adopted, by preference and for distinction's sake, the word *ἐκκλησία*, *Church*, for the congregation of Christians.

1. Now it is well known and obvious, that the word *Congregation*, as read in the old Testament, not only meant an assembly of the people gathered together at a special time for worship, but was constantly used to express the whole body of worshippers, the whole people of Israel, the congregation which the Lord had purchased (*e. g.* Ex. xii. 19. Lev. iv. 15. Num. xvi. 3, 9 ; xxvii. 17. Josh. xxii. 18, 20. Judg. xxi. 13, 16. Ps. lxxiv. 2).

¹ The student may consult Palmer, *On the Church*, ch. xi. where he will find quotations from Bp. Hall, Archbp. Usher, Hammond, Chillingworth, Field, &c.

² *קָהָל* is often rendered *ἐκκλησία*, as Dent. ix. 10 ; xviii. 16 ; Judges xxi. 8 ; 1 Kings viii. 65 ; 2 Chron. vii. 8, 12 ; often it is rendered *συναγωγή*, as Exod.

xvi. 1-3 ; Lev. iv. 13, 14, 21 ; Num. xvi. 3 ; xx. 6. In Psalm xxii. 22, "In the midst of the *Congregation* will I praise Thee." is rendered by the Apostle, "In the midst of the *Church* will I praise Thee" (Heb. ii. 12). So St. Stephen speaks of "the *Church* in the wilderness" (Acts vii. 38), meaning the congregation of the Israelites.

This too, *mutatis mutandis*, is the ordinary acceptation of the word *Church*, in the new Testament. It applies to the society of Christians, to those who believe in Christ, to those who live in Christian fellowship, and partake of Gospel privileges. For example: "Give none offence, neither to the Jews nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God" (1 Cor. x. 32).¹ "On this rock I will build My Church" (Matt. xvi. 18). "Saul made havoc of the Church" (Acts viii. 3). "Persecuted the Church of God" (1 Cor. xv. 9). "The Lord added to the Church such as should be saved" (Acts ii. 47). "Fear came on all the Church" (Acts v. 11). "The Church is subject unto Christ" (Eph. v. 24). "God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily prophets," &c. (1 Cor. xii. 28).

2. But it also signifies the Church, or body of Christians in a particular town or country. Thus we read of "the Church which was at Jerusalem" (Acts viii. 1); "the Church which was at Antioch" (Acts xiii. 1); "the elders of the Church at Ephesus" (Acts xx. 17); "the Church of God which is at Corinth" (1 Cor. i. 2. Compare Rom. xvi. 1, 4; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; Col. iv. 16; Rev. ii. ; iii. &c. &c.)

3. It is used even for a single family of Christians, or a single congregation meeting for worship, as the first Christians did, in a private house, *e. g.* "Priscilla and Aquila, and the Church that is in their house" (Rom. xvi. 5. 1 Cor. xvi. 19); "Nymphas and the Church which is in his house" (Col. iv. 15); "The Church in thy house" (Philem. 2). And accordingly, at times we find the word used in the plural, as signifying the various congregations of Christians, whether in one single city, or throughout the world; as Acts ix. 31; xv. 41. Rom. xvi. 4. 1 Cor. vii. 17; xi. 16; xiv. 33; xvi. 1, 19. Rev. i. 4, 11; ii. 23, &c.

We may say therefore, that as the *Congregation* among the Jews signified either a body of worshippers, or more often the great body of worshippers assembled at the temple or tabernacle, or the great body of the Jewish people considered as the people of God; so the *Church* amongst Christians signifies, in the new Testament, either a single congregation of Christians, or the whole body of Christians in a particular place, or the whole body of Christians dispersed throughout the world.

In our Article the word *Church* is interpreted *Congregation*, probably on the ground of the above considerations; namely,

¹ In this passage the "Church" is used to distinguish Christians from Jews and heathens.

because such is the original meaning of the word, and such its application many times in Scripture. The Church is called “a Congregation of *faithful men*,” *cætus fidelium*, because those of whom the Church is composed are the professed believers in Jesus Christ, that body of people “first called Christians in Antioch” (Acts xi. 26).

The name which our Lord Himself most frequently uses for the Church is, “the kingdom of God,” or “the kingdom of Heaven.” The prophets constantly spoke of the Messiah as the King who should reign in righteousness (Isai. xxxii. 1), the King who should reign and prosper (Jer. xxiii. 5), the King of Israel, who should come to Zion, “just, and having salvation” (Zech. ix. 9). Daniel foretold that, when the Assyrian, Medo-Persian, and Grecian empires had passed away, and after the fourth great empire of Rome had been established, “the God of Heaven should set up a kingdom, which should never be destroyed” (Dan. ii. 44); that the Son of Man should have given Him “dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him” (Dan. vii. 14). These prophecies led the Jews to expect that Messiah should set up a temporal kingdom, with all the glory and splendour of the kingdoms of this world. Our Lord Himself, therefore, uses the language of the Prophets, and the language current among the Jews, continually calling the Church, which He was to establish, by the name of kingdom: “My kingdom,” “kingdom of God,” “kingdom of Heaven,” though often correcting the mistaken views entertained of it, and explaining that His kingdom was not of this world. (See Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17; xii. 28; xiii. 38. Mark i. 14; iv. 11, 26, 30; x. 15. Luke iv. 43; vii. 28; viii. 1; ix. 2, 62; xvi. 16. John iii. 3. Acts i. 3; &c.)

Having premised thus much concerning the names or titles of that body of which the Article treats, we may next proceed to consider how the Scriptures prove the various statements of the Article.

1. That the Church is a visible body of believers.
2. That the pure word of God is held and preached in it.
3. That the Sacraments are duly ministered in it, according to Christ’s ordinance.

1. First, then, the Church is a visible body of believers.

This, we have already observed, does not interfere with the belief that there is a body of persons within the Church, known only to God, who differ from the rest, in being not only in outward

privilege, but also in inward spirit, servants of Christ; whom some have called the invisible Church, and who being faithful unto death, will enter into the Church triumphant. Nor does it interfere with a belief that the saints who are in Paradise, and perhaps also the holy angels of heaven, are members of the Church invisible, the company of God's elect and redeemed people. What we have to deal with here, is the Church of God, considered as Christ's ordinance in the world, for the gathering together in one body of all believers in Him, and making them partakers of the various means of grace.

It is argued indeed *in limine*, that the Church and kingdom of Christ cannot be visible, because our Lord said, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, lo there! for, behold the kingdom of God is within you" (Luke xvii. 20, 21). This, however, proves no more than this. The Pharisees, who had asked "when the kingdom of God should come?" expected a kingdom of earthly glory, pomp, and splendour. Our Lord answered, that this was not the way in which His kingdom should come, not with observation, nor so that men should point out, Lo here! as to a splendid spectacle. On the contrary, God's reign in the Church should not be like an earthly king's, but in the hearts of His people.¹

But it is plain, both from prophecy and the new Testament, that the Church was to be, and is, a visible company. "The mountain of the Lord's house was to be established on the top of the mountains, and all nations were to flow unto it" (Isai. ii. 2). Among the earthly kingdoms, Christ's kingdom was to grow up gradually, like a stone hewn without hands, till it became a mountain and filled the earth, breaking in pieces and consuming the worldly empires (Dan. ii. 35, 44). The kingdom of heaven in the Gospels is compared to a field sown with good and bad seed growing together till the harvest; to a marriage supper, where some have no wedding-garments; to a net taking good and bad fish, not separated till the net be drawn to the shore; by which we cannot fail to understand the outward communion of Christians in this world, in which the faithful and unfaithful live together, not fully separated till the Judgment (Matt. xiii. 24-30, 47-50; xxii. 11,

¹ Many consider that the passage ought to be rendered not "within you," but "amongst you," ἐντὸς ὑμῶν, *i. e.* Though you expect to see some sign of a kingdom, yet in truth the kingdom of God is already come among you, and you have not recognized it. But it is to

be noted that in the new Testament the words *Kingdom of God* signify three things:—1. The reign of Christ in His Church on earth. 2. The reign of Christ in the hearts of His people. 3. The reign of Christ in the eternal kingdom of glory.

12). Such parables would be inapplicable to an invisible company, and can only be interpreted of a visible body.

Our Lord distinctly commanded, that, if a Christian offended against his brother, the offence should be told to the Church (Matt. xviii. 17). But if the Church were not a visible and ascertainable body, such a thing could not be. Accordingly our Lord addresses His Church, as “the light of the world, a city set on a hill, that cannot be hid” (Matt. v. 14). St. Paul gives Timothy directions how to act as a bishop, that he might “know how to behave himself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth” (Tim. iii. 15). This would be unintelligible, if the Church were only an invisible spiritual society of faithful Christians, and not an outward organized body. So, when first persons were brought in large numbers to believe the Gospel, we are taught that all those who were placed in a state of salvation were “added to the Church” (Acts ii. 47); evidently, from the context, by the rite of baptism. This again plainly intimates that the Church was a definite visible body of men. The same appears from such expressions as the following: “Fear came on all the Church” (Acts v. 11); “a great persecution against the Church” (Acts viii. 1); “assembled themselves with the Church” (Acts xi. 26); “God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily prophets” (1 Cor. xii. 28). The clergy are called “the elders of the Church” (Acts xx. 17. James v. 14) who are “to feed the Church of God” (Acts xx. 28), to “take care of the Church of God” (1 Tim. iii. 5). People are spoken of as cast out of the Church (3 John 10). The same thing appears again from what is said of local or national Churches, which, being branches of the one universal Church, are evidently and constantly spoken of as the visible society of Christians in their respective cities or countries. (See Acts xi. 22; xiii. 1; xiv. 23; xv. 3, 22. Rom. xvi. 1, 16, 23. 1 Cor. vi. 4; vii. 17; xi. 16; xiv. 33; xvi. 1, 19. Gal. i. 22. 1 Thess. ii. 14. Rev. i. 4, &c.)

Accordingly, St. Paul, when he speaks of the unity of the Church, speaks not only of spiritual, but of external unity also; for he says, “There is one *body*, and one spirit” (Eph. iv. 4). And our blessed Lord, when praying for the unity of His disciples, evidently desired a visible unity, which might be a witness for God to the world; “that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe,” &c. (John xvii. 21).

We conclude therefore that, as the primitive Church always

held, so Scripture also teaches, that the Church is not merely a spiritual and mystical communion of faithful Christians, known only to God, but is a visible body of those who are outward followers of Christ, consisting partly of faithful, partly of unfaithful, but all professed believers in the Gospel.

2. The first characteristic given us of this body is, that the pure Word of God, or, in other language, the true faith, is kept and preached in it.

The Church is called by St. Paul "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15); whence it is manifest that a main province of the Church is to maintain and support the truth. Our blessed Lord prayed for His disciples, that the Father would "sanctify them through His truth" (John xvii. 17). He promised to the Apostles that "the Spirit of truth should guide them into all truth" (John xvi. 13). He bade them "go and teach all nations" (Matt. xxviii. 19). And we learn of the first converted Christians, that they continued in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship" (Acts ii. 42). Accordingly, the Apostles speak of the faith as *ONE* (Ephes. iv. 5); of the faith once delivered to the saints (Jude 3); urge Christians "earnestly to contend for" it (Jude 3); and desire their bishops "to rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith" (Tit. i. 13).

Hence to introduce false doctrine or heresy into the Church is described as damning sin. St. Peter speaks of those "who privily shall bring in damnable heresies" (2 Pet. ii. 1). St. Paul classes heresies among the works of the flesh (Gal. v. 20). He says, "If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be anathema" (Gal. i. 9). He bids Timothy withdraw himself from those "who teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness" (1 Tim. vi. 3, 5). And to Titus he says, "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject" (Tit. iii. 10). St. John bids, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed" (2 John 10). He says, "Whosoever abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God" (2 John 9). And calls all who "deny the Father and the Son," or "deny that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh," not Christians, but Antichrists (1 John ii. 22. 2 John 7).

Thus Scripture represents the Church as a body holding the truth, nay, "the pillar and ground of the truth;" and heretics, or persons holding vital error, are spoken of as apart from God, to be

rejected, and not received as fellow-Christians or members of Christ's Church.

The wording of our Article, "the pure word of God," may be somewhat difficult. Some would confine the meaning of it within very narrow limits, others would extend it to an indefinite latitude. We must notice, that the expression is not, "the word of God is purely preached," but, "the pure word of God is preached." If the former words had been used, we might have doubted in what body of Christians God's Word was always purely preached, with no mixture of falsehood or error. But "the pure word of God" is preached, wherever the main doctrines of the Gospel are preserved and taught. The question, however, of "fundamentals" has always been considered difficult; and different persons have chosen to make different doctrines fundamental, according to their own peculiar views of truth. Hence, some have excluded almost all Christians except themselves from holding the pure word of God; others have scarcely shut out Arians, Socinians, or even Deists. We may be sure the Church intended to maintain the purity of Christian truth, yet without the narrowness of sectarian bigotry. The way in which her own formularies are drawn up, — the first five Articles being almost a repetition and enforcement of the chief Articles of the Creed, and the eighth containing the Creeds themselves, — the question addressed to all members of the Church before admission to baptism, in the Catechism and in sickness, as to whether they believed the Creed, — the repetition on every Sunday and holiday of two of the Creeds, and once every month of the third, in the public service by the congregation, — the expressed adherence by the reformers to the decrees of the first four General Councils, — the general agreement to the same effect by the primitive Church, with which the reformers declared themselves to be in perfect accordance and unison: — these, and the like considerations, make it nearly certain that the compilers of the Article would have, and must have intended, that all who truly believed the Creeds of the Church were so far in possession and belief of "the pure word of God" as not to have forfeited the character of Christians, or the fellowship of the Christian Church.

3. The next mark of the Church is, that "the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance." We know, that, among the Jews, circumcision and the passover were essential to the existence of the people as the congregation of the Lord, and that he who rejected or neglected either was to be cut off from His people (Gen. xvii. 14. Exod. xii. 15). When the Lord Jesus

founded His Church, He appointed the two Sacraments to supersede the two great ordinances of the Synagogue, namely, baptism, to initiate the convert or the child, the Eucharist, to maintain communion with Himself and with His people.

The command which He gave to His Apostles was to “make disciples of all nations by baptizing them” (Matt. xxviii. 19): that is to say, persons from all nations, who believed the Gospel, were to be admitted into the number of the disciples, the Church of Christ, by the Sacrament of baptism. We know that the Apostles acted on this command, ever receiving by the rite of baptism all who had been converted to the truth. (See Acts ii. 38, 41; viii. 12, 13, 36–38; ix. 18; x. 47, 48; xvi. 14, 15, 33; xix. 3, 5. Rom. vi. 3, 4. Gal. iii. 27. Col. ii. 11, 12. 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21, &c.) Nay! our Lord Himself declared, “Except a man be born of *water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God” (John iii. 5). Whence it is quite clear, that a Christian Church must administer baptism according to our Lord’s command and the example of the Apostles, for otherwise its members could not be “born of water.”

But our blessed Lord, moreover, commanded His Apostles to break the bread and bless the wine in remembrance of Him; and declared the bread broken and the cup poured out to be His Body and Blood (Matt. xxvi. 26–30). Moreover, He declared that except a Christian received the grace of His Body and Blood, he had no life in him (John vi. 53). Accordingly, we ever find that the Apostles and the Apostolic Churches “continued stedfastly in the breaking of bread” (Acts ii. 42; xx. 7, 11. 1 Cor. x. 16, 17; xi. 17, &c.); believing and declaring, that the “cup which they blessed was the communion of the Blood of Christ, and the bread which they brake was the communion of the Body of Christ” (1 Cor. x. 16).

These two Sacraments, therefore, Baptism and the Holy Communion, were the ordinance of Christ, essential to the existence of His Church, steadily administered by His first ministers, and received by His early disciples, as completely as Circumcision and the Passover in the old dispensation of the Jews. The Article therefore justly asserts, that it is a necessary note of the Church, that the Sacraments should be duly ministered, according to the ordinance of Christ.

4. There is still one more point to be noticed. The Article says the “pure word of God” is not only to be held, but to be “*preached*,” and that the Sacraments are to be “*DULY ministered*”

according to Christ's ordinance." The first expression at once suggests the question, "How shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?" The second expression suggests the inquiry, How can sacraments be *DULY ministered?* and, whom has Christ authorized to minister them? The definition evidently implies the consideration of a ministry: even as we saw both fathers and reformers mentioning a duly ordained ministry as essential to the character of a Church. The present Article may possibly have less distinctly enunciated this, because in two future Articles the subject is specially treated.

It is a truth hardly questioned, that our Lord did ordain a ministry for the preaching of the word, and that those so ordained did exercise that ministry, and considered themselves as sent by Christ to fulfil it. (See Matt. x. ; xxviii. 19, 20. Luke x. 1, 16. John xx. 21, 23. Acts xx. 20 ; xxvi. 17. 1 Cor. iv. 1 ; ix. 16, 17 ; xii. 28. 2 Cor. i. 1. Gal. i. 1. Eph. iv. 11, 14. Phil. i. 1. Col. iv. 17. 1 Tim. iii. 1. Tit. i. 5. 1 Pet. v. 1, &c. &c.) It is also quite certain that those to whom He gave authority to baptize, and those whom He commanded to bless the cup and break the bread in the Communion, were His commissioned and ordained Apostles (see the institution of the Eucharist in Matt. xxvi, and of Baptism in Matt. xxviii). Moreover, we never hear of any one in the new Testament, except a minister of God, attempting to baptize or to administer the Holy Communion. We know equally well, that the practice and belief of the Primitive Church was that none but bishops and presbyters should minister the Communion, and, ordinarily *at least*, none but bishops, priests, or deacons, should preach or baptize.

Thus then we conclude, that to the right preaching of the Word, and to the due administration of the Sacraments according to Christ's ordinance, a ministry, such as Christ ordained, is necessary, and therefore is included in the definition of this Article.

Moreover, as Baptism was to be with water, and the Eucharist with bread and wine, these elements must be used in order that they be duly administered; and, with the elements, that form of words which Christ has prescribed, at least in the case of Baptism, where a distinct form has been given. And so, the Sacraments, to be duly administered, need first the right elements, then the right form of words, and lastly, a ministry according to the ordinance of Christ.

5. It has been already noticed, that the definitions of the Article may be fairly considered as including the statement given in

the Homily and in other partly authoritative documents, that one note of the Church is discipline, or the power of the Keys. For, if the Sacraments be duly ministered, unfit persons must be shut out from them; and if there be a duly constituted ministry, that ministry must have the power of the Keys committed by Christ to His Church. But, as this subject falls more naturally under Article XXXIII., we may defer its fuller consideration for the present.

The formularies of our Church have expressed no judgment as to how far the very being of a Church may be imperilled by a defect in this particular note of the Church; as by mutilation of the Sacraments, imperfect ordination, or defective exercise of the power of the Keys. At the present time, these questions force themselves on us. But the English Church has been content to give her decision as to the right mode of ordaining, ministering Sacraments, and exercising discipline, without expressing an opinion on the degree of defectiveness in such matters which would cause other communions to cease from being Churches of Christ.

II. "The Church of Rome hath erred, not only in living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith."

So many of the Articles specially enter upon the errors of the Church of Rome that the subject may require very brief notice here. By "matters of faith" probably it is not intended to express articles of the Creed. Had the Church of Rome rejected the Creeds, and those fundamental articles of the faith contained in them, the Church of England would probably have considered her distinctly as a heresy, and not as a corrupt and erring Church. But there are many errors which concern the faith of Christ, besides those which strike at the very foundation, and would overthrow even the Creeds themselves.

Amongst these we may reckon all those novelties and heterodoxies contained in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., or of the Council of Trent. They are thus reckoned up by Dr. Barrow: 1. Seven Sacraments. 2. Trent doctrine of Justification and Original Sin. 3. Propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass. 4. Transubstantiation. 5. Communicating under one kind. 6. Purgatory. 7. Invocation of Saints. 8. Veneration of Relics. 9. Worship of Images. 10. The Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches. 11. Swearing Obedience to the Pope. 12. Receiving the decrees of all synods and of Trent.¹

It is true that these do not involve a denial of the Creeds, but

¹ Barrow, *On the Pope's Supremacy*, p. 290, conclusion.

they are additions to the Creeds, and error may be shown in excess, as well as in defect of belief. They are to be received by all members of the Church of Rome, as articles of faith. They are not with them mere matters of opinion. Every priest is required to swear that they form parts of the Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved.¹ Now the Church of England holds all of them to be false: several of her Articles are directed against these very doctrines as fabulous and dangerous; and therefore she must conclude, that "the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in living and manner of ceremonies, but also in" those very points which she herself has declared to be "matters of faith."

¹ The Creed of Pope Pius IV. begins with a declaration of firm faith in the various Articles in the Nicene, or Constantinopolitan Creed; and then continues with a like declaration of firm faith in the twelve novelties enumerated in the text. It finally rejects and anathematizes all things rejected and anathematized by the Council of Trent. And concludes with a solemn vow and pro-

fession of all this as "the true Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved." "Hanc veram Catholicam fidem extra quam nemo salvus esse potest . . . sponte profiteor ac veraciter teneo, spondeo, voveo ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet et hæc sancta Dei evangelia." *Council. Trident. Canones et Decreta*, pp. 370-373, Monast. Guestphalorum, 1845.