

ARTICLE XII

De Bonis Operibus.

Bona opera quæ sunt fructus fidei et justificatos sequuntur, quanquam peccata nostra expiare et divini iudicii severitatem ferre non possunt, Deo tamen grata sunt et accepta in Christo, atque ex vera et viva fide necessario profluunt, ut plane ex illis, æque fides viva cognosci possit, atque arbor ex fructu indicari.

Of Good Works.

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

THERE is nothing corresponding to this Article in the series of 1553. It is one of the four new Articles added by Parker at the revision in the early years of Elizabeth, a portion of the first clause being taken by him (like others of his addition) from the Confession of Württemberg,¹ while the phrase "**follow after justification**" (justificatos sequuntur) is due to S. Augustine, who uses it in his treatise, *De fide et operibus*, c. xiv.

The object of the Article is obviously to state the mind of the Church of England on the position of "good works," with reference, perhaps, to the Roman teaching on the one hand, and the exaggerations of Luther and of some who professed to be his followers on the other.

¹ "Non est autem sentiendum quod iis bonis operibus, quæ per nos facimus, in iudicio Dei ubi agitur de expiatione peccatorum et placatione divinæ iræ ac merito æternæ salutis confitendum est. Omnia enim bona opera quæ nos facimus sunt imperfecta, nec possunt severitatem divini iudicii ferre."—*De bonis operibus*. See Hardwick, p. 125.

(a) The Tridentine statements occur in the decrees and canons of the sixth session (held in January 1547). They follow naturally from the view of justification held by the Roman Church, and are very emphatic in their assertion of the "merit" of good works; e.g. "We must needs believe that to the justified nothing further is wanting, but that they may be accounted to have, by those very works which have been done in God, fully satisfied the Divine law according to the state of this life, and truly to have merited eternal life, to be obtained also in its due time if they shall have departed in grace."¹ Again: "If anyone shall say that the good works of a man that is justified are in such wise the gift of God, as that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified, or that the said justified, by the good works which are performed by him through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, whose living member he is, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life, if so be, however, that he depart in grace, and, moreover, an increase of glory: let him be anathema."²

(b) On the other hand, Luther used strong expressions on the sinful character of all man's efforts. "Even the best work is a venial sin"; and yet more strongly, "Omne opus iusti damnabile est et peccatum mortale, si iudicio

¹ "Nihil ipsis justificatis amplius deesse credendum est, quo minus plene illis quidem operibus quæ in Deo sunt facta, divinæ legi pro hujus vitæ statu satisfecisse, et vitam æternam suo etiam tempore, si tamen in gratia decesserint, consequendam, vere promeruisse censeantur."—*Conc. Trident. Sessio Sexta*, c. xvi.

² "Si quis dixerit hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Deo ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita; aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam et Jesu Christi meritum, cujus vivum membrum est, fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam, et ipsius vitæ æternæ, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atque etiam gloriæ augmentum: anathema sit."—*Ib.* canon xxxii.

Dei judicetur.”¹ No wonder, then, that among his followers a depreciation of the need of good works of any kind was prevalent, and that Antinomianism and Solifidianism were widely spread. It is probable that it was even more in order to protect the Church against these errors than to protest against the Roman teaching that the Article was inserted,² though it is so worded as to guard against false views on either side.

The main statements of the Article may be summed up as follows:—

1. Good works are the fruits and result of faith, and the evidence of it.
2. They “follow after justification.”
3. They have no merit in themselves, and cannot endure the severity of God’s judgment.
4. Yet they are acceptable to God in Christ.

The Roman and Lutheran divines looked at good works from opposite sides, and were consequently led into exaggerated statements in different directions. The Anglican Article by its balanced statements endeavours to do justice to both sides of the whole truth on the subject of which it treats, and seems to recognise that in every “good work” there are two factors, a human and a Divine. In so far as the doer of the work is following the leadings of grace, it is good; in so far as he is not, there is an element of sinfulness in the work. The main points laid down in the Article seem to follow so natur-

¹ *Assert. omn. art. Opera*, tom. ii. fol. 325b, quoted in Moehler’s *Symbolism*, p. 158. The Council of Trent met these assertions by the twenty-fifth canon of the Sixth Session: “Si quis in quolibet bono opere justum saltem venialiter peccare dixerit, aut quod intolerabilius est, mortaliter, atque ideo poenas æternas mereri, tantumque ob id non damnari, quia Deus ea opera non imputet ad damnationem: anathema sit.”

² Parker writes in 1559, “They say that the realm is full of Anabaptists, Arians, Libertines, Freewill men,” etc. Parker’s *Correspondence* (Parker Society), p. 61.

ally from the teaching of Article XI. on justification by faith, that they require but little explanation and no formal Scriptural proof. It may, however, be well to point out that in the statement that **good works . . . follow after justification**, the “good works” of which this Article is speaking are clearly external works, or that actual obedience which produces a course of actions. Repentance, which from one point of view might certainly be termed a “good work,” cannot possibly be referred to, because it precedes and does not “follow after justification.”¹ The phrase, as we have seen, is due to S. Augustine, and, as Waterland says, by it Augustine “meant no more than that men must be incorporated in Christ, must be Christians, and good Christians (for such only are justified), before they could practise Christian works or righteousness, strictly so called: for such works only have an eminent right and title to the name of good works, as they only are salutary within the covenant, and have a claim upon the promise. Works before justification, *i.e.* before salutary baptism, are not, in his account, within the promise.”² The expression in the Article must be understood in the same way, and not pressed so as to make it imply that nothing good can

¹ “Bona opera” had apparently come to have almost a technical sense for definite *Christian* works. Gardiner in his *Declaration* (fol. xxxviii.) distinguishes carefully between “bona opera” which follow after justification, and “opera pœnitentiæ” which precede it. See Hardwick, p. 401; and the Tridentine decrees seem carefully to avoid speaking of “good works” as done before justification, while anathematising the view that “all works which are done before justification are truly sins.”—Sess. VI. canon vii.

² *Summary View of the Doctrine of Justification*, Works, vol. vi. p. 21; cf. Bp. Bull, *Harmony of Justification*, p. 55. “Augustine is certainly not to be understood of every work, but of a long continuance of works, so that his meaning may be this: the works which precede justification are less and fewer than those which follow it. Without some explanation of this kind, that maxim, so often used, will with difficulty be freed from an evident falsehood.”

possibly precede justification,—a position which, as will be shown under the following article, could not be established from Scripture, and one to which the Church of England is certainly not committed. That, then, to which this Article is intended to bind us is this, namely, that, as justification comes at the *beginning* of the Christian life, “good works” properly so called must be subsequent to it, and that they are the natural and necessary outcome of that faith by which a man is justified.

Waterland’s conclusion on the whole subject which has been considered in these two Articles (XI. and XII.) is worth quoting: “Take we due care so to maintain the doctrine of faith as not to exclude the necessity of good works, and so to maintain good works as not to exclude the necessity of Christ’s atonement, or the free grace of God. Take we care to perform all evangelical duties to the utmost of our power, aided by God’s Spirit; and when we have so done, say that we are unprofitable servants, having no strict claim to a reward, but yet looking for one and accepting it as a favour, not challenging it as due in any right of our own: due only upon free promise, and that promise made, not in consideration of any deserts of ours, but in and through the alone merits, active and passive, of Jesus Christ our Lord.”¹

¹ *Summary View, etc.*, p. 38.

ARTICLE XIII

Opera ante Justificationem.

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

Of Works before Justification.

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

THIS Article has remained unchanged since the publication of the Edwardian Series in 1553. There is nothing corresponding to it in the Augsburg Confession, nor has its language been traced to any earlier source. Its object is evidently to condemn the scholastic theory of congruous merit.

The subjects which require consideration in connection with it are these—

1. The title as compared with the Article itself.
2. The scholastic theory of congruous merit.
3. The teaching of the Article upon the subject.

I. The Title as compared with the Article itself.

It will be noticed that whereas the title speaks of **works before justification**, in the body of the Article

the phrase is not repeated, but a different one takes its place. **Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit.** The question then at once arises, Are these two expressions strictly convertible terms? The answer to this must depend on the reply given to another question, Is grace ever given before justification? If *not*, the two expressions, "works before justification," and "works before grace," may be regarded as convertible; but if it should appear that grace is sometimes given before justification, then it will be evident that the title of the Article is too wide, and must be limited by the expression actually used in the Article itself. The question as to the relation of grace to justification depends partly on the meaning given to the term "grace." Some of the schoolmen, as S. Thomas Aquinas,¹ were inclined definitely to limit it to the divine gift granted to *Christians*, while freely admitting that God's assistance (*auxilium*) was given to others. If, however, the word be used more generally for a gift of supernatural aid wherever given, the question is one which must be decided strictly by the testimony of Holy Scripture, and it is believed that there is ample evidence to establish the fact that grace may be given before justification. As Bishop Bull says: "The truth is that no work really good can precede the grace of God, since without that grace it cannot be performed. But good works may precede justification, and actually do precede it; for grace is given before justification, that we may perform those things by which we arrive at justification."² For proof of this it is sufficient to refer to two representative instances: (a) On the day of Pentecost, after the address of the Apostle Peter to the multitude, we read, "They were pricked in their heart (*κατενόησαν τὴν καρδίαν*), and said unto Peter and the

¹ See the *Summa*, I^a. II^o. cix. 1.

² *Harmony of Justification*, p. 162.

rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do?" (Acts ii. 37). Here, without doubt, was the grace of God at work. The grace of *compunction* was granted; but the reply of S. Peter shows equally clearly that even so those who had thus received grace were not yet justified. "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *unto the remission of your sins*; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (b) Again, it will scarcely be doubted that S. Paul received grace at the moment of his conversion. "Behold, he prayeth," was the message which came to Ananias (Acts ix. 11), and that prayer can only have been offered up and rendered acceptable by the action of the Holy Spirit upon his heart. But, strictly speaking, he was not *justified* for three days after his "conversion"; for when Ananias came to him his words were these: "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*" (Acts xxii. 16).

There is, then, on this view, a real discrepancy between the title of this thirteenth Article and the substance of it, and so much was practically confessed by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, who suggested as an emendation that the Article itself should run as follows: "Works done *before justification by Christ and regeneration by His Spirit* are not pleasing unto God," etc.¹ The origin of this discrepancy has been traced by Archdeacon Hardwick to an earlier draft of the Article. As was mentioned in the Introduction,² there still exists in the Record Office a MS. copy of the Articles, signed by the six royal chaplains, to whom they were submitted before their final revision and publication, and

¹ See Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 561. The Assembly also suggested a change in the closing words of the Article, substituting "they are sinful" for the far milder phrase, "We doubt not that they have the nature of sin."

² See p. 13.

in this we find that in the Article itself we have the expression: "Opera quæ fiunt ante justificationem cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant," etc.¹ It is evident that Cranmer and those working with him afterwards felt that this was inaccurate, and therefore modified the wording of the Article before publication, introducing the phrase which we now read in it, "Works before the grace of Christ," etc., although the old title was still allowed to remain, inexact though it was.

II. *The Scholastic Theory of Congruous Merit.*

The object of the Article, as has been already stated, is to repudiate the erroneous teaching of some of the **school-authors**² on the subject of grace. The school-authors, or schoolmen here referred to, are the divines of the centuries immediately preceding the Reformation: S. Bernard (1115) being generally reckoned as the "last of the Fathers," and S. Anselm (1109) or Peter Lombard, the "Master of the Sentences" (1164), the first of the schoolmen.³ We are here concerned, how-

¹ See Hardwick, p. 281.

² The Latin of the Article has merely "ut *multi* vocant." The regular name for the schoolmen in Latin is "scholastici" (cf. Art. XXIII. of 1553, *doctrina Scholasticorum*), a name which tells us nothing about the men themselves, except that they belonged to the "schools," either as teachers or learners.

³ The change of name is significant. The Fathers, "Patres," as Archbishop Trench points out, were productive, bringing out of their treasure things new and old. The schoolmen, on the contrary, were content simply to vindicate and establish the old. "The more illustrious teachers of earlier periods of the Church had found each his own special and peculiar work to perform, his own position to make good. Occupied with this, they had not found the inclination or the leisure for a deliberate oversight of the whole field of theology; they had not mapped it out as it demanded to be mapped out. It was to this that the schoolmen addressed themselves—to the organising after a true scientific method the rude undigested mass which lay before

ever, not with the men, nor with the scholastic system as a whole, but simply with one particular portion of it, namely, its teaching on grace. In reasoning on this subject, some among the schoolmen had come to teach a doctrine which is, to say the least, seriously tainted with semi-Pelagianism; for they maintained that man might be entitled to receive initial grace as the reward of actions done in his own strength without the aid of God's Holy Spirit.¹ Starting from the view that the Fall only involved the loss of the *donum supernaturale*, and left man with moral and religious faculties belonging to him by nature, they taught that the exercise of these faculties was the natural transition to grace, and that a good use of them was the medium of grace, or, in their phraseology, merited it *of congruity* (*de congruo*). God, they said, was not bound to reward such actions, but it was congruous or fitting that He should. But after grace was received, the work done in dependence on the aid of the Holy Spirit was really good, and this God was bound to reward, crowning His own gifts in man. Such actions deserved grace *de condigno*, and for them God was a debtor. The stock instance to which they made their appeal was the case of Cornelius (Acts x.), whose "prayers and alms came up for a memorial before God," and drew down God's grace upon him. The true explanation of such a case as this will be given in the next section. For the present, it is sufficient to notice that the theory, as popularly represented, opens the door to Pelagianism, and makes (at least in some cases) the *beginning* of man's

them." Thus their work was to adjust the relations of the various parts of theological learning, and to draw up in "Sums of Theology" the complete doctrine of the Church to which they professed implicit obedience. And further, they set themselves to "justify to the reason that which had first been received by faith," explaining the "how" and the "why" of the Church's teaching, and vindicating the rational character of supernatural truth. See Trench's *Medieval Church History*, Lect. xiv.

¹ See Gabriel Biel (1495), *Commentary on the Libri Sententiarum*, Lib. II. q. xxvii.

salvation his own act. Moreover, it brought back into the Church the conception of *earning* a reward, against which S. Paul's whole teaching on grace was directed.¹ The scholastic opinions and distinctions, however, on this subject have never been formally adopted by the Church of Rome. The idea of congruous merit was rightly condemned as bordering on Pelagianism by some of the Tridentine divines, and the decrees of the Council avoided altogether the phrases *meritum de congruo* and *de condigno*; and while, on the one hand, they guarded against Pelagianism by anathematising anyone who should say "that without the preventing inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and His help, man can believe, hope love, or be penitent, as he ought, so that the grace of justification may be conferred upon him,"² on the other hand they condemned the assertion that "*all* works done before justification, in what manner soever they be done, are truly sins, or deserve the hatred of God."³

III. *The Teaching of the Article upon the Subject.*

In considering what the teaching of the Article really is, it is important to remember the exact phrase to which attention has been previously drawn, "Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit," and also to bear in mind the fact already

¹ The illustration commonly given to explain the scholastic distinction brings this out very clearly. A servant, it is said, deserves his wages *de condigno*: he may deserve support in sickness or old age *de congruo*.

² "Si quis dixerit, sine præveniente Spiritus Sancti inspiratione, atque ejus adjutorio, hominem credere, sperare, diligere, aut penitere posse, sicut oportet, ut ei justificationis gratia conferatur: anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.* Sess. VI. canon iii.

³ "Si quis dixerit opera omnia quæ ante justificationem fiunt, quæcumque ratione facta sint, vere esse peccata, vel odium Dei mereri, aut quanto vehementius quis nititur se disponere ad gratiam, tanto eum gravius peccare: anathema sit."—Canon vii.

established, that grace may be and sometimes *is* given before justification. When due weight is given to these two considerations, it will be seen that there is really nothing in the Article which in any way depreciates the good works of those who, born in an inferior system, make such use of the opportunities granted to them as to draw down further blessings upon them. Article X. has asserted that "the condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God." The Article before us supplements this by maintaining that **works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or . . . deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin.** What it is intended to deny in each case is the semi-Pelagian notion, revived by some of the schoolmen, that in certain cases the *initiative* in the work of salvation rests with man. But we are not called upon by subscribing these Articles either to deny that God looks with favour upon the good deeds of men who are outside His covenant, or to maintain that the virtues of the heathen are really sins. All we deny is that they "deserve grace of congruity"; for if grace be a supernatural gift freely bestowed by God on men in order that they may attain eternal life, then certainly grace is found working outside the Christian covenant, and influencing men before they are (in theological language) "justified."¹ Wherever, then, a work that is really good can be found

¹ "They who acknowledge no grace of God, save that one only which is infused in justification, or who contend that at least that one goes before

done by men trained in any system, it is to be ascribed to the action of God's grace, and not to the man's own unaided efforts.¹ Thus in the case of Cornelius, to which the upholders of the doctrine of congruous merit made their appeal, we may fearlessly assert that his "prayers and alms" were "pleasant and acceptable to God" (*grata Deo*), for so much is involved in the statement that they "came up for a memorial before God" (Acts x. 4). But we deny that they were due to "his own natural strength." We deny also that they "deserved

all others, greatly err; since they cannot deny that faith at least precedes justification in nature, which faith we certainly have not from ourselves, but from the preventing grace of Christ. More rightly, therefore, do other Protestants, who are more sound and moderate, willingly concede that various disposing and preparing acts, produced in us through the Holy Ghost assisting, and not by the sole powers of our freewill, are required before justification, though most of them deny to these acts any power of justifying."—Bp. W. Forbes, *Considerationes Modestæ*, vol. i. p. 25.

¹ Hardwick (*Articles*, p. 402) quotes in illustration of this the following from Bishop Woolton's *Christian Manual*, p. 43 (Ed. Parker Society): "Albeit the works of heathen men are not to be compared with the good works of faithful men engrafted in the Church of Christ; yet for many causes, and principally for that without all controversy, all good gifts and endowments even in the paynims, are God's good gifts, they have the title and name of good works in some respects given unto them." Cf. *The Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, vol. ii. p. 337: "The principle underlying Article XIII. seems to me to be this, that there are not two totally different modes of access to God for men, faith for Christians, meritorious performance for non-Christians. There is but one mode of access, faith; and but one perfect, and, as it were, normal faith, that which rests on the revelation in the person of Jesus Christ. But faith itself, not being an intellectual assent to propositions, but an attitude of heart and mind, is present in a more or less rudimentary state in every upward effort and aspiration of men. Doubtless the faith of non-Christians (and much of the faith of Christians for that matter) is not in the strict sense "faith in Jesus Christ"; and therefore I wish the Article were otherwise worded. But such faith, when ripened, grows into the faith of Jesus Christ; as also it finds its rational justification in the revelation made through Him. Practically the principle of the Article teaches us to regard all the good there is in the world as what one may call *imperfect Christianity*, not as something essentially different, requiring, so to speak, to be dealt with by God in a wholly different manner."

grace of congruity," for we maintain that they were actually done by the aid of Divine grace, and that thus, although they were done "before justification," they cannot truly be described as "works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit"; for, as Augustine says, "Whatever of good works Cornelius performed as well before he believed in Christ as when he believed, and after he had believed, are *all to be ascribed to God.*"¹

It should be added, however, that a different interpretation of the Article from that here given is possible. On the view that the use of the term "grace" is to be limited to *Christian* works, there will be no discrepancy between the title and the body of the Article, and the Article in denying the semi-Pelagian theory of congruous merit will be taken as simply expressing the broad contrast between what is within and what is without the covenant. Works which are without it, even if done *auxilio Dei*, are not technically *grata Deo*, a phrase which in scholastic language is reserved for "good," *i.e.* *Christian* works, *viz.* those done by the aid of "grace" (cf. the language of Art. XII.). They must then broadly be said not necessarily to be sins, as Luther maintained, but at least to have *rationem peccati* (cf. Art. IX.), as not springing from faith in Jesus Christ, just as S. John speaks of the whole world (outside the Christian Church) as "lying in the evil one," though not thereby in the least intending to deny the possibility of the action of God's Holy Spirit on man apart from conscious knowledge of his Saviour.

On either interpretation the general result is much the same, it being quite clear that the real object of the Article is simply to guard against the practical revival of Pelagianism by the scholastic theory of congruous merit.

¹ *De Prædest. Sanctorum*, c. vii.

ARTICLE XIV

De Operibus Supererogationis.

Opera quæ supererogationis appellant, non possunt sine arrogantia et impietate prædicari. Nam illis declarant homines non tantum se Deo reddere quæ tenentur, sed plus in ejus gratiam facere quam deberent: cum aperte Christus dicat: Cum feceritis omnia quæcunque præcepta sunt vobis, dicite: Servi inutiles sumus.

Of Works of Supererogation.

Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We be unprofitable servants.

THIS Article dates from 1553, the only change made in it in Elizabeth's reign being the substitution of "impiety" for "iniquity," as more accurately representing the Latin "impietate."¹

Its object is, of course, to condemn the Romish teaching on "works of supererogation." The same teaching is also condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in a passage which admirably illustrates the article: "Tum et illorum arrogantia comprimenda est, et autoritate legum domanda, qui supererogationis opera quædam importaverunt, quibus existimant non solum cumulate Dei legibus, et explete satisfieri, sed aliquid etiam in illis amplius superesse quam Dei mandata

¹ In 1553 and 1563 the title was "Opera Supererogationis." The change to its present form was made in 1571.

postulent, unde et sibi mereri et aliis merita applicari possint."¹

The subjects which require consideration in explanation of the Article are these—

1. The name "works of supererogation."
2. The history of the growth of the system of indulgences.
3. The theological defence offered for them, involving works of supererogation, and the teaching of Scripture on the subject.

I. *The Name "Works of Supererogation."*

The word **supererogation** comes directly from the Latin. Starting with the simple verb "rogare," we note that in classical writers it is used, sometimes with "legem" or "populum" after it, sometimes absolutely, in a technical sense, meaning "to ask the people about a law," and so simply to "propose a bill," or "introduce a law." Hence the compound verb "erogare" was used in connection with a money bill, and came to mean "to pay out money from the public treasury, after asking the consent of the people," and so more generally, beyond the sphere of public law, to "expend" or "disburse money."² From this the double compound "supererogare" was formed with the meaning, to "pay over and above," equivalent to the Greek *προσδαπανᾶν*. As such its earliest occurrence is in the Latin versions of the New Testament, where it appears in S. Luke x. 35 in the parable of the Good Samaritan, "Whatsoever thou spendest more": *Quodcunque supererogaveris*. This rendering was current before the days of S. Jerome,

¹ *De Hæres.* c. 8: "De perfectione justificatorum, et de operibus supererogationis."

² Thus in the Latin of Codex Bezae "erogasset" stands for *δαπανησάντος* in S. Luke xv. 14.

being found in the writings of S. Ambrose,¹ as well as in some MSS. of the "Old Latin";² but it was its adoption in the Vulgate that made it the common property of Western Christendom.³ From it in later times the substantive "supererogatio" was formed, and the phrase "opera supererogationis" was adopted by ecclesiastical writers as the technical name for the "excess of merit" attributed to the saints, and for what the Article calls **voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments.** In this sense it was used not infrequently by writers of the thirteenth century, such as Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas; but until this period it is doubtful whether the phrase is ever found, or whether the verb occurs except in direct connection with S. Luke x. 35.

II. *The History of the Growth of the System of Indulgences.*

It was the open sale of indulgences, which was closely connected with the doctrine of works of supererogation, that first roused the indignation of Luther, and led to the revolt from the Papacy. But the doctrine and the practice only grew up very gradually, step by step, with no perception on the part of anyone of what the ultimate outcome of it all would be. The starting-point, in tracing out its history, may be found in very early days,

¹ S. Ambrose, *Hom. vii. in Lucam.*

² Sabatier gives it as found in *Codd. Veron. and Briz. Cod. Vercellensis* has "amplius erogaveris," which is the rendering found in Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. cxxv. 15*, although in *Quæst. Evangel. II. xix.* he has *supererogare.*

³ The "Rhemish New Testament" (1st ed. 1582) attempted to Anglicise the verb, and rendered S. Luke x. 35: "Whatsoever thou dost supererogate"; but it was found impossible to naturalise the clumsy Latinism, and it was withdrawn in the Douay version (1609), which is content with the natural rendering, "spend over and above,"

in the regard for (1) martyrdom, and (2) virginity, felt by the primitive Church.

1. It was only natural that the memory of those who had laid down their lives for the faith of Christ should be held in the greatest honour, and that their intercessions should be regarded as especially efficacious, and should be eagerly sought after. And as there were many "Confessors" who had suffered mutilation or banishment for the same cause, without being called upon to seal their testimony with their lives, it was equally natural that the same feelings of regard and admiration should be extended to them also. From this sprang, during the persecution of Decius, what we can only call the first form of indulgences. During this persecution, which raged so fiercely at Carthage in the middle of the third century, while there were many noble instances of men confessing their faith bravely, and enduring whatever was inflicted upon them rather than deny their Master, yet there were also many cases of grievous apostasy. Some Christians under the stress of persecution went so far as to deny Christ altogether, and to sacrifice to the gods of the heathen (*sacrificati*); others offered incense (*thurificati*); others obtained tickets (*libelli*), declaring that they had thus cleared themselves from the crime of Christianity (*libellatici*). With these different cases the Church was called upon to deal; and under the wise guidance of S. Cyprian she determined that the peace of the Church might be granted to those who through weakness had lapsed, but that a time of penitential discipline must first be passed by them to test and prove their sorrow. Some, however, of the lapsed were impatient, and could ill brook the delay of communion. They therefore persuaded the Confessors to intercede for them, and ask for their readmission to the sacraments of the Church. It will easily be seen that it was difficult for the authorities to refuse the request

of these men who had suffered so much for the Church, and unfortunately some of the Confessors were not proof against the moral dangers to which these appeals to their kindness exposed them. Not content with interceding for the lapsed, they claimed the right to restore them to the peace of the Church, and to grant sometimes to a lapsed person and his friends (*cum suis libelli pacis*),¹ or tickets to admit them to communion without having undergone the penitential discipline imposed upon them. Here, then, we meet with a form of "indulgence," *i.e.* a shortening or remission of canonical penance. But clearly there was in itself nothing beyond the power of the Church in granting this. The claim of the Confessors to grant it in their own right was steadily resisted by Cyprian; but the Church, which had imposed the penance, and to which the power of "binding and loosing" had been granted by Christ Himself,² was within her rights in shortening the time, and readmitting to communion those of whose true repentance she was assured. The whole episode, however, required to be noticed here, because historically the "libelli pacis" form a sort of precedent for the indulgences of the medieval Church, though, as will presently be shown, these claimed to be far wider reaching than anything which had ever entered the minds of the Confessors who granted the original "libelli."

2. The special reverence with which the early Church regarded virginity is well known. It is based on the teaching of S. Paul in 1 Cor. vii, in which, though he permits marriage, he certainly expresses a preference—under the then existing conditions—for the unmarried state. "Concerning virgins" he has "no commandment

¹ S. Cyprian, *Ep.* xv. See on the whole subject Archbishop Benson's article "Libelli" in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. ii. p. 981.

² S. Matt. xviii. 18.

(*præceptum*) of the Lord," but he gives his "judgment" (*consilium*),¹ and advises that such remain single. From these words grew the distinction subsequently drawn between "precepts," which all were bound to obey, and "counsels," which it was not *necessary* for a person to follow. From this it was only a step to teach that by following the "counsels" it was possible for a Christian to do more than was required of him by God, and hence the notion of a special "merit" attaching to the state of virginity and to other special states or conditions. This idea was greatly encouraged by the devotion to the monastic life which is so marked in the latter part of the fourth century; and from this time onward it is generally recognised that there are two kinds of life within the Church, the one for ordinary Christians mixing in the world, in which men are permitted to marry, and to engage in the ordinary business of life, though strictly bound to keep the "commandments" of God; the other, which is above the ordinary life of men, in which the "counsels of perfection" are carried out, those who are thus aiming at being "perfect" selling all their possessions (*cf.* S. Matt. xix. 21), abstaining from marriage, and devoting themselves entirely to the service of God.²

These facts require to be borne in mind, although their full significance and the use that might be made of them did not appear for several centuries. The system of a commutation of penance for money, which was introduced about the seventh century through the "Penitentials," cannot have failed to be seriously injurious to the moral sense of Christendom, however innocent may have been

¹ Cf. also 2 Cor. viii. 8 and 10, where *consilium* occurs again. The distinction is recognised by S. Augustine, and is used by him to illustrate S. Luke x. 35; *Quæst. Evangel.* II. xix., and *Enarr. in Ps.* cxxv. 15.

² Cf. Cheetham's *Church History*, p. 349.

its original intention.¹ But the system of "Indulgences" proper is scarcely found before the eleventh century and the time of the Crusades.² It is confessed on all sides that this great movement marks an epoch in the history of indulgences, and that practically a new departure was taken at the Council of Clermont (1095), when Urban II. declared that to those who would take up arms against the Infidel, he remitted the penance due to their sins, and promised to those who should die in the combat the pardon of their sins and life eternal;³ and when the Council formulated their decision in these words—

"Whosoever shall go to Jerusalem to liberate the Church of God out of pure devotion, and not for the purpose of obtaining honour or money, let the journey be counted in him of all penance."⁴

From this time may be said to date the medieval system, whereby an "Indulgence" or remission of penance, and of some or all of the *temporal* penalties attached to sin, was granted in return for certain acts of devotion whereby the Church profited. Such indulgences were granted, not only to those who "took the Cross," but to those who took part in the building of churches and cathedrals, and in many other pious acts, so that practically the expenditure of a certain sum of money could always secure them, and the line between this and the actual sale of an indulgence for money was a very

¹ On the Penitential System and the Commutation of Penance see Strong's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 314 and 342, where the good and evil of the system are both frankly recognised.

² There are, however, indications of something like it in the ninth century, when John VIII. (882) said that those who had been killed in war against the heathen, fighting for the Church, received life eternal; and that he gave them *absolution, as much as he had power to do*. See Lépicier, *History of Indulgences*, p. 189.

³ Synodalis Concio Urbani II., Mansi, xx. p. 821.

⁴ "Quicumque pro sola devotione, non pro honoris vel pecuniæ adeptione ad liberandum Ecclesiam Dei Jerusalem profectus fuerit, iter illud pro omni pœnitentia reputetur."—*Ib.* p. 816.

thin one, and not easy to discern. Originally the idea may have been only of the remission of canonical penance; but it very soon came to mean a great deal more than this. The canonical penance did not exhaust the *temporal*, as distinct from the *eternal*, penalties of sin;¹ and since "purgatory" was a part of the temporal penalty, the indulgence was supposed to avail for a remission of a part or all of the pains to be there undergone. Moreover, the indulgence could be used for others than the person who performed the meritorious act, and could thus be transferred to the account of the departed, and used for the benefit of the souls in purgatory;² and since it was called indiscriminately "remissio," "relaxatio," and "venia peccatorum," and was said to be granted *a culpa et a venia*,³ the door was opened to the notion that

¹ It is necessary to remember carefully this distinction. According to the theory which underlies the granting of indulgences, even after the sin is forgiven and its guilt (*culpa*) pardoned, there always remains a certain amount of temporal penalty (*pœna*) still to be paid either here or in purgatory. The beginning of this is seen in Albertus Magnus: "Delet gratia finalis peccatum veniale in ipsa dissolutione corporis et animæ, etc.: Hoc ab antiquis dictum est; sed nunc communiter tenetur, quod peccatum veniale cum hinc deferatur a multis, etiam quantum ad culpam, in purgatoria purgatur."—*In Compend. Theol. Verit.* iii. 13, quoted in Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, p. 165. Still more definite is the statement of the Council of Trent: "Si quis post acceptam justificationis gratiam cuilibet peccatori pœnitenti ita culpam remitti et reatum æternæ pœnæ deleri dixerit, ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exsolvendæ vel in hoc sæculo vel in futuro in purgatorio, antequam ad regna cœlorum aditus patere possit: anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid.*, Sessio vi. canon 30.

² According to the formal theory of the Church of Rome, as laid down by Sixtus IV. in a Constitution of 1477, indulgences for the departed only avail *per modum suffragii, i.e.* "the Church has no direct power over the souls of the departed. She can but humbly entreat God to accept the merits of Christ, and, having respect to them, mercifully to remit the whole or a portion of the pains due to the souls suffering in purgatory" (Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 485). If this is all, it is impossible for the person who procures the indulgence to know whether it has been of any avail at all.

³ There was no doubt that this form was anciently used; but the Council of Constance (1418) decreed that all indulgences granted with this formula

it involved a promise of eternal forgiveness; and thus the grossest errors and superstitions were admitted and, it cannot be doubted, were encouraged by the authorities in order to fill the coffers of the Church. Thus an enormous stimulus was given to the system by the institution of the "Jubilee" in the year 1300, when Boniface VIII. offered "the fullest forgiveness of sins" to all those who for fifteen days should devoutly visit the churches of S. Peter and S. Paul in Rome.¹ This naturally drew a vast crowd of pilgrims to the city, and greatly enriched the Church; consequently, instead of being held at the expiration of every hundred years, as was originally intended, the period was shortened, first to fifty years by Clement VI. by his famous Bull "Unigenitus," in which he boldly expounded the doctrine of the "treasury of the Church" committed to the successors of S. Peter;² then by Urban VI. to thirty-three years (1389); and finally by Paul II. to twenty-five (1470). Naturally, protests were raised from time to time,³ but in spite of them the system which evoked the scorn of devout Churchmen like Dante,⁴

were revoked and annulled; and Benedict XIV. (*De Syn. Diac.* xiii. 18. 7) holds that all such are spurious; while modern writers say that if the phrase remission of sins occurs in the grant of an indulgence, it means the remission of punishment. See Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 482.

¹ The words of the Bull are these: "Non solum plenam et largiorem, imo plenissimam suorum concedimus veniam peccatorum." On the Jubilee see Robertson, *Church History*, vol. vi. p. 326 seq.

² Cf. Neander, *Church History*, vol. ix. p. 59 (Eng. tr.).

³ See an account of some of the earlier and less known protests in Neander, *Church History*, vol. vii. p. 487. The later denunciations of the whole system by Wiclif, and Huss, and Jerome of Prague are well known. See Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, vol. i. p. 325.

⁴ See *Paradiso*, Canto xxix. l. 123-115—

"Ora si va con motti, e con iscede,
A predicare, e pur che ben si rida,
Gonfia il cappuccio, e più non si richiede,
Ma tale uccel nel becchetto s' annida,
Che se 'l vulgo il vedesse, vederebbe
La perdonanza, di che si confida,

as well as of Chaucer¹ and Langland,² grew into the scandal of the open sale of indulgences by Tetzel and the "quæstores." At the beginning of the sixteenth century, in the words of the Roman Catholic historian, Lingard, the preachers, "not content with their sermons from the pulpit, offered indulgences in the streets and markets, in taverns and in private houses; they even taught, if we may credit the interested declamation of their adversary, that every contributor, if he paid on his own account, infallibly opened to himself the gates of heaven; if on account of the dead, instantly liberated a soul from the prison of purgatory."³

III. *The Theological Defence offered for Indulgences, involving Works of Supererogation, and the Teaching of Scripture on the Subject.*

It has been necessary to give this brief sketch of the growth of the practical system of indulgences, because it

Per cui tanta stoltezza in terra crebbe,
Che senza pruova d' alcun testimonio
Ad ogne promession si converrebbe.

Now is our preaching done with jestings slight
And mockings, and if men but laugh agape,
The cowl puffs out, nor ask men if 'tis right;

Yet such a bird doth nestle in their cape,
That if the crowd beheld it, they would know
What pardons they rely on for escape.

And thus such madness there on earth doth grow,
That without proof of any evidence,
To each Indulgence eager crowds will flow."

—Plumptre's Translation.

¹ See the description of the "Pardonere," "That streit was comen from the court of Rome," in the prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*—

"His wallet lay before him in his lappe,
Bret-ful of pardon come from Rome al hote."

² *Piers the Plowman*, Passus I. l. 66 seq. Pass. X. l. 316 seq.

³ Lingard, *History of England*, vol. iv. c. vii. Cf. for the state of things in England at a somewhat earlier period, Gascoyne's *Liber Veritatum*, p. 123.

is only in connection with them that the notion of "works of supererogation" came into prominence. Nothing is more certain from history than the fact of the gradual growth of the system, bit by bit, without any clear conception being formed by anyone of what it really meant, or very much serious thought being bestowed upon it. But when the custom of granting indulgences had made its way and was adopted into the regular system of the Church, it was impossible to avoid awkward questions being raised. Explanations of its meaning were asked for, and a theological defence of it was required. This was supplied by the schoolmen, and in it "works of supererogation" play an important part.

The original system, whereby canonical penance imposed by the Church was removed by the same authority, was naturally and properly defended as the exercising of the power of "binding and loosing" which the Church possessed by Christ's own gift. But when the indulgence was something more than this, when it could be transferred to the benefit of others, and availed for the dead and mitigated the pains of purgatory, something more was needed. Even the doctrine of the union of the faithful in the one Body, together with the power of intercessory prayer, was totally inadequate to bear the superstructure of the popular system. Accordingly the schoolmen of the thirteenth century took up a phrase that had been used some time earlier, and elaborated the doctrine of the "thesaurus ecclesiæ." Availing themselves of the old distinction between "counsels" and "precepts," they taught that the **voluntary works over and above God's commandments**, which had been performed by the saints, and which were not needed to "merit" their own salvation, were not lost or wasted, but went into the treasury of the Church; and that, together with the infinite merits of Christ, these **works of**

supererogation formed a deposit of superabundant good works, which the Pope, as holding the keys of the kingdom of heaven, could unlock and dispense for the benefit of the faithful, so as to pay the debt of the temporal punishment of their sins, which they might still owe to God.

This was the theological defence of the system, which assumed consistency in the hands of the great schoolmen of the thirteenth century, Alexander of Hales (1245), Albertus Magnus (1280), Bonaventura (1274), and S. Thomas Aquinas (1270).¹ The language of the last, if the *Supplement* may be quoted as his, is especially instructive. It betrays a certain amount of uneasiness, and it is clear that Aquinas felt that his task was a difficult one; erroneous opinions on the subject were common, but the Church had approved of indulgences, and therefore they had to be defended.²

¹ Alexander of Hales is very strong in insisting that the indulgence avails "ad forum Dei" as well as "ad forum Ecclesiæ," and that it is more than a mere relaxation of canonical penance (*Summa*, pars iv. 9. 23, art. 1, and see art. 2). "Indulgentiæ et relaxationes fiunt de meritis supererogationis membrorum Christi, quæ sunt spiritualis thesaurus ecclesiæ. Hunc autem thesaurum non est omnium dispensare, sed tantum eorum, qui præcipue vicem Christi gerunt." "Præexistente pœna debite et sufficientis contritionis, potest summus pontifex totam penam debitam peccatori pœnitenti dimittere." "Probabiliter et verissime præsumitur, quod illis qui sunt in purgatorio potest pontifex facere indulgentias. Nota tamen, quod plura requiruntur ad hoc, quod debito modo fiat indulgentia: scilicet potestas clavium ex parte conferentis; ex parte ejus, cui confertur, charitas, credulitas, devotio; inter utrum causa et modus—Potest ergo dici, quod illis qui sunt in purgatorio possunt fieri relaxationes secundum conditiones prædictas per modum suffragii sive impetrationis, non per modum judicariæ absolutionis sive commutationis." These and other quotations are given in Gieseler's *Church History*, vol. iii. p. 373, where see also the teaching of Albertus Magnus, *In Sent.*, Lib. IV. dist. 20, arts. 16 and 17; and for the teaching of Aquinas see the *Summa Suppl.*, Pars iii. Q. 25–27.

² Cf. Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, vol. v. p. 60: "The starting-point of both these theologians [Bonaventura and Aquinas] was prevailing

But although a defence was thus elaborated for the system, it can hardly be seriously maintained that it can be proved from Scripture. The theory of a superabundant "thesaurus ecclesiæ," and of good works that can thus be arbitrarily transferred from one to another, rests on a wholly false notion of our relation to God. The idea of a *quantitative* satisfaction for all things wrongly done, that has to be made either in this life or in the next, but which "is capable of being commuted for the ceremonial utterance of a prayer or the visit to a shrine, each good for a given number of days, or years, or centuries,"¹ can claim no support whatever from Scripture; the notion that men can **not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they may actually do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required,** is directly contrary to the words of our Lord, quoted in the Article: **When ye have done all that are commanded you, say, We be unprofitable servants** (S. Luke xvii. 10). Yet, as a certain scriptural foundation has been alleged for the doctrine, it is necessary to consider the passages on which the maintainers of it have relied. They are mainly two—(1) the incident of the rich young ruler, (2) the

practice. Indulgences existed, and therefore were right. It was their business to give a rational explanation of what the Church had thought fit to do." See Bonaventura, *In IV. Sent.*, dist. 20: "Universalis ecclesia has relaxationes acceptat; sed constat quod ipsa non errat, ergo vere fiunt."

¹ Plumptre's *Spirits in Prison*, p. 307. If it be said, as it is sometimes, it is a very difficult thing to obtain a real and valid indulgence, for that it is of no avail unless you have "made so good a confession (a very difficult thing to do) as to be free from all sin, even venial"; and unless you are "on your guard against every occasion of sin afterwards" (*Cor Cordi loquitur*, p. 233), it can only be replied, that in this case the popular system, whereby indulgences are publicly offered to those who visit certain churches, or perform certain devotions, is seriously misleading, and that the necessity for fulfilling these conditions ought to be publicly stated in every case in which an indulgence is offered.

teaching of our Lord and S. Paul on marriage and virginity.

1. The rich young ruler. The incident referred to is that related in S. Matt. xix. 16–22. It is argued by Bellarmine, who adduces it, that as the young man had "kept the commandments," he had done all that was necessary to obtain eternal life, and that therefore the words, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven," contain not a "precept," but a "counsel"; and thus, if the direction had been followed, a "work of supererogation" would have been performed. To this it has been fairly replied that since the charge was given in answer to the question, "What *lack* I yet?" it is obvious that something was still wanting, and that there is no room for the notion of works of supererogation here. It is clear from the young man's previous answer that he had formed a very inadequate conception of his duty to God, and of the real range of the claim which God had upon him. It was in order to help him to realise this that the further direction was given, and the conclusion of the narrative shows that there was indeed something "lacking" to him, for "when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions."

2. The teaching of S. Paul on virginity in 1 Cor. vii. has been already referred to, with its implied distinction between "precepts" and "counsels." Our Lord's words, in which He speaks of some who have "made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake" (S. Matt. xix. 12), are also referred to in this connection; and it is inferred that those who follow the "counsel" lay up a superabundant store of good works which can "satisfy" for others, as they are not needed

for those who perform them. Now it may be freely admitted that a distinction may be rightly drawn between "precepts" and "counsels." There are some things which are duties for *all* alike, which are commanded to all men generally, and can therefore be put in the form of universal "precepts." There are other things to which all men are clearly not called. It is obvious on the face of it that there can be no "precept" to abstain from marriage, or the obedience of men would bring the world to an end. And yet there are those to whom the words of Holy Scripture on the virgin state, or the command to "sell all thou hast," come with an imperative voice; and they feel constrained to obey. To *them* the counsel has become a precept. By obeying they perform no "works of supererogation," but are simply following the Divine voice, which tells their conscience that the charge is for *them*. By rejecting it, they may imperil their salvation, for our Lord Himself says, when speaking on this very subject: "He that is able to receive it, *let him receive it*" (S. Matt. xix. 12).¹

If, then, the admission of a distinction between precepts and counsels does not involve the theory of works of supererogation, the whole scriptural foundation for them breaks down, and we may reasonably conclude that they **cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety**, and that they are opposed to our Lord's words already referred to: "When ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do."

¹ "It is a further question whether a person's salvation may not be very seriously involved in *his* obeying a call from God, even although that to which he is called may not be in itself necessary to salvation." —Pusey, *The Truth of the Office of the English Church*, p. 215.

ARTICLE XV

Nemo proter Christum est sine peccato.

Of Christ alone without Sin.

Christus in nostræ naturæ veritate per omnia similis factus est nobis, excepto peccato, a quo prorsus erat immunis, tum in carne tum in spiritu. Venit, ut Agnus absque macula esset, qui mundi peccata per immolationem sui semel factam, tolleret: et peccatum (ut inquit Johannes) in eo non erat. Sed nos reliqui, etiam baptizati, et in Christo regenerati, in multis tamen offendimus omnes: et si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.

Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things (sin only except), from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh, and in His spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, Who by the sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world: and sin (as S. John saith) was not in Him. But all we the rest, (although baptized and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things, and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

THIS Article dates from 1553, since which time it has undergone no alteration. Its language has not been traced to any earlier source. Three principal subjects are treated of in it, viz.—

1. Christ's perfect humanity and sinlessness.
2. His Atonement.
3. Our sinfulness.

Since all these subjects have been previously considered in the Articles (1 and 2 in Article II., and 3 in Articles IX. and X.), it is not altogether easy to see the exact object with which the one before us was added to the series. Hardwick¹ and Bishop Harold

¹ Pp. 100, 402.

Browne¹ both appear to hold that it was aimed against the belief in the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin. This does not, however, appear probable for the following reasons:—

1. The Blessed Virgin is not mentioned in the Article. As a rule the Articles are perfectly direct and plain spoken in their condemnation of erroneous views, and if their compilers had had this doctrine in view it is most unlikely that they would have contented themselves with so *indirect* a condemnation of it.

2. Much of the Article is on this hypothesis unnecessary. Why was it needful to say so much about Christ's perfect humanity and atonement in order to condemn the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception?

3. The expression in the Article is, "all we the rest, although baptized and born again in Christ," etc., and it would be perfectly open to a Romanist to hold that the Blessed Virgin was never baptized, and that, *therefore*, her case is not considered in the Article at all!²

4. At the time when the Articles were drawn up there was no need to condemn the doctrine, as it was not held *de fide* in the Roman Church.³

A far more probable view is that this Article (like the following one) was aimed against the errors of some

¹ *Articles*, p. 347.

² This is actually the view taken by Francis a Sancta Clara (Davenport), a Franciscan, who wrote a Commentary on the Articles in 1633, endeavouring to reconcile them with the Tridentine decrees. See his *Paraphrastica Expositio*, p. 20.

³ The doctrine was first *definitely* discussed by the schoolmen, the Franciscans upholding it, the Dominicans (including Aquinas) denying it (see Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, vol. ii. p. 260). The Council of Trent managed to remain neutral and to avoid a condemnation of either party, merely stating that it was not intended to include the Blessed Virgin in the decree on original sin (Session V.). It was reserved for Pope Pius IX. to declare the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception to be an article of faith by his Bull of December 9, 1854.

among the Anabaptists. On this hypothesis every word in it tells, for among these fanatics were some who revived docetic notions of our Lord's humanity, some who denied His atonement and asserted His sinfulness, and others who had the hardihood to maintain that the regenerate could not sin. Nowhere do we find a clearer statement of their errors, or a better commentary on this and the following Article, than in the letter of Bishop Hooper, which has been already quoted in the first volume of this work.¹ Similarly, in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* we meet with a condemnation of the very same errors.² And in the light of these passages we may safely conclude that the real object of the Article was to condemn in plain and direct terms the heresies of those who denied our Lord's true humanity, sinlessness, and atonement, while maintaining their own entire freedom from sin.

Since the doctrines of our Lord's human nature and of His atonement were considered under Article II., and that of human depravity came before us in connection

¹ See p. 22.

² *De Hæres.* cap. 5. "De duabus naturis Christi. . . Alii eum sic Deum judicant ut hominem non agnoscant, et de corpore nugantur de cælo divinitus assumpto, et in virginis uterum lapso, quod tanquam in transitu per Mariam quasi per canalem aut fistulam præterfluxerit.

"Cap. 8. De perfectione justificatorum, et de operibus supererogationis. Illorum etiam superbia legibus nostris est frangenda, qui tantam vite perfectionem hominibus justificatis attribuunt, quantam nec imbecillitas nostræ naturæ fert, nec quisquam sibi præter Christum sumere potest; nimirum ut omnis peccati sint expertes, si mentem ad recta pieque vivendum instituerint. Et hanc volunt absolutam morum perfectionem in hanc presentem vitam cadere, cum debilis ipsa sit, et fragilis, et ad omnes virtutis et officii ruinas præceptis, etc.

"Cap. 9. De casu justificatorum et peccato in Spiritum Sanctum. Etiam illi de justificatis perverse sentiunt, qui credunt illos, postquam justi semel facti sunt, in peccatum non posse incidere, aut si forte quicumque eorum faciunt, quæ Dei legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro peccatis non accipere."

with Article IX., and will require to be noticed under Article XVI., it is unnecessary to say more upon them here. The only point touched on in this Article on which nothing has so far been said directly, is that of our Lord's sinlessness. On this matter the evidence of Scripture is clear and precise. (a) Not only is there no hint or indication of sin in any word or action attributed to Him, but His challenge to the Jews, "Which of you convinceth Me of sin?" (S. John viii. 46), and His declaration on the eve of His Passion, "the prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me" (S. John xiv. 30), are clearly the utterances of one who was absolutely free from all taint of sin.¹ (b) Reference should also be made to the definite statements of the apostles. S. Peter, S. Paul, S. John, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews all agree in directly asserting His sinlessness.

"Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth," 1 Pet. ii. 22. "Him who knew no sin, He made to be sin on our behalf," 2 Cor. v. 21.² "He was manifested to take away sins, and in Him is no sin," 1 John iii. 5. "One that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," Heb. iv. 15. "Such an high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for His own sins, and then for the sins of the people: for this He did once for all, when He offered up Himself," Heb. vii. 26, 27.

Such passages as these are amply sufficient to justify

¹ Cf. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 23.

² Cf. Rom. viii. 3: *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας*. "The flesh of Christ is 'like' ours inasmuch as it is flesh: 'like,' and only 'like,' because it is not sinful: *Ostendit nos quidem habere carnem peccati, Filium vero Dei similitudinem habuisse carnis peccati* (Orig.-lat.)." —Sanday and Headlam *in loc.*

the statement of the Article that **Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which He was clearly¹ void, both in His flesh and in His spirit . . . and sin (as S. John saith) was not in Him.²**

¹ Lat. *prorsus*. Clearly = thoroughly, completely, unreservedly. It is so used in *Piers the Plowman*, "Thei shul be clenسد *clerliche* and wasshen of her sinnes in my prisoun purgatorie" (B. xviii. 389), and later in Fitzherbert's 'Surveyinge' (A.D. 1525): "Lette a man make a castell, towre, or any maner of newe buildings and finysse it *clerely*." Other instances of a similar use of the word are given in Murray's *New English Dictionary*, s.v.

² On the subject of our Lord's absolute sinlessness (the "non posse peccare" as well as "posse non peccare"), and its compatibility with liability to real temptation, see an article on "Our Lord's Human Example" in the *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xvi. p. 282; Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 165; Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, Appendix; Mill's *Sermons on the Temptation*, p. 24; and R. L. Ottley's *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, vol. ii. p. 293.

ARTICLE XVI

De peccato post Baptismum.

Non omne peccatum mortale post baptismum voluntarie perpetratum, est peccatum in Spiritum Sanctum et irremissibile. Proinde lapsis a baptismo in peccata, locus poenitentiae non est negandus. Post acceptum Spiritum Sanctum possumus a gratia data recedere atque peccare, denuoque per gratiam Dei resurgere ac resipiscere. Ideoque illi damnandi sunt qui se quamdiu hic vivant, amplius non posse peccare affirmant, aut vere resipientibus veniae locum denegant.

Of Sin after Baptism.

Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore, they are to be condemned, which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

THE title of this Article in the first edition of 1553 was *De peccato in Spiritum Sanctum* ("Of Sin against the Holy Ghost"). This was altered in 1563 into *De lapsis post Baptismum* ("Of Sin after Baptism"); and at the final revision of 1571 the Latin was made to correspond more closely with the English by the substitution of the present phrase, "*De peccato post Baptismum.*" In two other expressions in the body of the Article slight changes have also been made. "*Locus poenitentiae*" was in 1553 translated in the English version by "place for penitentes," and "place for penitence" in 1563; "grant of repentance" being inserted in 1571; at which time "*locus veniae*" in the last sentence was substituted for "*locus poenitentiae.*"

(In 1553 this had been rendered, as at its first occurrence in the Article, "place for penitentes," for which "place of forgiveness" had been inserted in 1563.)

There is a general resemblance between this Article and the twelfth of the Confession of Augsburg, but the verbal similarity is not sufficiently close to justify us in saying that the last-mentioned document was the source of our own Article.¹ The two are aimed against the same errors, which consisted in a revival of the views of some in early days concerning blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, the impossibility of falling from grace, and the refusal of pardon to those who fall into deadly sin after baptism. These errors are also noticed in the letter of Bishop Hooper, referred to in the last Article. "A man, they say, who is thus regenerate cannot sin. They add that all hope of pardon is taken away from those who, after having received the Holy Ghost, fall into sin";² and further evidence of their existence at the time when the Article was drawn up may be found in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*,³ as well as in the following passage from Calvin's *Institutes*.

¹ "*De poenitentia.* De poenitentia docent quod lapsis post baptismum contingere possit remissio peccatorum, quocunque tempore cum convertuntur. Et quod ecclesia talibus redeuntibus ad poenitentiam absolutionem impertiri debeat. Constat autem poenitentia proprie his duabus partibus: altera est contritio seu terrores incussi conscientiae agnito peccato. Altera est fides, quae concipitur ex evangelio seu absolutione, et credit propter Christum remitti peccata, et consolatur conscientiam et ex terroribus liberat. Deinde sequi debent bona opera, quae sunt fructus poenitentiae. Damnant Anabaptistas qui negant semel justificatos posse amittere Spiritum Sanctum. Item, qui contendunt quibusdam tantam perfectionem in hac vita contingere ut peccare non possint. Damnantur et Novatiani qui nolebant absolvere lapsos post baptismum redeuntibus ad poenitentiam. Rejiciuntur et isti qui non docent remissionem peccatorum per fidem contingere, sed jubent nos mereri gratiam per satisfactiones nostras."

² See p. 22.

³ *Ref. Leg. Eccl., De Hæres.* cap. 9: "Etiam illi de justificatis perverse

“Our age also has some of the Anabaptists not very unlike the Novatians. For they pretend that the people of God are regenerated in baptism into a pure and angelical life. . . . But if any man fail after baptism, they leave nothing to him but the inexorable judgment of God.”¹

Two main subjects appear to require consideration in this Article.

1. The fact that deadly sin is not unpardonable.
2. The possibility of falling from grace.

I. *The fact that deadly Sin is not Unpardonable.*

(a) **Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable.**

The view of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost which is here rejected, appears to have been first propounded by Origen in the third century,² and was revived in the sixteenth by some among the Anabaptists. A brief examination of the passages of the New Testament which speak of the sin which “hath never forgiveness” will

sentiunt, qui credunt illos postquam justi semel facti sunt, in peccatum non posse incidere, aut si forte quicumque eorum faciunt, quæ Dei legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro peccatis non accipere. Quibus opinione contrarii, sed impietate pares sunt, qui quodcumque peccatum mortale, quod post baptismum a nobis susceptum voluntate nostra committitur, illud omne contra Spiritum Sanctum affirmant gestum esse et remitti non posse.”

¹ *Institutes*, IV. i. 23.

² See Athanasius, *Ep. ad. Serap.* iv. § 10, where this view (which he also attributes to Theognostus) is considered and rejected. The view of Athanasius himself appears to be that whereas “blasphemy against the Son of Man” was to blaspheme against Him before the full revelation of His Divinity was made, “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost” is to “ascribe the deeds of the Word to the devil,” i.e. to blaspheme against Him after His eternal Godhead has been manifested. Cf. *Orationes contra Arianos*, I. § 50.

show that whatever may be the precise nature of the irremissible sin, there is certainly no ground for maintaining that all deadly sin willingly committed after baptism should be regarded as unpardonable.

The passages to be considered fall into two groups: (1) those in the Gospel in which our Lord speaks of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; (2) certain passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the First Epistle of S. John.

1. In regard to the first class of passages (S. Matt. xii. 31–37; S. Mark iii. 28–30; S. Luke xii. 10), it must be noticed that our Lord never speaks in general terms of “sin against the Holy Ghost” as unpardonable. Of *one* sin, which He terms “the blasphemy against the Spirit,” He says, “it shall not be forgiven,” and that the man who commits it “is guilty of an eternal sin” (*ἔνοχος ἐστὶν αἰωνίου ἀμαρτήματος*).¹ Now the fact that this sin is thus spoken of as “blasphemy” at once marks it out as a sin of a particular class, belonging to sins of the tongue, involving outward expression; while the occasion on which our Lord warned His hearers against it (“because they said He had an unclean spirit”) throws light on its character. Whether the Pharisees had been actually guilty of it our Lord does not say, but they were clearly in danger of committing it; and what they were doing was to ascribe manifestly Divine works to Satanic agency. To do this was in a very real sense to “blaspheme against the Holy Spirit,” by whose agency the works were done. And it is quite clear that, whatever be the precise nature of the irre-

¹ That this is the true reading in S. Mark iii. 30 is undoubted. The *textus receptus* has *κλέσως* for *ἀμαρτήματος*. The amended reading has an important bearing on the question of the justice of eternal punishment. If the punishment is “eternal,” is it not because the sin is “eternal”?

missible sin of which our Lord speaks,¹ no support whatever can be drawn from His words for the general proposition that deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is unpardonable. It may be noted in passing that the Edwardian Articles did not content themselves, as our own do, with simply denying an erroneous view of the nature of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, but proceeded in an additional Article (XVI.) to define its nature more precisely. The Article ran as follows:—

Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

“Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is, when a man, of malice and stubbornness of mind, doth rail upon the truth of God’s word manifestly perceived, and being enemy thereunto persecuteth the same. And because such be guilty of God’s curse, they entangle themselves with a most grievous and heinous crime, whereupon this kind of sin is called and affirmed of the Lord unpardonable.”

The Article was omitted by Parker in the revision of 1563, probably from an unwillingness to define the nature of this sin, and a desire not to bind the consciences of the clergy to a particular interpretation of a difficult set of passages. And as our present Articles are contented with a purely *negative* position, denying an erroneous view, but stating nothing positively concerning the character of this “blasphemy,” there is no need to enter further upon the subject here. Reference may, however, be made in passing to Waterland’s able and convincing sermon upon S. Matt. xii. 31, 32, where

¹ Bishop Ellicott (*Lectures on the Life of our Lord*, p. 187, note 1) defines it as “an outward expression of an inward hatred of that which is recognised and felt to be Divine,” and truly says that its irremissible nature depends, “not on the refusal of grace, but on the now lost ability of fulfilling the conditions required for forgiveness.”

the reader will find a full discussion of “the precise nature of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.”¹

2. There remain for consideration certain hard passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the First Epistle of S. John, on which Origen and Theognostus based their views, and which also played an important part in the controversies of the early Church concerning penitential discipline and the restoration of the lapsed to communion, since it was urged by the advocates of strictness that it was contrary to the teaching of these Epistles for the Church to grant reconciliation and pardon to those who had fallen into deadly sin after baptism.² The passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews are three in number: chs. vi. 4–6, x. 26–29, xii. 15–17.

Ch. vi. 4–6: “For as touching those who were once enlightened (*ἀπαξ φωτισθέντας*) and tasted (*γευσαμένους*) of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away (*παραπεσόντας*), it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh (or, “the while they crucify,” etc., R.V. marg. *ἀνασταυροῦντας*), and put Him to an open shame (*παραδειγματίζοντας*).”

With regard to this passage it is very important to

¹ Waterland, *Works*, vol. v. Sermon xxviii. See also Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, Bk. V. vol. ii. p. 475 (Eng. tr.).

² It has not been thought necessary to give in the text any account of these controversies, the principal of which were those with the Montanists and Novatianists and (in later times) the Donatists. The Montanists taught the impossibility of a second repentance, and refused to restore to communion those who had been guilty of deadly sin. The Novatianists appear to have admitted the possibility of final pardon for such sinners (and possibly the Montanists did not actually deny this), but they denied to the Church the power to grant peace and reconciliation to them. For some account of these controversies, see Schaff’s *History of the Church*, “Ante-Nicene Christianity,” pp. 196 and 425.

notice the exact words used by the apostolic writer. Those of whom he is speaking (whether or no *φωτισθέντας* be taken definitely of baptism¹) had been thoroughly Christianised, and had subsequently apostatised ("and then fell they"). They are regarded as still opposing themselves to Christianity, still "crucifying the Son of God afresh," and "putting Him to an open shame" (notice the *present* participles here); and while they are doing this it is impossible, says the writer, to renew them again to repentance. But nothing whatever is said of an "impossibility" should they cease their opposition to the gospel. Hence, as Bishop Westcott has pointed out, "the apostasy described is marked, not only by a decisive act, but also by a continuous present attitude, a hostile relation to Christ Himself and to belief in Christ; and thus there is no question of the abstract efficacy of the means of grace provided through the ordinances of the Church. The state of the men themselves is such as to preclude their application."²

Ch. x. 26-29: "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses: of how much surer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

¹ "Φωτίζειν and φωτισμός were commonly applied to baptism from the time of Justin (*Apol.* i. 61, 65; cf. *Dial.* c. 122) downwards. And the Syrian versions give this sense here."—Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 148.

² *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, additional note on vi. 1-8, p. 165.

Here again it will be sufficient to note that the tense is *present*. "It must be observed that the sacrifice of Christ is finally rejected, and sin persisted in (*ἀμαρτανόντων*). The writer does not set limits to the efficacy of Christ's work for the penitent."¹

Ch. xii. 15-17: "Looking carefully lest there be any man that falleth short of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby the many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one mess of meat sold his own birthright. For ye know that even when he afterward desired to inherit the blessing, he was rejected (for he found no place of repentance), though he sought it diligently with tears."

It will be observed that the difficulty of this passage is far less when rendered (as above) as it is in the Revised Version. Readers of the Authorised Version might naturally think that the writer denied that Esau found repentance, or a place of repentance. A reference to the Greek makes it clear that what Esau sought was not a "place of repentance" (*τόπον μετανοίας*), for the pronoun "it" is feminine (*αὐτήν*). Grammatically it may refer either to "repentance" (*μετανοίας*) or to "the blessing" (*εὐλογίαν*); but there can be little room for doubt that the Revisers are right in referring it to the latter (cf. Gen. xxvii. 38). If this is so there is no ground for maintaining, on the strength of this passage, that a man may seek diligently to find repentance and fail to obtain it. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that when Esau "sought the blessing diligently with tears," his probation, so far as his birthright was concerned, was already over, for the award had been made, and the blessing actually given to another. His "repentance," therefore, is parallel to nothing on this side of the

¹ Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 327.

grave. Thus, while all these passages are full of solemn warning on the terrible consequences of sin, and the danger of putting off repentance too late, it will be seen that when carefully considered they give no countenance to the opinion which is condemned in the Article as to the irremissible character of deadly sin willingly committed after baptism.

The same is true of the remaining passage in the First Epistle of S. John (1 John v. 16, 17): "If any man see his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask, and God will give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: not concerning this do I say that he should make request. All unrighteousness is sin: there is a sin not unto death."

On this passage is based the distinction ordinarily drawn in the Church between "deadly" and "venial" sins. It will be noticed, however, that S. John does not define "sin unto death," nor, indeed, does he absolutely forbid intercession for it. He is dealing, as Bishop Westcott points out, with the prayers of Christians for Christians; and after pointing out the efficacy of their prayers for one another, he indicates that there is a sin, the natural issue of which is death (*πρὸς θάνατον*). This excludes men from the Christian society, and he cannot enjoin prayer for it.¹ But there is no reason whatever for maintaining that the Apostle denies the possibility of forgiveness for such deadly sin, if the sin is forsaken and repented of.

(b) **Wherefore the grant of repentance (*locus penitentiæ*) is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism.** The statement of the Article would seem to follow naturally from the position just maintained. And it may be supported by a refer-

¹ See Bishop Westcott's "additional note" in *The Epistles of S. John*, p. 199.

ence to S. Paul's treatment of the incestuous man at Corinth. Here was a man who had been guilty of a most deadly sin, and who had been by the Apostle's direction excluded from the fellowship of the faithful, and "delivered unto Satan" (1 Cor. v. 4, 5). But this "deliverance unto Satan" did not necessarily involve his final condemnation. On the contrary, its object is described as "the destruction of the flesh, *that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.*" Moreover, if 2 Cor. ii. 5-11 refers (as is commonly thought) to the same case, then the Apostle distinctly contemplates the restoration of the offender upon his repentance to the communion of the Church, and charges the Corinthians to forgive him and reinstate him. And if for such a sinner a "*locus penitentiæ*" was allowed, it is difficult to think that in other cases the Church would be right in refusing it. Consequently the Church has always resisted the demands made by some in the interests of purity that those who have fallen into a grievous sin should be excluded from communion for the remainder of their lives, and has never shrunk from proclaiming God's forgiveness to *all* penitent sinners. In some of the early controversies in regard to penitential discipline a distinction was drawn between these two things, namely, God's willingness finally to forgive those who have been guilty of deadly sin after baptism, and the power of the Church to grant "pardon" to such. It was sometimes urged, as by the Novatianists,¹ that though God might in His

¹ That this was the position maintained by Novatian seems to be shown by the words of S. Cyprian in *Ep.* lv. § 28 (*al.* li.), where he describes him as urging the lapsed to weep and mourn, and do all that is necessary for peace, though "peace" was refused them. Eusebius speaks as if all hope of salvation was denied to them (*H. E.* VI. xliii.). In this, however, he was probably mistaken as regards Novatian and his followers, though the statement would perhaps be true of the Montanists. See Tertullian, *De*

infinite mercy forgive such at the last, yet the Church had no commission from Him to declare His forgiveness, and therefore could hold out no "locus pœnitentiæ" to the lapsed, although she might urge them to pray that they might finally receive pardon, and find a "place of forgiveness" (locus veniæ). It would appear that this distinction was present to the Elizabethan revisers of the Articles (if not to their original compilers), for after saying that "the grant of repentance (locus pœnitentiæ) is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism," the Article adds at the close the statement that

(c) They are to be condemned which . . . deny the place of forgiveness (locus veniæ) to such as truly repent.—That some distinction of

meaning between the two phrases locus pœnitentiæ and locus veniæ (and their English equivalents) is intended, is shown by the fact already noted, that originally the same phrase stood in both clauses of the Article.¹ The diversity of phraseology subsequently introduced must have had some definite intention, and it was in all probability that which has just been indicated. Thus the Article as a whole implies, not only that God is willing to forgive penitent sinners, but, further, that the Church has a commission to declare His pardon, and to grant reconciliation where there is true repentance.

The phrase "locus pœnitentiæ" is almost a technical

Pudicitia, c. xix., where he says that there are some sins which admit of no pardon, namely, murder, idolatry, fraud, denial of Christ, blasphemy, adultery, and fornication. "For these Christ will no longer plead" (Horum ultra exorator non erit Christus). He says, however, in the same chapter, of a grievous sinner: "Let her indeed repent, but in order to put an end to her adultery, not, however, in prospect of restoration to communion. For this will be a repentance (pœnitentia) which we too acknowledge to be due much more than you do; but concerning pardon (*veniæ*), we reserve it to God."

¹ See above, p. 444.

one for an opportunity of changing a former decision, so that the consequences no longer follow. It occurs in Latin writers, e.g. 4 Esdr. ix. 12, as well as the Jurists¹ and others, being used in Pliny's famous letter to Trajan on the Christians, where he expresses a hope of their improvement if a "locus pœnitentiæ" is granted to them.² The Greek equivalent, τόπος μετανοίας, is also found in Wisd. xii. 10, as well as in early Christian writers,³ by whom it was probably taken from Heb. xii. 17, where the Vulgate renders it by "locus pœnitentiæ." "Locus veniæ" does not seem to be of such frequent occurrence. It is used, however, by Tertullian in *De Pudicitia*, c. xviii.

II. *The Possibility of Falling from Grace.*

On this subject the teaching of the Article is clear and decided. **After we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned which say they can no more sin as long as they live here.** These statements are primarily aimed against the teaching of the Anabaptists, who maintained that a man who is regenerate cannot sin. Such teaching is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture. The Lord's Prayer, which was surely meant to be a prayer to be used by *all* men, recognises the need of forgiveness for all; and the language of the Apostles addressed to believers throughout the Epistles assumes that all have sinned and come

¹ Bishop Westcott (on Heb. xii. 17) quotes Ulpian, *ap. Corp. J. C.*, Dig. XL. tit. vii. 3, § 13.

² Pliny, *Epp.* x. 97.

³ E.g. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* I. vii.; Tatian, *c. Græc.* xv.; *Const. Apost.* II. xxxviii., V. xix.

short of the glory of God. There are, however, some words in the First Epistle of S. John to which the Anabaptists and others who maintained a theory of perfection could point in support of the statement that the regenerate cannot sin, namely, 1 John iii. 6, 9: "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him, neither knoweth Him. . . . Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because His seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God" (cf. also c. v. 18: "Whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not"). Strong as these words are, it must be remembered that the writer who uses them has already in an earlier passage of the same Epistle said emphatically: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; but if we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His word is not in us." These words are perfectly general, and seem quite incompatible with the notion that S. John teaches that any man can claim total immunity from sin and the possibility of sinning here on earth. How, then, is the later passage, previously cited, to be understood? It must certainly be qualified by what has already been said by the writer, and therefore we need feel no hesitation in pressing the present tenses, *οὐκ ἁμαρτάνει, ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν*, and saying that they refer to a habit and practice rather than to isolated acts. It is true that the believer often falls into sin, yet sin is not the ruling principle of his life, and in so far as he is really born of God and abides in Him, "he sinneth not." If it be urged that thus to interpret the words is to explain away the language of Scripture, it may fairly be replied that "the only possible escape from such modification is

by asserting the possibility of sinlessness, *which contradicts* i. 8, or else by asserting that *none* of us have seen God, and none of us are children of God, *which contradicts the whole Epistle*";¹ and as there are no other passages of Scripture which give any countenance to the theory of sinless perfection in this life, the Article is perfectly justified in its assertions, that "after we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given and fall into sin," and that "they are to be condemned which say they can no more sin so long as they live here."

It will be noticed that after laying down that we may depart from grace, the Article says further, "We may arise again and amend our lives." It is important to notice that the word is *may*, not *must*, for herein lies a marked difference between the teaching of the Church of England and the Calvinistic tenet of "indefectible grace"; for Calvin and his followers, while rejecting the Anabaptist notion that the "regenerate" cannot sin, nevertheless taught that those who were once made Christ's own, though they might fall away for a time, could not permanently and finally lose His grace.² Thus the statement of our Article has always been a stumbling-block to them. So early as 1572 the authors of the Second

¹ Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 434. See also Westcott, *Epistles of S. John*, p. 101. "*Sinneth not*. The commentary on this phrase is found in ch. i. 6. It describes a character, 'a prevailing habit,' and not primarily an act. Each separate sinful act does as such interrupt the fellowship; and yet so far as it is foreign to the character of the man, and removed from him (ii. 1), it leaves his character unchanged." Reference may also be made to Dr. Plummer's note in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, p. 124.

² See the fifth and sixth of the "Lambeth Articles." "A true, living, and justifying faith—the Spirit of God sanctifying—is not extinguished, does not fall away, does not vanish in the elect either totally or finally." "A truly faithful man, that is, one endowed with justifying faith, is certain by the full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and his eternal salvation through Christ."

Admonition to Parliament were forced to admit that "the book of the articles of Christian religion speaketh very dangerously of falling from grace, which is to be reformed because it savoureth too much of error." And at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 a suggestion was made that after the statement that we "may depart from grace given," there should be added the qualifying words, "yet neither totally nor finally."¹ Happily no notice was taken of these criticisms, and the sober statement of the Article remained unqualified. The whole tenor of Scripture implies the possibility of falling from grace; and if S. Paul had reason to fear lest, when he had preached to others, he himself "should be rejected" or "become reprobate" (*ἀδόκιμος*), 1 Cor. ix. 27, it is hard to understand how men can be found to deny the same possibility in the case of others. The subject is closely connected with the whole doctrine of Predestination, and will therefore come before us again in connection with the Seventeenth Article, where something will be said on the Calvinistic system in general. It is therefore unnecessary to consider the matter more fully here.

¹ See p. 58 seq.

ARTICLE XVII

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: unigeniti Jesu Christi imagini efficiuntur conformes: in bonis operibus sancte ambulant: 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 piis et his 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 homini-

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 con-

bus curiosis, carnalibus, et Sp'ritu Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuo versari Prædestinationis Dei sententiam, perniciosissimum est præcipitium, unde illos Diabolus protrudit, vel in desperationem, vel in æque perniciosam 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.

firm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

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

THE changes which this Article has undergone since 1553 are very slight; the words "in Christ" were added in the first paragraph in 1563, and at the same time "although the decrees of Predestination are unknown to us" were omitted at the commencement of paragraph the third.

The *object* of the Article was evidently to allay the angry strifes on the subject of predestination, and while speaking in cautious terms on what was felt to be a deep mystery, to guard against the excesses and extravagances to which the doctrine had led. Thus, after describing what predestination is in the first paragraph, the whole of the rest of the Article is devoted to the *practical* consequences which follow from the doctrine, and to laying down rules which, when rightly understood, are distinctly aimed against that limitation of God's love and God's promises, which has been characteristic of so much predestinarian teaching. The need for such an Article as this is pointedly shown in the language of the section

"De Prædestinatione" in the *Reformatio Legum*, which begins by calling attention to the terrible consequences, shown in the lives of many, springing from what can only be called a reckless and monstrous fatalism. The section is one which deserves careful study, and will be seen to throw not a little light on the meaning of the Article now under consideration.

"Ad extremum in Ecclesia multi feris et dissolutis moribus vivunt, qui cum re ipsa curiosi sint, differti luxu, et a Christi spiritu prorsus alieni, semper prædestinationem et rejectionem, vel, ut usitate loquuntur, reprobationem in sermone jactant, ut cum æterno consilio Deus vel de salute vel de interitu aliquid certi constituerit, inde latebram suis maleficiis et sceleribus, et omnis generis perversitati quærant. Et cum pastores dissipatam illorum et flagitiosam vitam coarguant, in voluntatem Dei criminum suorum culpam conferunt, et hac defensione profligatas admonitorum reprehensiones existimant: ac ita tandem, duce diabolo, vel in desperationis puteum abjiciuntur præcipientes, vel ad solutam quandam et mollem vitæ securitatem, sine aut pœnitentia aut scelerum conscientia dilabuntur. Quæ duo mala disparem naturam, sed finem videntur eundem habere. Nos vero sacris Scripturis eruditi, talem in hac re doctrinam ponimus, quod diligens et accurata cogitatio de prædestinatione nostra et electione suscepta (de quibus Dei voluntate determinatum fuit antequam mundi fundamenta jacerentur); hæc itaque diligens et seria, quam diximus, his de rebus cogitatio, piorum hominum animos Spiritu Christi afflatus, et carnis et membrorum subjectionem persentiscentes, et ad cœlestia sursum tendentes, dulcissima quadam et jucundissima consolatione permulcet, quoniam fidem nostram de perpetua salute per Christum ad nos perventura confirmat, vehementissimas charitatis in Deum flammæ accendit, mirabiliter ad gratias

agendas exsuscitat, ad bona nos opera propinquissime adducit, et a peccatis longissime abducit, quoniam a Deo sumus electi, et filii ejus instituti. Quæ singularis et eximia conditio summam a nobis salubritatem morum, et excellentissimam virtutis perfectionem requirit: denique nobis arrogantiam minuit, ne viribus nostris geri credamus, quæ gratuita Dei beneficentia et infinita bonitate indulgentur. Præterea neminem ex hoc loco purgationem censemus vitiorum suorum afferre posse; quia Deus nihil ulla in re injuste constituit, nec ad peccata voluntates nostras unquam invitas trudit. Quapropter omnes nobis admonendi sunt, ut in actionibus suscipiendis ad decreta prædestinationis se non referant, sed universam vitæ suæ rationem ad Dei leges accommodent; cum et promissiones bonis et minas malis, in sacris Scripturis generaliter propositas contemplantur. Debemus enim ad Dei cultum viis illis ingredi, et in illa Dei voluntate commorari, quam in sacris Scripturis patefactam esse videmus.”¹

This section, it will be noticed, guards still more strongly than does the Article against the abuses of the doctrine, and points out very precisely the dangers then existing. It is also valuable as indicating with certainty the true interpretation of the last clause of the Article, which says that God’s promises are to be received “in such wise as they be *generally* set forth to us in Holy Scripture,”—a subject on which something must be said later on.

The sources of the Article, and of the section just quoted from the *Reformatio Legum*, are thought to lie to some extent in the writings of Luther, including both his letters and the Preface to the Epistle to the Romans;²

¹ *Reformatio Legum Eccl.*, *De Hæres.* c. xxii.

² See Bp. Short’s *History of the Church of England*, c. x. App. C, where this is pointed out; and see below, p. 485.

and the language of the last paragraph has been traced by Archbishop Laurence to Melancthon.¹ Still more important, however, is it to notice that the description of predestination given in the first paragraph is to a very great extent couched *in the actual words of Holy Scripture*. The chief passages on which it is based are Rom. viii. and ix. and Eph. i., and the correspondence is even closer in the Latin than in the English. In writing to the Ephesians S. Paul blesses God, “who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ: even as *He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world* (sicut elegit nos in ipso ante mundi constitutionem), that we should be holy and without blemish before Him in love: *having foreordained us unto adoption as sons*, through Jesus Christ unto Himself, *according to the good pleasure of His will* (qui prædestinavit nos in adoptionem filiorum per Jesum Christum in ipsum secundum propositum voluntatis suæ), to the praise of the glory of His grace, which He freely bestowed on us in the Beloved . . . in whom also we were made a heritage, *having been foreordained according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His will* (prædestinati secundum propositum ejus, qui operatur omnia secundum consilium voluntatis suæ),” Eph. i. 3–11. Elsewhere he speaks of “vessels made to honour” (cf. “*vasa in honorem efficta*” with “*an non habet potestatem figulus luti ex eadem massa facere aliud quidem vas in honorem, aliud in contumeliam?*” Rom. ix. 21), while in Rom. viii. 28–30, he tells us that “to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are *called according to His purpose*. For whom He foreknew, He also *foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son*, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren: and *whom He fore-*

¹ See Archbp. Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 179.

ordained, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified" (Scimus autem quoniam diligentibus Deum omnia co-operantur in bonum, iis qui secundum propositum vocati sunt sancti: Nam quos præscivit, et prædestinavit conformes fieri imaginis Filii sui, ut sit ipse primogenitus in multis fratribus. Quos autem prædestinavit, hos et vocavit, et quos vocavit, hos et justificavit; quos autem justificavit, illos et glorificavit). If these passages are carefully compared with the Article, it will easily be seen how closely it follows them: and hence it results that to one who has previously accepted Scripture as containing the word of God, the positive statements of the Article present no further difficulty.¹ They are evidently meant to be simply a reflection of the language of Scripture, and therefore whatever interpretation we are justified in putting upon the language of Scripture, the same we shall be justified in putting upon the corresponding language of the Article. This principle, when fully grasped, will be found to remove much of the difficulty which is sometimes felt in regard to subscription to this seventeenth Article. It is only in the first and last paragraphs that any difficulty is found. The second paragraph, dealing with the practical consequences of the doctrine, contains nothing to which exception can be taken. The third paragraph will be explained and justified later on; and if this first paragraph be taken, as it is surely meant to be taken, as a summary of Scripture statements rather than a definite interpretation of them, no difficulty whatever need be felt as to its acceptance. Coming now to the substance of the Article, the subjects treated of in it are the following:—

¹ Cf. the passage from Mozley's *Lectures and other Theological Papers* (p. 220), quoted on p. 352.

1. The description of predestination.
2. The steps which accompany it.
3. The practical effect of the doctrine.
4. Two considerations calculated to guard the doctrine from abuses.

I. *The Description of Predestination.*

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.

There have been from time to time various theories held with regard to predestination, and various schemes and systems have been formed by Christians. Of these, the most important are the following, which it will be convenient to consider in the order in which they are here enumerated, rather than in accordance with a more strictly chronological arrangement:—

- (a) Ecclesiastical predestination.
- (b) The Arminian theory.
- (c) The Calvinistic theory.
- (d) The Augustinian theory.

(a) *Ecclesiastical Predestination.*—According to this, predestination is not necessarily to life, but to privilege, *i.e.* to the opportunity of obtaining eternal life in the way of God's covenant. On this view, the "elect" are to be identified with the "called," and include all baptized persons. As Bishop Harold Browne puts it: "Some 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; the elect are identical with the *baptized*, and the election constitutes *the Church*.¹

That this doctrine is taught in Holy Scripture admits of no doubt whatever. Throughout the Old Testament God is said to have "chosen" the whole people of the Jews, and not a select few out of their number.² The "children of Jacob" were His "chosen ones" or "elect" (Ps. cv. 6).³ And when we pass from the Old Testament to the New, we find that the members of the Christian Church are regarded as having succeeded to the privileges of the Jews, and that the language used of the Israelites is applied by the Apostles to them.⁴ So S. Paul, in writing to different Churches, addresses his readers indiscriminately as "called" (*κλητοι*);⁵ and S. Peter in a similar way writes to the "elect" (*ἐκλεκτοι*) who are "sojourners of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia,

¹ *On the Articles*, p. 393.

² *Ἐκλέγειν* is used frequently of this "choice." See, e.g., Deut. iv. 37, vii. 7, x. 15, xiv. 2; Ps. cxxxiv. (cxxxv.) 4, etc.

³ *Ἐκλεκτός* is used very widely in the LXX., and represents no fewer than twenty different Hebrew words. This is of itself significant, and should prevent us from attempting to fix too hard and fast a meaning upon it in the New Testament. It is used of the whole nation in Ps. civ. (cv.) 6, 43, cv. (cvi.) 5, and elsewhere; but also of individuals, as Moses, Ps. cv. (cvi.) 23; Joshua, Num. xi. 28; and David, Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 19.

⁴ With Ex. xix. 5, *ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων· ἐμὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον*, cf. Tit. ii. 14 (*λαὸς περιούσιος*) and 1 Pet. ii. 9: *γένος ἐκλεκτὸν, βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν* (this last phrase is the LXX rendering of the same phrase *יְהוָה* in Mal. iii. 17); and cf. also Eph. i. 14: *εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως*.

⁵ Rom. i. 6, 7; 1 Cor. i. 2; cf. S. Jude, ver. 1.

Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,"¹ and elsewhere charges them to "make their calling and election sure" (2 Pet. i. 10). Such language can only be used of an election to privilege. Among the Apostles' converts were many who were in danger of falling away, and of committing grievous sins, and yet they are all alike regarded as "called" and "elect," or chosen. Clearly, then, the "called" and "elect" are identical; and the Apostles, in using this language, are writing to their converts as chosen and called by God to the high privilege of being His people.

The same kind of language is found in the writings of many of the early Fathers,² indicating that they also held that the Christian Church had stepped into the place of the Jews, and that therefore its members could

¹ 1 Pet. i. 1. Cf. ii. 9 (*ἐκλεκτὸν γένος*), v. 13 (*συνεκλεκτῆ*), and Col. iii. 12; and note that it was of an election to *privilege* that our Lord spoke when He said, "Have I not *chosen* (*ἐξελέξαμην*) you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" S. John vi. 70.

² See Clement of Rome, c. lxiv., where he speaks of God as having elected our Lord Jesus Christ, and us by Him, to *εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον*. *ἐκλεκτός* is a "favourite word" with Clement (Lightfoot). It occurs at least eight times in his Epistle (see cc. i. ii. vi. xlv. xlix. lii. lix.), but there is nothing that is absolutely determinative of his use, though it is probable that he uses it of the Church generally, as he certainly does *κλητός*. See the salutation: *Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παροικοῦσῃ Κόρινθον, κλητοῖς, κ.τ.λ.* But it is possible that *ἐκλεκτός* sometimes slides into a further meaning, e.g. in ii.: *εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι μετὰ δέους καὶ συνειδήσεως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ; xlix.: ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐτελειώθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ; lix.: ἱκεσίαν ποιούμενοι ὅπως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τὸν κατηριθμημένον τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ . . . διαφυλῶσιν*. Ignatius of Antioch certainly uses *ἐκλεκτός* in the sense of ecclesiastical election. See the salutation to the Epistle to the Trallians: *ἐκκλησία ἀγία τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Τράλλεσιν τῆς Ἀσίας, ἐκλεκτῇ καὶ ἀειοθέῃ, κ.τ.λ.* Cf. also the salutation to his Epistle to the Ephesians (*ἐκκληλεγμένην*). Hermas uses it several times of the Church. See *Vis. i. 3, iii. 5, iv. 2*. Justin Martyr speaks of Christians being "called" as Abraham was, *Dial. c. cxix.*; and to the same effect Irenæus says that "the Word of God, which formerly elected the patriarchs, has now elected us" (*Adv. hæc. IV. lviii.*).

rightly be addressed as "elect." And there can be no doubt that this view of election is recognised in our own formularies. Not only is the Church described in the Homily for Whitsunday as "an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and *elect* people," but in three out of the four passages where the word "elect" occurs in the Book of Common Prayer, it is used of the Church or body of Christians generally. Thus, in the Collect for All Saints' Day, God is said to have "knit together His *elect* in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body" of His Son. In the Catechism the catechumen is taught to speak of "God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the *elect* people of God"; and in the Baptismal Service, before the child is baptized, we pray that "he may receive the fulness of God's grace, and ever *remain* in the number of His faithful and *elect* children,"—an expression which implies the possibility that he may fail and lose his election.¹ In the fourth passage in which the word occurs in the Book of Common Prayer, the exact meaning to be given to it may be a matter of doubt. It is in the prayer which follows the Lord's Prayer in the order for the Burial of the Dead, where we pray God "shortly to accomplish the number of His *elect*,² and to hasten His kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of His holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory." It is scarcely natural to take the word here as practically equivalent to the baptized; and the probability seems to be that something further is intended here, and in the Article before us,

¹ To these three passages may be added the versicle, "Make thy *chosen* people joyful;" cf. Ps. cxxxii. 9, from which the words are taken.

² The phrase seems to have been originally suggested by the language of S. Clement, quoted in the note on the previous page.

where predestination is described as God's "purpose to deliver those whom He hath *chosen* in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation as vessels made to honour." And if this is so, if, that is, the formularies of the Church while accepting "ecclesiastical election" point also to something beyond it as well, it would appear that in this they faithfully reflect the teaching of Holy Scripture. For while, as we have seen, ecclesiastical election is distinctly taught therein, yet there are some passages the language of which is not really satisfied by this theory. Although it is true that in the Epistles the "called" and the "elect" are identified, yet in our Lord's words in the Gospel, "Many are called (*κλητοί*), but few are chosen" (*ἐκλεκτοί*), they are expressly distinguished. Moreover, while it is admitted that S. Paul's language in Rom. viii. and ix. is *primarily* intended to refer to nations, and to the election of the Christian Church to privilege, yet it is impossible to exclude from his thought something further. The use of the words "prepared unto glory," "fitted unto destruction" (ix. 22, 23), and of the phrase "them He also *glorified*," as the crown of the series of blessings enumerated in viii. 28-30, "prove conclusively that he is looking . . . to the final end and destination of man."¹ It appears, then, that the theory of ecclesiastical election, though perfectly scriptural, does not cover the *whole* teaching of Scripture on the subject; and that we must recognise that there is a further truth, if not definitely revealed, at least implied, in the passages just referred to.

¹ Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 266; cf. p. 347: "It is quite true to say that the election is primarily an election to privilege; yet there is a very intimate connection between privilege and eternal salvation, and the language of ix. 22, 23, 'fitted unto destruction,' 'prepared unto glory,' cannot be limited to a mere earthly destiny."

(b) *The Arminian theory of Predestination.*—The view which is generally associated with the name of Arminius is that God foresaw from all eternity who among men would make a good use of the grace which is freely offered to all, and that *therefore*, i.e. because He foresaw their future merits, He predestined some to final glory. This is sometimes called *predestinatio ex prævisis meritis*, and its leading characteristic is that it does away with the mystery of the doctrine, and makes predestination to life a *consequence of God's foreknowledge*. Since Van Harmen or Arminius¹ only propagated his views at the beginning of the seventeenth century, it is obvious that an Article drawn up in 1553 can have nothing to do with him and his followers. It is therefore quite unnecessary to enter into the history of the Dutch "Remonstrants" and the Synod of Dort.² But there were Arminians before Arminius, and the view of predestination which he and his followers developed and worked into their system was held in a loose and informal way by many before him. Indeed, so far as the Fathers before Augustine can be said to have had any theory of predestination to life beyond that of ecclesiastical election, it would appear that they held it to be a consequence of foreseen merit.

Possible indications of this view have been found in the writings of Justin Martyr³ and Irenæus.⁴ Still

¹ Born in Holland in 1560; professor at Leyden, 1604; and died in 1609.

² See Mosheim, vol. iii. p. 354 (ed. Stubbs); and cf. Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, c. ix.

³ Ἄλλ' εἰμαρμένην φαμέν ἀπαράβατον ταύτην εἶναι τοῖς τὰ καλὰ ἐκλεγόμενοις τὰ ἄξια ἐπιτίμια· καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίως τὰ ἐναντία τὰ ἄξια ἐπίχειρα, *Apol.* I. c. xliiii.; cf. Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, p. 81: "If Justin held the doctrine of predestination at all, it must have been in the Arminian sense—*ex prævisis meritis*."

⁴ "Deus his quidem qui non credunt, sed nullificant eum, infert excitatem . . . Si igitur et nunc, *quolquot scit non credituros Deus*, cum

more clearly is it seen in the teaching of the great Alexandrians, Clement¹ and Origen.² Among later writers it is taught by Chrysostom,³ whose influence became predominant in the East; and although in the West the system of Augustine in the main held the field, yet there are traces of something approaching to the earlier view among some of the schoolmen,⁴ and it has never wanted its defenders in the Church of Rome.⁵

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."—*Adv. Hær.* IV. xlv. "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 præsciens, utrisque aptas præparavit habitationes."—IV. lxiv.

¹ Ὁς προώρισεν ὁ Θεός, δικαίους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐργακῶς, *Strom.* VII. xvii. 107. Μεταλαμβάνει δὲ τῆς εὐποίας ἕκαστος ἡμῶν τρὸς ὁ βούλεται ἐπεὶ τὴν διαφορὰν τῆς ἐκλογῆς ἄξια γενομένη ψυχῆς ἀρετῆς τε καὶ συνάσκησις πεποίηκεν, *ib.* V. xiv. 141; cf. Kaye's *Clement of Alexandria*, p. 434.

² See especially *Philocalia*, xxv. p. 227 (ed. Robinson): Ἄνωτέρω δὲ ἐστὶ τοῦ προορισμοῦ ἢ πρὸ γένωσις· ὁς γὰρ προέγνω, φησί, καὶ προώρισεν συμμέρους τῆς εἰκότος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ· προεταπεινάσας οὖν ὁ Θεὸς τῷ εἰρημῶ τῶν ἐσομένων, καὶ κατανοήσας ῥοπήν τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῶν τῶνδ' ἐτιμῶν καὶ ὁμίην ἐπὶ ταύτην μετὰ τὴν ῥοπήν, καὶ ὡς ὅλοι ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιδώσουσι τῷ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν, προέγνω αὐτοὺς, γινώσκων μὲν τὰ ἐνστάμενα προγινώσκων δὲ τὰ μέλλοντα· καὶ ὁς οὕτω προέγνω, προώρισεν, κ.τ.λ.; cf. *Ad Rom.* vii. 17. It is interesting to notice that Calvin frankly owns that Origen and S. Ambrose and S. Jerome were all "Arminians," and "were of opinion that God dispenses His grace among men according to the use which He foresees that each will make of it," *Inst.* III. xxii. 8.

³ Ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι. Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν τοῦτο εἶπεν ὁ Θεός; διτι οὐκ ἀναμένει, καθάπερ ἄνθρωπος ἀπὸ τοῦ τελοῦς τῶν πραγμάτων ἰδεῖν τὸν ἀγαθόν, καὶ τὸν οὐ τοιοῦτον, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τοῦτων οἶδε τίς μὲν ὁ ποιηρὸς, τίς δὲ ὁ μὴ τοιοῦτος.—Chrysost. *In Ep. ad Rom.*, Hom. xvi. (on Rom. ix. 16).

⁴ See the summary of their teaching in Hagenbach, *History of Doctrine*, vol. ii. p. 299; and Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 148.

⁵ "A large number of Jesuits e.g. Toletus, Maldonatus, Lessius, Vas-

Turning now to the consideration of the evidence of Scripture, we note that the only passage to which an appeal can with any show of reason be made by the upholders of this theory is Rom. viii. 28, 29: "We know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to His purpose (τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς). For whom He foreknew, He also foreordained (προώρισε) to be conformed to the image of His Son," etc.¹ Here the Greek commentators generally have taken κατὰ πρόθεσιν of the *man's* free choice,—a view which is undoubtedly false, as the expression must refer to *God's* purpose (cf. ix. 11: ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ); and προέγνω has been interpreted of foreknowledge of character and fitness. This is plausible; but a careful examination of those passages of Scripture where God's "knowledge" of individuals or nations is spoken of shows that it cannot be maintained. The word γινώσκω, as used of God, "means 'to take note of,' 'to fix the regard upon,' as a preliminary to selection for some special purpose. The compound προέγνω only throws back this 'taking note' from the historic act in time to the eternal counsel which it expresses and executes."² But if the solitary passage which might have seemed to favour the Arminian theory breaks down, there is, on the other hand, a mass of scriptural evidence against it. The language of both Old and New Testament alike is quite decisive that God's

quez, Valentin, and Suarez (while he taught at Rome), admit that predestination to grace, but deny that predestination to glory, is irrespective of merit foreseen. God decrees, they say, to give grace to all, and predestines those who, as He foresees, will correspond to it, the rest being reprobate.—Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 745.

¹ Cf. 1 Pet. i. 1, 2: ἐκλεκτοῖς . . . κατὰ πρόβλεψιν Θεοῦ πατρὸς.

² Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 217, where reference is made to Ps. i. 6, cxliv. (cxliii.) 3; Hos. xiii. 5; Amos iii. 2; S. Matt. vii. 23, for γινώσκειν. To these may be added Gen. xviii. 19: "I have *known* him, to the end that he may command his children," etc.

election of Israel was not a consequence of foreseen faith or good works. Again and again it is stated that it was "not for their righteousness, for the uprightness of their heart, that they went in to possess the land";¹ and S. Paul appeals to the history of Jacob and Esau in Rom. ix. 10–13 as exhibiting "the perfectly free character of the Divine action, that purpose of God in the world which works on a principle of selection not dependent on any form of human merits or any convention of human birth, but simply on the Divine will as revealed in the Divine call."² And although this election was simply to higher privileges, and had nothing to do with eternal salvation, yet it establishes the general principle that in God's dealings with men there is "an element of inscrutable selectiveness."³ The Arminian theory ignores this fact, and does away with the mystery of the doctrine, whereas S. Paul insists that it is mysterious and unfathomable. According to Arminianism, it is dependent on foreseen good works. S. Paul expressly says it is "not of works," and uses the history of Jacob and Esau to enforce this principle. "The children being not yet born, neither having done anything good or bad, *that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth*, it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. Even as it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated" (Rom. ix. 11–13).

If God be omniscient and almighty, it is impossible to deny (1) that He does foresee from all eternity who will make a good use of grace, and (2) that He does predestinate such to final glory. But the error of the Arminians lies in connecting the two assertions by a

¹ Deut. ix. 5, 6; cf. x. 15; 1 Sam. xii. 22; Jer. xxxi. 1–3; Mal. i. 2, 3, etc.

² Sanday and Headlam, p. 239.

³ Gore in *Studia Biblica*, iii. p. 40.

"therefore," and thus making the one a consequence of the other. This introduces an idea of *time*, a "before" and "after," into the Divine life, whereas the foreknowledge of God and His predestination, both being from all eternity, are (if the word may be permitted) *synchronous*, neither being dependent upon the other.

(c) *The Calvinistic theory.*—There remain for consideration the Augustinian and the Calvinistic systems, the latter of which is only a more daring and logical development of the former; as what Augustine suggested in the fifth century, that Calvin said plainly in the sixteenth;¹ and what was left indefinite in the earlier system, was filled up and completed in the later.

Like Arminianism, Calvinism holds that predestination is to *life* and not only to privilege; but, unlike that system (which arose as a reaction from it), it teaches that it is "arbitrary," springing from God's good pleasure, from motives unknown to us. The "five points" of the whole scheme are these—

1. Predestination, including (a) predestination to life, and (b) reprobation or predestination to condemnation.

2. Particular redemption, or the doctrine that Christ died, not for all men, but only for the "elect," *i.e.* those predestined to life.

3. Total ruin, or the doctrine that at the Fall man was wholly deprived of original righteousness.

4. Irresistible grace or effectual calling.

¹ Calvin's *Institutes* were first published in 1536, so that his views had been made public some time before the English Articles were drawn up. But the great discussion on predestination at Geneva, and the publication of his book *De Predestinatione*, only took place in 1552. It has consequently been doubted whether his system had produced much influence in England at the time when the seventeenth Article was drawn up. (See Bp. H. Browne *On the Articles*, p. 412.) But it is certain that there was much fatalistic teaching among the Anabaptists, which is probably to some extent a reflection of his system. Cf. Hooper's letter quoted on p. 22: "They maintain a fatal necessity," etc.

5. Final perseverance.

It must be admitted that on all these points Augustine in the course of the controversy with the Pelagians used language which practically involved the conclusions which Calvin with fatal logic did not shrink from drawing, at the expense of shutting his eyes to a whole series of counter-truths asserted in Scripture. But, on the whole, it appears to be true to say that Calvinism goes beyond Augustinianism in its *definite and systematic* teaching of particular redemption, total ruin, and reprobation.¹ A clear view of the whole system as it was presented and taught in England may be obtained from the "Lambeth Articles" (1595), which state the points with great precision, and from the imposition of which the Church of England was happily saved by the wisdom and good sense of Queen Elizabeth.² The Articles in question are as follows:—

"1. God from eternity hath predestinated some to life, some He hath reprobated to death.

"2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life is not the prevision of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything which may be in the persons predestinated, but only the will of the good pleasure of God.

"3. Of the predestinated there is a fore-limited and certain number which can neither be diminished nor increased.

"4. They who are not predestinated to salvation will be necessarily condemned on account of their sins.

"5. A true living and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God sanctifying, is not extinguished, does not fall away, does not vanish in the elect either totally or finally.

¹ Augustine's disciple, Prosper, seems definitely to have taught *reprobation* (*Ep. ad Rufinum*, c. xiv.; *App. ad Op. August.* x. p. 168), and both it and particular redemption were maintained by Gottschalk in the ninth century. See Neander's *Church History*, vol. vi. p. 180 *seq.*, and Hagenbach's *History of Doctrine*, vol. ii. p. 293 *seq.*, with the references there given.

² Cf. p. 53. See Perry's *English Church History*, part ii. p. 351 *seq.*

"6. A truly faithful man, that is, one endowed with justifying faith, is certain by the full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and his eternal salvation through Christ.

"7. Saving grace is not given, is not communicated, is not granted to all men, by which they might be saved if they would.

"8. No man can come to Christ except it be given to him, and unless the Father draw him. And all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come unto the Son.

"9. It is not placed in the will or power of every man to be saved."¹

No words are needed to point out how alien is the whole tone and temper of this narrow and harsh dogmatism from the wise moderation with which the seventeenth Article is framed. A comparison of the two documents

¹ "1. Deus ab æterno prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit.

"2. Causa movens aut efficiens 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 præfinitus 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 sanctificans non extinguitur, non excoedit, non evanescit in electis aut finaliter aut totaliter.

"6. Homo vere fidelis, id est, fide justificante præditus, certus est plerophoria fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.

"7. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur universis hominibus, qua servari possint, si voverint.

"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 servari."

Specimens of various Calvinistic Confessions drawn up on the Continent may be found in Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 162 *seq.*

is sufficient to show that the Article is not favourable to the Calvinistic theory, which, indeed, is directly contrary to Scripture in its *limitation* of Divine grace to a few;¹ and assertion of its *irresistible character*² in those few, to say nothing of the dreadful dogma of reprobation, which was considered by Calvin as an integral part of his system, and on which the Article is wholly silent.³ Further evidence that the Church of England is not favourable to the Calvinistic scheme will be found in the remarks offered above on Articles IX. and XVI.;⁴ and the last paragraph of the Article now under consideration will presently be shown to be aimed at two of the most dangerous tenets of the same system.

(d) *The Augustinian theory.*—The teaching of Augustine on the subject of predestination has exercised profound influence over the whole Western Church. In the controversy with the Pelagians he was led to formulate his views and to discuss the question thoroughly, and his teaching will be found fully stated in his works,

¹ Particular redemption is directly contrary to such passages of Holy Scripture as S. John iii. 16–17; 1 Tim. ii. 3–6, etc. Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 11, where S. Paul speaks of the possibility of a brother perishing, even one "for whom Christ died"; which on the Calvinistic hypothesis is an impossibility.

² Against the theory of "irresistible grace" it is perhaps sufficient to refer to S. Paul's dread lest he himself might prove a castaway, 1 Cor. ix. 27; and the whole tenor of his Epistles, in every one of which his readers are assumed to be in a state of grace which is *real*, but from which they *may* fall, and in which they are therefore exhorted to continue.

³ The word "reprobate" (*ἀδόκιμος*, Vulg. *reprobus*) occurs occasionally in the New Testament, the key passage being Rom. i. 28 (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 27), which shows that only those are blinded and hardened and become reprobate who have deliberately flung aside and scorned the knowledge of God, which they already possessed. In Rom. ix. 22, S. Paul purposely uses an indefinite form *κατηρησμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν*, whereas, when he speaks of the vessels of honour, he says expressly that *God προητοίμασεν*. See on the whole passage Sanday and Headlam, p. 261.

⁴ Cf. p. 51 *seq.*

De Dono Perseverantiae and *De Prædestinatione Sanctorum*. In these he takes up the position (1) that predestination is to *life*, and not merely to privilege; (2) that it is "arbitrary," *i.e.* that the reason why one is predestinated to life and another is not, is unknown to us; and thus (3) the reason is not foreseen faith; (4) only those endowed with the gift of final perseverance can be saved; but why this gift is granted to one and withheld from another, lies in the inscrutable will of God. His teaching has been made the subject of an admirable study by Professor Mozley, and the conclusion at which he arrives is, that while Augustine is *right* in recognising fully that Scripture *does* speak of predestination to life, yet he is *wrong* in ignoring the fact that Scripture is twosided on this great question. "If one set of passages, taken in their natural meaning, conveys the doctrine of predestination, another conveys the reverse. The Bible in speaking of mankind, and addressing them on their duties and responsibilities, certainly speaks as if all had the power to do their duty or not, when laid before them; nor would any plain man receive any other impression from its language than that the moral being had freewill, and could determine his acts one way or another. So that sometimes speaking one way and sometimes another, Holy Scripture as a whole makes no assertion, or has no definite doctrine on this subject."¹ "The characteristic of S. Augustine's doctrine compared with the scriptural one is, that it is a *definite and absolute doctrine*. Scripture, as a whole, as has been said, only informs us of a mystery on the subject; that is to say, while it informs us that there is a truth on the subject it makes no consistent statement of it, but asserts contrary truths, counterbalancing those passages which convey the predestinarian doctrine by passages as plain the other way:

¹ *Augustinian Theory of Predestination*, p. 38.

but S. Augustine makes predestinarian statements, and does not balance them by contrary ones. Rather he endeavours to explain away those contrary statements of Scripture. Thus he evades the natural force of the text that God would have all men to be saved, by supposing that it only means that no man is saved except through the will of God, or that "all men" means not all men, but some out of all classes and ranks of men."¹ The criticism then to be offered upon the Augustinian scheme is, that it is a onesided development of scriptural truth. What it gains in consistency it loses in truth. It is right to a great extent in its affirmations, and wrong to a great extent in its denials. It is right in asserting that predestination is to life, and that the ground of it is inscrutable by us; wrong in denying that sufficient grace is given to all, and that salvation lies in the power of all men.

The four principal theories of predestination have now been stated, and reasons have been given for not deeming any one of them entirely satisfactory. How then, if all these are rejected, is the seventeenth Article to be understood? *In exactly the same way as these passages of Scripture which speak of predestination, i.e.* "as containing one side of the whole truth respecting grace and freewill, the other side, namely, of grace or the Divine power; but not at all as interfering with anyone's belief in a counter truth of man's freewill and originality as an agent. And in this sense it only excludes a Pelagian, and not such as are content to hold a mystery on the subject, and maintain the Divine power in conjunction with man's freewill."² The fact is, that the Bible lays down apparently contrary truths, both of which have yet to be held by one who would hold the whole truth. Freewill and predestination are both taught in the Bible; and though we cannot

¹ *Augustinian Theory of Predestination*, p. 155. ² Mozley, *op. cit.* p. 333.

see at present *how* they are compatible with each other, yet if, in the interests of logical consistency, we are led to deny either one of them, we shall find ourselves involved in errors and difficulties from which there is no escape. For the present we must be content to hold both as *parts* of the truth, remembering that we know but "in part," and leaving their complete reconciliation to the time when we "shall know, even as we are known."

Some words of Dr. Liddon's may serve to conclude this section. In speaking of the "old controversy between the defenders of the sovereignty of God on the one side, and the advocates of the freewill of man on the other," he says—

"The very idea of God as it occurs to the human mind, and the distinct statements of revelation, alike represent the Divine will as exerting sovereign and resistless sway. If it were otherwise, God would not be Almighty, that is, He would not be God. On the other hand, our daily experience and the language of Scripture both assure us that man is literally a free agent; his freedom is the very ground of his moral and religious responsibility. Are these two truths hopelessly incompatible with each other? So it may seem at first sight; and if we escape the danger of denying the one in the supposed interests of the other, if we shrink from sacrificing God's sovereignty to man's freewill, with Arminius, and from sacrificing man's freedom to God's sovereignty, with Calvin, we can only express a wise ignorance by saying, that to us they seem like parallel lines which must meet at a point in eternity, far beyond our present range of view. We do know, however, that being both true, they cannot really contradict each other; and that in some manner, which we cannot formulate, the Divine sovereignty must

not merely be compatible with, but must even imply, the perfect freedom of created wills."¹

II. *The Steps which accompany Predestination.*

After having described in scriptural terms what is meant by predestination to life, the Article proceeds, still in close dependence upon Scripture, to describe the several steps or processes which accompany it.

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.

These several processes, thus described, have been summed up as follows:—(1) Vocation, (2) obedience to vocation through grace, (3) free justification, (4) sonship by adoption, (5) conformity to the image of our Lord, (6) a religious life, and (7) eternal felicity.²

It is right that these various steps by which God's eternal decree is carried out should be thus enumerated in the Article, because they form a most important safeguard against Antinomian perversions of the doctrine, showing how much is really involved in *predestination to life*. Though we cannot, with Arminius, say that foreseen good works are the *ground* of such predestination, yet we *can* say that they are involved in it; and that where there is predestination to eternal felicity,

¹ Liddon's *Elements of Religion*, p. 191. Cf. Sanday and Headlam *On the Romans*, p. 348.

² Bishop Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 252

there is also predestination to obedience and to conformity to the image of our Lord. This was fully brought out by Bishop Bancroft at the Hampton Court Conference, as the subjoined extract will show.

"The Bishop of London took occasion to signifie to His Majesty, how very many in these daies, neglecting holinesse of life, presumed too much of persisting of grace, laying all their religion upon predestination, If I shall be saved, I shall be saved; which he termed a desperate doctrine, showing it to be contrary to good divinity and the true doctrine of predestination, wherein we should reason rather *ascendendo* than *descendendo*, thus, 'I live in obedience to God, in love with my neighbour, I follow my vocation, etc.; therefore I trust that God hath elected me, and predestinated me to salvation'; not thus, which is the usual course of argument, 'God hath predestinated and chosen me to life, therefore though I sin never so grievously, yet I shall not be damned; for whom He once loveth, He loveth to the end.'"¹

III. *The practical Effect of the Doctrine.*

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

¹ Dean Barlow's account of "the sum and substance of the Conference" at Hampton Court. *Cardwell's Conferences*, p. 180.

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 (*impurissimæ vitæ securitatem*), no less perilous than desperation.

Briefly, this rather wordy paragraph amounts to this—

(a) For "godly persons" the doctrine is full of comfort, as tending to establish and confirm their faith, as well as to kindle their love towards God. It acts upon them as the sense of a lofty destiny often acts upon men, encouraging them to do and dare all things, secure that the difficulties and dangers which lie before them cannot really hinder the accomplishment of their designs. In this lay the real strength of the Calvinistic creed, and of the Puritan character which it trained and developed. On the other hand, in systems where there is little or no sense of God's power carrying out His purposes with resistless force through His chosen instruments, there the character trained under them is likely to be deficient in fibre and tenacity of purpose. So Dean Milman has, in a striking passage, pointed out the weakness of Pelagianism: "No Pelagian ever has, or ever will, work a religious revolution. He who is destined for such a work must have a full conviction that God is acting directly, immediately, consciously, and therefore with irresistible power, upon him and through him. It is because he believes himself, and others believe him to be, thus acted upon, that he has the burning courage to undertake, the indomitable perseverance to maintain, the inflexible resolution to

die for his religion; so soon as that conviction is deadened his power is gone. . . . He who is not predestined, who does not declare, who does not believe, himself predestined as the author of a great religious movement, he in whom God is not manifestly, sensibly, avowedly, working out His pre-established designs, will never be saint or reformer."¹

(b) For those whom the Article calls "curious (*i.e.* inquisitive) and carnal persons" it is most dangerous and perilous to dwell on the mystery, as it exposes them to a twofold danger, since (1) if they believe that they are *not* predestined to life it urges them to despair, while (2) if they believe that they *are* so predestined it leads them into recklessness and Antinomianism.

Both dangers were terribly apparent during the period of the Reformation, when this subject exercised so strong a fascination over men's minds. Many were taking up the "desperate" doctrine referred to by Bancroft, and saying, "If I shall be saved, I shall be saved," and thus became utterly reckless of their actions and conduct; while others were driven to despair by the conviction that they were "reprobate."² Of this Foxe, the martyrologist, gives a remarkable instance, in his account of the death of John Randall, of Christ's College, Cambridge, who destroyed himself in a fit of religious desperation: "He was found in his study hanging by his girdle, before an open Bible, with his dead arm and finger stretched pitifully towards a

¹ Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. i. p. 150.

² It was evidently because of this danger that the clergy were exhorted in the "Injunctions" of 1559 to "have always in a readiness such comfortable places and sentences of Scripture as do set forth the mercy, benefits, and goodness of Almighty God towards all penitent and believing persons," in order that "the vice of damnable despair may be clearly taken away." Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, vol. ii. p. 218.

passage on predestination";¹ and both the dangers are alluded to in a passage in one of Luther's letters, which bears a striking resemblance to the language of our own Article.

"Men should not turn their eyes on the secret sentence of election, foreknowledge, and predestination, as they are called; for such speeches lead to doubt, security, or despair,—are you elected? no fall can hurt you, and you cannot perish,—are you not elected? there is no remedy for it. These are shocking speeches, and men ought not to fix their hearts on such thoughts; but the gospel refers us to the proclaimed word of God, wherein He has revealed His will, and through which He will be known and will work."²

IV. *Two Considerations calculated to guard the Doctrine from Abuses.*

The last paragraph of the Article gives two rules which seem more particularly intended to guard against the Calvinistic tenet of particular redemption. They are the following:—

(a) **We must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally (generaliter) set forth to us in Holy Scripture.**

(b) **In our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God.**

¹ Froude, *History of England*, vol. ii. p. 81; cf. Foxe, iv. p. 694.

² Luther's *Letters*, No. 1753. There are two expressions in the English of this second paragraph of our Article on which a note may be useful—(1) "curious" in the phrase "curious and carnal persons" simply means inquisitive (cf. *Ecclus.* iii. 23: "Be not curious in unnecessary matters"), (2) "wretchlessness" (Latin, *securitas*) is only another form of the word "recklessness." It occurs with various forms of spelling. In modern editions it invariably appears as "wretchlessness," but in the edition of 1553 it is spelt "rechielesnesse"; in 1571, "rechelesnesse."

In the first of these rules the English sounds somewhat ambiguous, but there can be no doubt that "generally" here means "universally," *i.e.* of God's promises *as applying to all men*, and not, as the Calvinistic party asserted, only to a particular class consisting of a few favourites of Heaven. This interpretation is rendered certain by the corresponding passage in the *Reformatio Legum*, which has been already quoted, where God's promises to the good, and threats to the evil, are spoken of as *generaliter propositæ* in Holy Scripture. The same interpretation was pointed out by Baro in his *Concio ad Clerum* in 1595, in the controversy when the Lambeth Articles were first projected;¹ and was also asserted against the Puritans by Bishop Bancroft at the Hampton Court Conference.² Thus the clause directly condemns the theory of particular redemption.³

The second rule seems equally clear against the doctrine of reprobation. "In our doings that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God"; and that will certainly is that "all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4). The clause is perhaps still more directly aimed against a tenet not unknown to the Calvinists, but finding special favour with the

¹ Strype's *Whitgift*, p. 466.

² Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 181. For this meaning of the word, cf. the Catechism, which speaks of two sacraments ordained by Christ "as generally necessary to salvation," *i.e.* necessary for all men; and cf. the use of the word "generally" in the Authorised Version, in 2 Sam. xvii. 11; Jer. xlviii. 38.

³ With the expression "*generaliter propositæ*" cf. the language of Article VII., which says that in Scripture "*æterna vita humano generi est proposita*"; cf. Latimer's *Sermons*, p. 182, ed. 1584. "The promises of Christ our Saviour be general; they pertain to all mankind. . . . The promises of Christ which be general and pertain to the whole world."

Anabaptists, which spoke of a secret will of God opposed to His revealed will; so Hooper, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, writes in 1549 of the Anabaptists: "They maintain a fatal necessity, and that beyond and besides that will of His, which He has revealed to us in the Scriptures, God hath another will by which He altogether acts under some kind of necessity."¹ Such teaching as this is at once condemned in our Article, which refers us exclusively to the revealed will of God.²

It only remains, for the sake of completeness of treatment, to point out—(1) that there was no Article on the subject of predestination in the Confession of Augsburg; and (2) that at the Council of Trent much perplexity was felt on the subject, and finally a decree was drawn up in most guarded terms so that everyone might agree to it: "No one, so long as he exists in this mortal state, ought so far to presume concerning the secret mystery of Divine predestination as to determine for certain that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinated; as if it were true that he who is justified either cannot sin any more, or if he do sin, that he ought to promise himself a certain repentance; for except by a special revelation it cannot be known whom God hath chosen to Himself."³

¹ *Original Letters*, Parker Society, p. 66.

² It must be admitted that the wording of this particular sentence is not particularly happy, and that Guest had some reason for his desire that it should be altered, because it might be thought to countenance the notion of a secret will of God opposed to "that will . . . which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God." See his letter to Cecil among the *State Papers* ("Domestic" Elizabeth, vol. lxxviii. No. 37) referred to on p. 45.

³ Sess. VI. c. xii.

ARTICLE XVIII

*De speranda æterna salute tantum
in nomine Christi.*

*Of obtaining eternal Salvation, only
by the Name of Christ.*

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.

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.

THIS Article now stands as it was originally published in 1553.¹ The copula with which it begins is difficult to account for. "They *also* are to be had accursed": The "et" of the Latin was omitted in 1563, but restored again in 1571, and was perhaps intended to link this Article on to the last clause of Article XVI.: "They are to be condemned (illi damnandi sunt) which say they can no more sin here," etc.

The language of the Article has not been traced to any earlier source, but there is a section in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* which affords a close parallel to it.

¹ In 1553 and 1563 the title was as follows: "Tantum in nomine Christi speranda est æterna salus": "We must trust to obtain eternal salvation only by the name of Christ." The change of construction in 1571 brought it into harmony with the titles of the other Articles, almost all of which now begin in the same way.

"Horribilis est et immanis illorum audacia, qui contendunt in omni religione vel secta, quam homines professi fuerint, salutem illis esse sperandam, si tantum ad innocentiam et integritatem vitæ pro viribus enitantur juxta lumen quod illis præluet a natura infusum. Autoritate vero sacrarum literarum confixæ sunt hujusmodi pestes. Solum enim et unicum ibi Jesu Christi nomen nobis commendatum est, ut omnis ex eo salus ad nos perveniat."¹

This section and the Article before us are evidently intended to rebuke the same error; and it has sometimes been thought that the opinion condemned is that which maintains a possibility of salvation for the heathen, and those who have never heard the name of Christ. On a careless reading of the Article such a view may seem probable. But there are two considerations which make strongly against it: (1) The title in the Latin is "De *speranda* æterna salute," etc.; strictly, "of *hoping* for eternal salvation." Such a phrase could only be used if the case contemplated was that of those within sound of the gospel, knowing "the name of Christ" and able to "trust to obtain salvation by it." (2) From the fact that the Article begins with a definite anathema of certain people, and couples the opinion denounced with that condemned in Article XVI., it is clear that it is no vague opinion that is intended to be here rejected, but the positive teaching of a particular set of persons. Now it does not appear that the question of the salvability of the heathen was formally raised by any of the sects of the day; but when we discover that one of the many schools of Anabaptists was teaching, not only that religion was a matter of indifference, but also that the deliberate rejection of the Saviour of the world would not be attended with loss, it

¹ *Reformatio Legum Eccl., De Hæres. c. xi.*

is almost certain that it is against them that this Article is directed.¹ "There are such libertines and wretches," writes Hooper, "who are daring enough in their conventicles not only to deny that Christ is the Messiah and Saviour of the world, but also to call that blessed Seed a mischievous fellow, and deceiver of the world."² So at a somewhat later date (1579) one Matthew Hamant was burnt at Norwich for maintaining that "Christ is not God nor the Saviour of the world, but a mere man, a sinful man, and an abominable idol." There are other indications in the Articles—such as the emphatic language used in Article XV. on Christ who "came to be the Lamb without spot, Who, by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world," and Who was "clearly void" from sin "both in His flesh and in His spirit"—of the necessity there was to guard against teaching of this character; and it certainly was not without cause that the compilers of the Articles introduced into them this strong assertion, that eternal salvation is only to be looked for through the name of Christ.

The Article, then, means neither more nor less than S. Peter's words in Acts iv. 12, which are referred to in it: "In none other is salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." If this text be, as it surely is, reconcilable with a belief in the salvability of the heathen, then so also is this Article, which proclaims that **Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved**, for the one says no more than the other. With regard to the heathen who live and die out of reach of the gospel, Scripture says but little;³ but

¹ Cf. Hardwick, p. 101.

² See p. 23.

³ "I hold it to be a most certain rule of interpreting Scripture that it

sufficient is revealed, not only to make us shrink from pronouncing their condemnation, because we are taught not to judge "them that are without" (1 Cor. v. 12, 13), but even to enable us to have a good hope concerning them. God is "the Saviour of *all men*," but "especially of believers" (1 Tim. iv. 10),—an expression which can only mean that others besides Christians or "believers" can be saved. S. Paul also speaks of the "Gentiles which have no law," and yet "do by nature the things of the law," showing "the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith" (Rom. ii. 14, 15); and it is probable that our Lord's parable of the Sheep and the Goats in S. Matt. xxv. is intended to refer primarily to their case.¹ Consequently, whatever individual teachers may have maintained, the Church as a whole has never committed herself to the assertion that the heathen must be lost, nor denied to them the possibility of salvation. Though never brought into covenant with God here, they may be brought to know Him hereafter. But if so, whatever

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. quoted in Browne *On the Articles*, p. 443.

¹ In this chapter (S. Matt. xxv.) there are three parables: the first two, the Ten Virgins and the Talents, refer directly to the kingdom of heaven, *i.e.* the Church. With the third, the Sheep and the Goats, the case is different. (1) It is spoken of *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, *all the nations*, a phrase which most naturally refers to the heathen world; (2) neither those on the right hand nor those on the left recognise that they have ever seen Christ or ministered to Him on earth. Apparently, then, they had not known Him in this life; and (3) the test by which their lives are judged is the test of works of mercy and kindness, just those "things of the law" which the Gentiles might "do by nature," if they had "the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith."

grace may be theirs here, or glory be granted to them hereafter, they will not have been **saved by the law** (in lege) **or sect which they professed**, but only by Christ, the one Mediator, Who is "the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (S. John i. 9), and to whom, although they knew it not, they ministered, in doing works of mercy to their fellow-men.

If these considerations are carefully borne in mind, it appears to the present writer that there need be no hesitation concerning the acceptance of this Article. It certainly condemns a lax and latitudinarian view which would treat religion as a matter of indifference, and hold that the rejection of Christ mattered not. But Scripture equally condemns this, and speaks in the strongest terms of those who reject the truth, and let it go after they have received it (see [S. Mark] xvi. 16; S. John iii. 18, 19, xii. 48, etc.). But this *letting go* of the true faith was exactly the sin of which so many of the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century were guilty, looking on our Lord sometimes as a mere man, and denying Him to be the Saviour of the world; affirming that Holy Scripture was given "only to the weak," and claiming the inner light of the Spirit, and licence therefrom for every kind of profanity.¹ Not without good reason was this Article inserted to condemn them.

¹ See the Nineteenth Article of 1553, which immediately followed that one which has now been considered in the original series. The text of it will be found on p. 78, and cf. p. 233.

ARTICLE XIX

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 cæremoniarum ritus, verum in his etiam quæ credenda sunt.

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 Hierusalem, 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.

THIS Article has remained practically¹ unchanged since the original edition of 1553. It was possibly suggested by the words in the corresponding Article in the Confession of Augsburg: "Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur sacramenta." But the Anglican Article is more precise and guarded, and has nothing answering to the next words found in the Lutheran Confession: "Et ad veram unitatem Ecclesiæ satis est consentire de doctrina evangelii et administratione sacramentorum."²

¹ Slight verbal changes were introduced into the English Article in Elizabeth's reign in order to bring it into more exact accordance with the Latin, in which there has been no alteration whatever. "And manner of ceremonies" was added in 1563; and "their" before "faith" omitted in 1571.

² *Confessio Augustana*, c. vii., De ecclesia.

The object of the Article appears to be twofold: (1) to give such a definition or description of the visible Church as shall exclude the claim of the Roman Church to be the only true Church, while not embracing under the terms of the definition the various sects of Anabaptists and others then springing up; and (2) to deny the claim of the Roman Church to infallibility.

That some such polemical object was intended by those who framed the description in the first part of the Article appears from the following passage in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, between which and the Article there is evidently a very close connection:—

“Etiam illorum insania legum vinculis est constringenda, qui Romanam Ecclesiam in hujusmodi petra fundatam esse existimant, ut nec erraverit, nec errare possit; cum et multi possint ejus errores ex superiore majorum memoria repeti, et etiam ex hac nostra proferri, partim in his quibus vita nostra debet informari, partim etiam in his quibus fides debet institui. Quapropter illorum etiam intolerabilis est error, qui totius Christiani orbis universam ecclesiam solius episcopi Romani principatu contineri volunt. Nos enim eam quæ cerni potest ecclesiam sic definimus ut omnium cœtus sit fidelium hominum, in quo sacra Scriptura sincere docetur, et sacramenta (saltem his eorum partibus quæ necessariae sunt) juxta Christi præscriptum administrantur.”¹

To a later date belongs the Homily for Whitsunday, first published in 1563, and ascribed to the authorship of Bishop Jewell. But it is interesting to notice that it introduces a description of the Church which is evidently suggested by that in the Article into a similar polemical passage combating the claims of the Church of Rome.

“But now herein standeth the controversy, whether

¹ *De Hæres. c. xxi., De Romana Ecclesia et potestate Romani pontificis.*

all men do justly arrogate to themselves the Holy Ghost, or no. The Bishops of Rome have for a long time made a sore challenge thereunto, reasoning for themselves after this sort. The Holy Ghost, say they, was promised to the Church, and never forsaketh the Church: but we are the chief heads and the principal part of the Church: therefore we have the Holy Ghost for ever; and whatsoever things we decree are undoubted verities and oracles of the Holy Ghost. That ye may perceive the weakness of this argument, it is needful to teach you first what the true Church of Christ is, and then to confer the Church of Rome therewith, to discern how well they agree together.

“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.* And it hath always three notes or marks whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to Christ’s holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. This description of the Church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God and also to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith.”¹

The connection between the description here given and that in the Article is obvious. That in the Homily is little more than a rhetorical amplification of that given in the Article. The chief difference is that the Homily adds a third note to the two given in the Article, namely, “the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.”² It may, however, fairly be argued that even

¹ “The second part of the sermon for Whitsunday.” *The Homilies*, p. 494 (ed. S.P.C.K.).

² This “note or mark” is also added in the “Short Catechism” issued together with the Articles in 1553 (see Dixon’s *History of the Church of*

this is no substantial addition, because it is really included in the right administration of the sacraments, which must involve their administration by properly qualified persons, and to those only who are properly qualified to receive them.¹

The main subjects to be considered in connection with this Article are the following :—

1. The description of the visible Church.
2. The statement that the Church of Rome hath erred in matters of faith.

I. *The Description of the visible 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.

It will be convenient to consider separately each term in this description.

England, vol. iii. p. 528), where it is said that "the marks of this Church are : first, pure preaching of the gospel ; then, brotherly love, out of which, as members of all one body, springeth goodwill of each to other ; thirdly, upright and uncorrupted use of the Lord's sacraments, according to the ordinance of the gospel ; last of all, brotherly correction and ex-communication, or banishing those out of the Church that will not amend their lives. This mark the holy Fathers termed discipline." See *Liturgies of King Edward VI.* (Parker Society) p. 513. Somewhat to the same effect we read in Nowell's *Catechism*, published in 1570, that the "marks of the visible Church are the sincere preaching of the gospel, that is to say, of the benefits of Christ, invocation and administration of the sacraments," and it is added that "in the same Church, if it be well ordered, there shall be seen to be observed a certain order and manner of government, and such a form of ecclesiastical discipline," etc. See Nowell's *Catechism* (Parker Society), pp. 56, 175 ; cf. also Ridley's *Works* (Parker Society), p. 123.

¹ Cf. Bp. Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 452.

(a) **The visible Church.** The word "Church"¹ is the English equivalent for the Greek *ἐκκλησία*, which has passed through three stages of meaning. (1) In its classical sense it is not a *religious* word at all, but simply stands for the assembly of the citizens of Athens and (later) of other free Greek cities, called together for the discussion of public business. In this sense it occurs once in the New Testament of the "lawful assembly" (*ἡ ἔννομος ἐκκλησία*) at Ephesus, Acts xix. 39. (2) It obtains a religious connotation first in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, where it is frequently used as the translation of the Hebrew *קָהָל*, for the assembly of the Israelites, especially when gathered for sacred purposes.² In this sense it is found twice in the New Testament, viz. in Acts vii. 38, where S. Stephen speaks of "the Church in the wilderness," and in Heb. ii. 12 in a quotation from the LXX. of Ps. xxii. 22. (3) This Old Testament use of the term prepared the way for the third stage in its usage, in which it is adopted by our Lord as the name of the Society which He came to found on earth. It is so used on two occasions by Him in the Gospels, namely in S. Matt. xvi. 18 (to be noted as its earliest occurrence), "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church" (*οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*), and S. Matt. xviii. 18, where it is said of the erring brother, "If he refuse to hear thee, tell it to the Church ; and if he refuse to hear the Church also,

¹ The English word "Church" is ordinarily said to come from the Greek *Κυριακή*. But see the *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 694 (ed. ii.), where reasons are given for doubting this derivation.

² It is never used for the Hebrew *קָהָל* for which *συναγωγή* is the regular equivalent. This word is also used regularly in the first four books of the Pentateuch for *קָהָל* ; but from Deuteronomy onwards, though *συναγωγή* is still occasionally used for it, *ἐκκλησία* is more usually employed. See Deut. iv. 10, ix. 10, xviii. 16, etc. ; and on the history of the word in general, see Trench's *Synonyms of the New Testament*, p. 1.

let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican." Owing probably to its use in this sense by our Lord Himself, we find on turning to the Acts and Epistles that it is the familiar designation of the Christian Society, used sometimes for the Society *as a whole*, throughout the world, 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. i. 22;¹ Phil. iii. 6, etc.; sometimes for the Church in a particular place, as "the Church which was in Jerusalem," Acts viii. 1; "the Church of God which is at Corinth," 1 Cor. i. 2; "the Church of the Thessalonians," 1 Thess. i. 1; or "the Church in Ephesus," Rev. ii. 1; sometimes even for a particular congregation gathered together in some house. So we read of Prisca and Aquila, and "the Church that is in their house" (Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19), and of Philemon, and the Church in his house (Philem. 2, and cf. Col. iv. 15).² This varying usage of the word in its Christian sense is faithfully reflected in the language of our own Articles, which speak sometimes of "the Church" (Art. XX.), or "the visible Church" (Art. XIX.) as a whole, sometimes of "every particular or national Church" (Art. XXXIV.), such as "the Church of Jerusalem," of "Alexandria and Antioch," as well as "the Church of Rome" (Art. XIX.).

The phrase employed in the Article before us, "the *visible Church*," is important. It obviously indicates that the Church is a definite ascertainable body, which can be pointed out to men, and distinguished from any other bodies or societies claiming identity or similarity with it.

¹ This usage is especially characteristic of the Epistle to the Ephesians, in which the conception of one Catholic Church stands out with peculiar clearness. See Eph. i. 22, iii. 10, v. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32.

² It may be noted that the word can also be used for "any gathering" of men assembled by chance or tumultuously, as it is by the "town clerk" in his speech at Ephesus, Acts xix. 32, 41. Its use for the *building* in which Christians meet together for worship is post-biblical, and apparently not found before the third century at the earliest.

What the distinguishing marks of the Church are the Article proceeds to state, and these will presently be explained. But before this can be done, the phrase before us requires further consideration.

At the time when the Articles were drawn up there was in some quarters a tendency to attach little importance to the notion of a "visible Church," and to speak much of an "invisible Church," consisting of true believers known only to God, wherever they might be found, outside and independent of all external organisation.¹ That God *does* know who are really His, in whatever society or body they may be found, is of course perfectly true, and what no Christian can deny. But when this is said, there is really nothing more that can be said of an "invisible Church." Its existence

¹ See a startling exposition of this view in Hooper's *Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith*: "I believe and confess one only Catholic and Universal Church, which is an holy congregation and assembly of all faithful believers, which are chosen and predestinate unto everlasting life, before the foundations of the world were laid: of whose number I count myself, and believe that I am, through the only grace and mercy of the Father, and by the merits of my good Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and not by means of my good works and merits, which indeed are none.

"I believe that this Church is invisible to the eye of man, and is only to God known; and that the same Church is not set, compassed, and limited within a certain place or bounds, but is scattered and spread abroad throughout all the world; but yet coupled together in heart, will, and spirit by the bond of faith and charity, having and altogether acknowledging one only God, one only head and mediator Jesus Christ, one faith, one law, one baptism, one spiritual table, wherein one meal, and one spiritual drink, is ministered to them unto the end of the world. This Church containeth in it all the righteous and chosen people, from the first righteous man unto the last that shall be found righteous in the end of the world: and therefore I do call it universal. For as touching the visible Church, which is the congregation of the good and of the wicked, of the chosen and of the reprobate, and generally of all those which say they believe in Christ, I do not believe that to be the Church because that Church is seen of the eye, and the faith thereof is in visible things."—Later writings of Bishop Hooper (Parker Society), p. 40.

does not practically concern us; for to say of any particular individuals that they belong to the true (invisible) Church, and of others that they belong only to the visible body, involves a serious confusion of thought, since the very act of pointing out any members of this "invisible Church" makes it at once a "visible" one; and for man to say who does or who does not belong to it is to claim the prerogatives of God, and to assume the power to see into the hearts of men. Thus the phrase "the invisible Church" was mischievous and misleading, and led men to attach little importance to the Divinely appointed external organisation of the historical Church founded by our Lord; and we may be thankful that those who are responsible for the Article ignored it altogether and spoke only of that body or society of which Scripture speaks, namely, "the visible Church of Christ."¹

That our Lord intended to found a Church, and that this Church was to be "visible," must now be shown. The passage already quoted from S. Matt. xvi. 18 is conclusive evidence that it was our Lord's purpose to found a Church; and though, as has been previously mentioned, the word *ἐκκλησία* only occurs on two occasions in the Gospels, yet in the former of the two passages it is closely connected, if not expressly identified with "the kingdom of heaven," which is the ordinary title by which our Lord refers to the new order of things which He came to inaugurate,

¹ This silence about any "invisible Church" is all the more noteworthy because the Thirteen Articles drafted in 1538 had distinctly recognised two senses of the word Church: "unam, qua Ecclesia accipitur pro congregatione omnium sanctorum et vere fidelium, qui Christo capiti vere credunt et sanctificantur Spiritu ejus. Hæc autem vivum est et vere sanctum Christi corpus mysticum, sed soli Deo cognitum, qui hominum corda solus intuetur. Altera acceptio est qua Ecclesia accipitur pro congregatione omnium hominum qui baptizati sunt in Christi," etc.—Art. V. See Hardwick, p. 263.

and the Society which was to be established on earth. That this "kingdom," though "not of this world" (S. John xviii. 36), was nevertheless intended to be a "visible" one, embracing good and bad alike, is indicated in more than one parable; e.g. that of the Tares (S. Matt. xiii. 24–30), the Draw-net (vers. 47–50), and the Wedding Garment (xxii. 1–14). It is intended to embrace all nations of the earth (xxviii. 19). The rite of baptism is appointed as the method of admission to it (*ib.*, cf. S. John iii. 3–5); a visible rite is instituted as the means of supporting the life of its members (S. Matt. xxvi. 26; S. John vi. 51), and men are commissioned and "sent" with power to remit and retain sins (S. John xx. 21–23). All this implies a definite, ascertainable body with an outward organisation, a body, or society, which can be described as a "visible" one. And when we turn to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles we find abundant evidence that the actual existing *ἐκκλησία* was such. Throughout the Acts baptism is the rite of admission to it (Acts ii. 38, 41, viii. 12, xvi. 15, etc.); "continuing steadfastly in the breaking of the bread" is one of the characteristics of believers (ii. 42, cf. ii. 46 and xx. 7); and "elders" are "appointed in every Church" (xiv. 23); and it may be safely said that wherever the "Church" is mentioned, the language used is only capable of being applied to a visible body. Thus a "persecution arose against the Church" (viii. 1), the Church was "gathered together" (xiv. 27), "saluted" (xviii. 22), "confirmed" (xvi. 5). The same is true in regard to the Epistles. In every case S. Paul writes to members of a definite society, consisting, as his letters only too plainly show, of professed believers, some of whom were guilty of grievous sins,—a mixed body, in which the evil are mingled with the good; and if further proof be required that this is

the character of the *ἐκκλησία* as described in Holy Scripture, it may be found in the Epistles to the seven Churches of Asia (Rev. ii., iii.), which are clearly addressed to visible organised societies, and which similarly recognise the existence of the evil as well as the good in those societies. Thus everywhere throughout Scripture it is "the visible Church" which is spoken of, to which the promises are made, and in which the hope of salvation is held out.

(b) This "visible Church" is described as a **congregation of faithful men** (*cætus fidelium*). Stress may fairly be laid on the word "congregation" as implying that the Church is in some way united so as to be a definite body with an organism and a life of its own, for, as has been truly pointed out, a congregation is more than an aggregation. It means a body or society. "There is a great difference between an aggregation and a body. A body is not merely a heap of members, . . . but it is a system of members knit together into one organism and pervaded by one life. . . . So the Church is a living organism deriving from Christ, who is its Head, the life of the Holy Ghost."¹

"Faithful" in this connection signifies "professed believers." It cannot be taken as implying anything as to the character of the faith in the members of the Church, or as if it indicated the presence of a true and lively faith in all who belong to the body; but it refers simply to those who "profess and call themselves Christians." That this is so is shown by the fact that a later Article (XXVI.) expressly states (in full accordance, as has been already proved, with the teaching of Scripture) that "in the visible Church the evil are ever mingled with the good." Thus the Church consists of bad as well as good, and therefore the word "faithful" must be understood in the sense explained above.

¹ Goulburn's *Holy Catholic Church*, p. 9.

(c) We now come to the "notes" of the Church, of which the Article gives two. The first is this: that in the Church **the pure word of God is preached**. That we are right in regarding this as one of the necessary notes or marks of the Church may fairly be inferred from many passages of Scripture. Our Lord's charge to His Apostles after the resurrection was to "make disciples of all nations," not only "baptizing them," but also "teaching them to observe all things" that He had commanded (S. Matt. xxviii. 19). The Church of the first days is described by S. Luke as continuing "steadfast in the apostles' teaching," as well as in "the fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers" (Acts ii. 42). S. Paul was sent to "preach the gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17). He charges Timothy to "preach the word" (2 Tim. iv. 2), to "hold fast the form of sound words" which he has heard (2 Tim. i. 13); and generally, throughout the Apostolic Epistles, it is assumed that there is a definite body of teaching to be handed on by the Church and her ministers.¹ That definite body of teaching, so far as necessary doctrine is concerned, we believe (as was shown under Article VI.) to be contained in Holy Scripture. "Preaching," as Hooker reminds us, is the "open publication of heavenly mysteries."² Thus the "pure word of God is preached" wherever the main doctrines of the gospel are openly taught and proclaimed. And since the main doctrines are summarised in those Creeds to which the Church of England expressly adheres, and which she declares "ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture,"³ it may reasonably be concluded that all who are in possession of the Creeds of the Church, and proclaim the doctrine contained in them, are so far forth

¹ See, e.g., 2 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 13-16; S. Jude 3.

² *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. V. c. xviii.

³ Article VIII.

in possession of "the pure word of God," and fulfilling their duty of preaching it, as to satisfy the requirements of this note of the Church.

(d) A second note of the Church is given in the following words: **The sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.** It has already been shown that our Lord appointed baptism as the rite of admission to His Church, and that the Eucharist was instituted with the charge, "Do this in remembrance of Me." By it, as S. Paul says, we are to "show forth the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). It is therefore a rite for all time, and in the face of these declarations it can scarcely be doubted that the due administration of the sacraments must be a necessary mark of the Church, and that any body of Christians not possessing sacraments thereby forfeits all claim to be regarded as a branch of Christ's visible Church. A further question may be raised as to what constitutes a *due* administration of the sacraments. And to this it may be replied that all the conditions necessary for the validity of sacraments must be fulfilled. There must be the proper "matter," *i.e.* in the one case water, in the other "bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received"; as well as the proper form of words. It would seem also that a regularly constituted ministry is implied in this note of the Church;¹ for though the prevailing opinion in the Church has ever been that baptism (1) with water, and (2) in the name of the Holy Trinity, is valid by whomsoever it may be administered, these being, as the Prayer Book says, "essentials of baptism," yet for the consecration and administration of the Holy Communion it has ever

¹ The question of the Episcopal ministry and its necessity is considered elsewhere, and is therefore not touched upon here.

been held that the action of a rightly ordained minister is required.¹ Unless these various conditions were satisfied, it would be impossible to maintain that the sacraments were "duly (*recte*)"² ministered according to Christ's

¹ This is not the place to enter fully into the question of the validity of lay baptism, which is carefully vindicated by Hooker (*Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. V. c. lxii.). But in view of the distinction drawn in the text between the two sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist as far as the action of an ordained minister is concerned, it may be well to explain the scriptural grounds on which the Church is justified in maintaining that lay baptism is valid, while she never permits a lay consecration of the Eucharist. Briefly, then, it may be said that there are various indications in the New Testament that no importance is attached to the minister of baptism. In the Gospels we are expressly told that during our Lord's earthly ministry "Jesus baptized not Himself, but His disciples" (S. John iv. 2). In the Acts of the Apostles we read that when the Holy Ghost had come on the household of Cornelius, Peter, though apparently the only apostle or Christian minister present, "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord" (Acts x. 48). The Samaritans were baptized by Philip the deacon, though the Holy Ghost was not given till the hands of the apostles were laid on them (Acts viii. 12-17). Of the men at Ephesus it is said that "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them" (Acts xix. 5, 6); the natural inference from these words being that the act of baptism was not performed by the apostle himself; an inference which is raised almost to a certainty by S. Paul's own words in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, which show that his usual custom was not to baptize himself, "for God sent" him "not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. i. 14-17). These passages seem amply sufficient to warrant the Church in relaxing the rule that a regularly ordained minister is required for the ministerial act. But no such series of passages can be cited with regard to the Eucharist, and therefore the Church has never felt justified in sanctioning any relaxation of her rule that the Society should act through her regularly commissioned officers.

² The difference between "*recte*" and "*rite*" as used in the Articles is not very great, both words being capable of being rendered by the same English word "*duly*." But "*rite*" includes a wider reference to due ecclesiastical order than "*recte*" does, as may be seen by a comparison of the following passages: Art. XIX. "Sacraments be *duly* (*recte*) ministered." XXV. Sacraments were ordained "that we should *duly* (*rite*) use them." XXVII. "They that receive baptism *rightly* (*recte*) are grafted into the Church." XXVIII. "To such as *rightly* (*rite*),

ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."¹

II. *The Statement that the Church of Rome hath erred in Matters of Faith.*

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

The object of this clause is not to condemn the Roman Church as apostate, but simply to deny her claim to infallibility. Whatever may be said about the infallibility of the Church as a whole, it is clear from history that no one branch of the Church can claim for herself infallibility apart from other branches. So the Article points to the historical fact that in the past the principal Churches of the East have erred, mentioning the three great patriarchates, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, and maintains that similarly the Roman Church

worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread," etc. XXXII. "That person which is *rightly* (rite) cut off," etc. XXXVI. "We decree all such to be *rightly* (rite) and orderly consecrated." Thus the sacraments may be *duly* ministered (recte), *i.e.* they may be *valid*, and yet something wanting for what Hooker calls their "ecclesiastical perfection" (bk. V. lxii. 15).

¹ A question is sometimes raised here concerning the Church of Rome in consequence of the denial of the cup to the laity. Can it be said that the sacraments are duly ministered where this practice is followed? And if not, what about the claims of the Church of Rome to be regarded as a branch of Christ's Church at all? As is shown below, there is really no sort of question that the Church of England *does* recognise the Church of Rome as a true branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and therefore this clause of the Article cannot have been intended to exclude her. And since where the cup is denied to the laity the sacrament, though mutilated in the administration, is yet valid, both parts being duly consecrated, it may be said that the sacraments "be duly (recte) administered," etc.

has also "erred." No particular errors are specified in any case; but it is not difficult to point to periods during the great Arian controversy when each of the three Eastern Churches mentioned in the Article fell into serious errors. Thus the Church of Antioch went wrong at the Council of the Dedication in 341, when a defective creed acceptable to the Arians was accepted in lieu of the Nicene faith.¹ The Church of Alexandria certainly "erred" when Athanasius was in banishment, and Gregory or George of Cappadocia ruling the See.² The Church of Jerusalem was also infected with Arianism for a considerable time.³ In the same way the Article states that the Church of Rome has erred in the past. She erred when her Bishop Liberius accepted an Arian creed;⁴ when Zosimus vindicated Pelagius;⁵ and when Honorius accepted the Monothelite heresy.⁶ Later examples of errors might easily be given, but it is probable that those who compiled the Articles were thinking of these earlier ones, and pointing to well-known and admitted facts of history as establishing the general statement that the Church of Rome was liable to error, and as sufficient to justify them for not accepting as necessarily correct the decisions of the Council of Trent. In view of this Council, and any possible decisions that might emanate from it, it was important that the Church of England should make her own position clear, and state beforehand the grounds which she felt would justify her in declining (if necessary) to submit when Rome had formally spoken. The Council, it will be remembered, was

¹ See Bright's *History of the Church*, p. 47.

² *Ib.* pp. 48, 79.

³ Cyril of Jerusalem was originally appointed by the Semi-Arians, and only gave in his adhesion to the Nicene faith about the year 362. See for the Arianism of the Church of Jerusalem, Hort's *Two Dissertations*, p. 92 *seq.*

⁴ Bright, *op. cit.* p. 87.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 237.

⁶ See Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 427 *seq.*

actually being held when the Articles were drawn up. Fourteen sessions had been held between 1546 and 1551, and among the subjects on which decrees had been passed were the Holy Scriptures (the Apocrypha being declared to be canonical in the fourth session), original sin and justification (sessions five and six), the number and nature of the sacraments (sessions seven to fourteen). It is possible, therefore, that these are referred to in our Article, but it is obviously impossible that the decrees of the Council on Communion in both kinds, or on Purgatory and kindred subjects, or the creed of Pope Pius IV. can have been intended, as these were not drawn up for some years after the Articles were issued.

That the clause before us is not intended to condemn the Roman Church as apostate is clear from the language used. For this the language employed must have been far stronger. The Roman Church is spoken of as a "Church," though an erring one; and although painfully strong language has sometimes been used of that Communion by individuals within the English Church, identifying it with Antichrist and the Babylon of the Apocalypse, yet this has been only the language of individuals. The position formally taken up by the Church of England has never wavered. While lamenting the errors of the Church of Rome, she has never maintained that they amount to apostasy, or destroy her claim to be regarded as a branch of Christ's Church. So in the *Institution of a Christian Man* (1537) it is said that the "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," and "all the particular Churches in the world, which be members of this Catholic Church, may all be called apostolical Churches, as well as the Church of Rome, or any other Church wherein the apostles themselves were

sometime resident."¹ But an even more convincing proof than language such as this is to be found in the fact that the English Church accepts the Orders of the Church of Rome, and has never denied the priesthood of, or attempted to reordain, any Roman priests who have sought admission to her Communion. If the Church of Rome were regarded as apostate, her ordinations could never be accepted as conveying a valid commission. The fact, then, that they are so accepted in the English Church is conclusive on this point, and further argument is needless. Some words of Hooker may, however, be cited in conclusion, as summing up the whole matter with clearness and fairness.

"The Church of Christ, which was from the beginning, is and continueth unto the end: of which Church all parts have not been always equally sincere and sound. . . . In S. Paul's time the integrity of Rome was famous; Corinth many ways reprov'd; they of Galatia much more out of square. In S. John's time Ephesus and Smyrna in far better state than Thyatira and Pergamus were. We hope, therefore, that to reform ourselves, if at any time we have done amiss, is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were of before. In the Church we were, and we are so still. Other differences between our estate before and now we know none, but only such as we see in Judah; which having sometime been idolatrous became afterwards more

¹ *Formularies of Faith*, p. 55. In the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man* (1543), the passage is rewritten, but the recognition of the Church of Rome is equally clear. "The Church of England, Spain, Italy, and Poole be not separate from the unity, but be one Church in God." "The Church of Rome, being but a several Church, challenging that name of *Catholic* above all other, doeth great wrong to all other Churches . . . for that Church hath no more right to that name than the Church of France, Spain, England, or Portugal," etc.—*Op. cit.* p. 247.

soundly religious by renouncing idolatry and superstition. . . . The indisposition, therefore, of the Church of Rome to reform herself must be no stay unto us for performing our duty to God; even as desire of retaining conformity with them would be no excuse if we did not perform that 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, in like sort with Rome we dare not communicate concerning sundry her gross and 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; and our hearty prayer unto God Almighty is, that being conjoined so far forth with them, they may at the length (if it be His will) so yield to frame and reform themselves, that no distraction remain in anything, but that we ‘all may with one heart and one mouth glorify God, the Father of our Lord and Saviour,’ whose Church we are.”¹

¹ *Eccl. Polity*, bk. III. ch. i. § 10.

ARTICLE XX.

De Ecclesiæ Autoritate.

Habet Ecclesia Ritus statuendi jus, et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem, quamvis Ecclesiæ non licet quicquam instituere, quod verbo Dei scripto adversetur, nec unum Scripturæ locum sic exponere potest, ut alteri contradicat. Quare licet Ecclesia sit divinorum librorum testis et conservatrix, attamen ut adversus eos nihil decernere, ita præter illos nihil credendum de necessitate salutis debet obtrudere.

Of the Authority of the Church.

The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ: yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

THIS Article, with the exception of the first or affirmative clause (The Church . . . controversies of faith), dates from 1553, and is almost identical with a passage in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*.¹ It has not been traced to any earlier source, and there is nothing corresponding to it in the Confession of Augsburg. The affirmative clause first makes its appearance in 1563, and some doubt has been felt with regard to its source

¹ *Ref. Leg. Eccl.*, De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica, c. xi.: “Quamobrem non licet ecclesiæ quicquam constituere, quod verbo Dei scripto adversetur, neque potest sic unum locum exponere ut alteri contradicat. Quanquam ergo divinorum librorum testis sit et custos et conservatrix Ecclesia, hæc tamen prerogativa ei minime concedi debet, ut contra hos libros vel quicquam decernat, vel absque horum librorum testimoniis ullos fidei articulos condat, eosque populo Christiano credendos obtrudat.”

and authority. It is *not* found in the Parker MS. signed by the members of the Upper House of Convocation on Jan. 29, 1563. Nor is it contained in an English "minute" of the Articles among the Elizabethan *State Papers*, dated January 31, 1563.¹ On the other hand, it *is* found in an undated Latin MS. in the *State Papers*, in which it has evidently been introduced *after the original draft was made*.² This is probably the earliest document to contain it, and Hardwick's theory³ is likely to be true, that this is the actual MS. from which the first edition of the Elizabethan Articles was printed, viz. that published by Wolfe, the royal printer, under the direct authority of the Queen herself. Anyhow, this edition contains the clause in question;⁴ and though it is just possible that it was added by the Lower House of Convocation, to which the Articles were submitted after acceptance by the Upper House, yet there is a strong probability that it was inserted by the Queen herself in the exercise of her royal prerogative. However, it was undoubtedly deficient in full synodical authority, and, consequently, some MS. copies of the Articles, as well as some printed editions, omit it.⁵ Of these the most important is the English edition printed by Jugge and Cawood in 1563, to which the Act of Parliament of 1571, requiring subscription to the Articles, made

¹ "Domestic," vol. xxvii. 40.

² *Ib.* 41 A. "The disputed clause in Article XX., filling just one line and somewhat overcrowding the page, was clearly introduced in the same hand after the first draft was made."—Hardwick, p. 140.

³ *Articles*, p. 140.

⁴ *Cf.* p. 31.

⁵ *E.g.* it is omitted (1) in an English draft of the Articles among the *State Papers* ("Domestic," 41), endorsed, "Articles of Religion agreed on, 1562, in the Convocation hous"; (2) in an English MS. signed by the bishops in the Convocation of 1571; (3) in the English edition of Jugge and Cawood of 1563 alluded to in the text; and (4) in one Latin and one English edition of Jugge and Cawood in 1571. See Hardwick, p. 142.

reference.¹ It would appear certain, however, that at the final revision of 1571, if not earlier, the clause was ratified by Convocation;² for when the charge was raised against Archbishop Laud at his trial, that he had himself added the clause to the Articles without the slightest authority, *a transcript attested by a notary public from the original records of Convocation was produced containing the words in question*.³ The records of Convocation unfortunately perished in the great fire of London in 1666; but there is no possible room for doubting that this Article as found in them *did* contain the clause. As Hardwick says, "the testimony of that record was produced upon the trial of Archbishop Laud, in the most open and explicit manner, at a time when it was perfectly accessible to his accusers, or was rather in the hands of his infuriated enemies, and yet 'not one of them ever ventured to question the truth of the assertion, or attempted to invalidate the proofs on which his defence had rested.'"⁴

The words of the disputed clause, it might be added, are (like so many of the additions of 1563) probably suggested by similar language used in the Confession of Würtemberg: "Credimus et confitemur quod . . . hæc ecclesia habeat jus judicandi de omnibus doctrinis."⁵

The object of the clause, and indeed of the whole Article, is to state definitely the powers and offices of the Church, with special reference to (a) the errors of

¹ *Cf.* p. 43.

² At his trial Archbishop Laud stated publicly that "'tis plain that after the stir about subscription in the year 1571 the Articles were settled and subscribed unto at last, as in the year 1562, with this clause in them for the Church: for looking further into the records which are in mine own hands, I have found the book of 1563 subscribed by all the Lower House of Convocation in this very year of contradiction, 1571."—Laud's *Works*, vol. vi. p. 68 (A. C. Lib.).

³ Laud, *op. cit.* p. 66.

⁴ *Articles*, p. 144.

⁵ *De Ecclesia*.

the Puritan party, who were inclined to deny to the Church any right to enforce rites or ceremonies beyond those for which "Scripture proof" might be alleged; and (b) the exaggerated view of the authority of the Church in doctrinal matters held by the Romanists, who denied that in the promulgation of necessary doctrine the Church was limited to what was contained in Scripture, or might be proved thereby.

Three main subjects are brought before us in the Article, and require separate consideration—

1. The *legislative* power of the Church with regard to rites or ceremonies.
2. The *judicial* authority of the Church with regard to doctrine.
3. The office of the Church with regard to Holy Scripture.

I. *The Legislative Power of the Church with regard to Rites or Ceremonies.*

The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, that is, she may from time to time make new ones, if she deem it expedient, or she may decree to retain old ones in the face of opposition, or change and abolish existing ones. This power may fairly be called "legislative," and it is analogous to the power exercised in the State by Crown and Parliament, which make new laws and abolish old ones. It was noticed under the last Article that the word "Church" was somewhat ambiguous, being sometimes used for the Church universal and sometimes for any particular or national Church; and the question may be raised in which of these two senses is it here employed. The answer is found by a reference to the last clause of Article XXXIV., which (like the clause before us) was added

in 1563: "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." This merely amplifies the clause now under consideration, and makes it clear that we are to understand it as referring to the power of national or particular Churches, and vindicating the right of the Church of England to such action as was taken from time to time in the revision of the services of the Church. As historical instances, then, of the exercise of this power, we may point to (a) the renewal of the baptismal vow prefixed to Confirmation, a new rite decreed for the first time in 1662; (b) the retention of the sign of the Cross, in face of much opposition, in 1604; and (c) the abolition of the "chrism," or white vesture, given to the newly baptized in token of the innocency granted to them in baptism. This was retained in the first English Prayer Book in 1549, but dropped at the next revision in 1552. In each of these cases the local or national Church exercised the power inherently belonging to it. But the power is not unlimited; and after stating *what* the power is, the Article proceeds to add two restraining clauses, keeping it within certain well-defined limits.

(a) **It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written.**

(b) **It ought not to decree anything against the same.**

It will be noticed that the rites or ceremonies decreed need not receive any positive support from Scripture. All that is required is that there should be nothing in them that is opposed to or condemned by Scripture. An illustration may make this clear; and a convenient one is furnished by Dean Goulburn. The Church, in the exercise of her legislative power, might add to the

Book of Common Prayer a new office of thanksgiving on the occasion of the harvest. No scriptural authority need be asked for. But if into such an office "it were proposed to insert some words of adoration to the holy angels as being very possibly the ministers of natural blessings to mankind, this would be a flagrant stretch of the Church's prerogative, since S. Paul condemns the worshipping of angels; and when S. John fell down to worship at the feet of an angel, the being to whom the homage was offered replied, 'See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant.'"¹ It was here that the Puritans went wrong, as they objected to many of the ceremonies of the Church, not because they were contrary to Scripture, but simply because they were not based upon Scripture. To demand "Scripture proof," however, in such matters is seriously to mistake the purpose and object of the Scriptures. They were given "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness" (2 Tim. iii. 16), *i.e.* for moral and doctrinal purposes, not as a guide or directory in matters of ritual. In these the Church possesses the power which is conceded to every society to make rules for the guidance of its own members. The existence of such a power is assumed throughout Scripture. It obviously belonged to the Jewish Church. Although there was an elaborate ritual and ceremonial law with stated feasts ordained by God Himself, yet the Jewish Church claimed and exercised the power to add other feasts, such as Purim and Dedication, to those of Divine appointment. Our Lord's words, "The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat: all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe" (S. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3), imply that power to make regulations still remained with the authorities; and we see from the Acts and the Epistles

¹ Goulburn's *Holy Catholic Church*, p. 212.

that when the Christian Church was established, such powers were exercised from the first in it as occasion required. Thus we find S. Paul incidentally laying down definite regulations in his Epistles on various details, *e.g.* that men are to worship with the head uncovered, women with the head covered (1 Cor. xi.); on the conduct of public worship by the prophets (1 Cor. xiv. 27); that women are to keep silence in the churches (1 Cor. xiv. 34; cf. 1 Tim. ii. 12). He lays down the general principle, "Let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40), and appeals to the "custom" of the Churches as if it were final and decisive, and individuals ought to conform to it. "If any man seemeth to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God" (1 Cor. xi. 16).

These passages are sufficient to prove that it was understood from the first that such legislative power was vested in the Church; and it would be superfluous to prove at length that it has in all ages been exercised by national Churches, and that different customs have been followed in different places. Three quotations may, however, be appended in order to show how the matter was regarded in early times.

In his famous "letter to Januarius," Augustine, after speaking of the sacraments, and some things "which we hold on the authority, not of Scripture, but of tradition, and which are observed throughout the whole world," *e.g.* Good Friday, Easter Day, etc., proceeds as follows:—

"There are other things, however, which are different in different places and countries, *e.g.* some fast on Saturday, others do not; some partake daily of the Body and Blood of Christ, others receive it on stated days; in some places no day passes without the sacrifice being offered, in others it is only on Saturday and Sunday, or it may be only on Sunday. In regard to these and all other variable observances which may be met anywhere, one is

at liberty to comply with them or not as he chooses; and there is no better rule for the wise and serious Christian in this matter than to conform to the practice which he finds prevailing in the Church to which it may be his lot to come. For such a custom, if it is clearly not contrary to the faith nor to sound morality, is to be held as a thing indifferent, and ought to be observed for the sake of fellowship with those among whom we live." He then goes on to describe his mother's perplexity when she first came to Milan and found that the Church there did not fast on Saturday; and gives the advice of S. Ambrose, which, he says, "I have always esteemed, as if I had received it by an oracle from heaven": "When I visit Rome I fast on Saturday; when I am here I do not fast. On the same principle, do you observe the custom prevailing in whatever Church you come to, if you desire neither to give offence by your conduct nor to find cause of offence in another's."¹

Rather later than this the ecclesiastical historian Socrates set himself to catalogue as far as possible "the diversity of customs in the Churches," with regard not only to the Lenten fast, but also to the great "variation in the services performed in church," and other matters; remarking in conclusion that "it would be difficult, if not impossible, to give a complete catalogue of all the various customs and ceremonial observances in use throughout every city and country."²

Lastly, in answer to the question of Augustine of Canterbury, "Whereas the faith is one and the same, are there different customs in different Churches, and is one custom of Masses observed in the holy Roman Church and another in the Gallican Church?" Pope Gregory the Great replied as follows: "You know, my brother, the custom of the Roman Church, in which you remember you

¹ *Ad inquisitiones Januarii*, Ep. liv.

² Socrates, *H. E.* V. c. xxii.

were bred up. But it pleases me, that if you have found anything either in the Roman or in the Gallican or in any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same, and sedulously teach the Church of the English, which is as yet new in the faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several Churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Choose, therefore, from each Church those things that are pious, religious, and correct, and when you have, as it were, made them up into one body, let the minds of the English be accustomed thereto."¹

It is clear from these citations that the English Church is in complete harmony with the Church of earlier days when she not only asserts that "the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies," but further maintains that "every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."²

¹ Bæda, *H. E.* I. c. xxvii.

² The theory, as stated in the Article, is perfectly clear, and represents the position from which the Church has never swerved. It is to *the Church*, not to the civil power, Parliament or Crown, that this "power" belongs. But in a Church by law established, it cannot be denied that there are grave practical difficulties in the way of exercising it. The Book of Common Prayer having been actually attached to an Act of Parliament, of which it forms a part, it is plain that, as a matter of fact, it cannot be in any way altered without the consent of that authority which gave coercive power to enforce its use. But it is equally clear that this authority, viz. Parliament, has no sort of moral right to attempt to alter it, except at the wish of the Church which first prepared and accepted it, and then presented it to Parliament to be attached to the Act of Uniformity; and the constitutional method of proceeding in the case of any "rites or ceremonies" to be decreed, is very clearly laid down in "the Royal Declaration" still prefixed to the Articles. "If any difference arise about the external policy concerning the *Injunctions, Canons*, and other *Constitutions* whatsoever thereto belonging, the clergy in their Convocation is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave under

II. *The judicial Authority of the Church with regard to Doctrine.*

The Church . . . hath authority in controversies of faith.

(a) This "authority" is altogether distinct in kind from the "power" which has just been considered. The "power" is *legislative*, and includes the right to make new ceremonies, to change and abolish old ones. The "authority" is *judicial*. It is not the right to make a single new Article of faith, but simply *authority in a doctrinal controversy to pronounce what the true doctrine is.*¹ And since, in the words of Article VI., "Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation," it is clear that the words mean that to the Church belongs the function of interpreting the Scripture, and deciding what the true meaning of it may be. This is strictly "judicial" authority, analogous to the power vested in the judges of interpreting the laws of the country. While the laws are made by the Crown with assent of Parliament, yet, when once a law has been placed on the Statute Book, Parliament has no power whatever to say what it means. Indeed, the legislators may have intended one thing, but if they have our Broad Seal so to do; and we approving their said Ordinances and Constitutions, providing that none be made contrary to the laws and customs of the land."

¹ Cf. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. V. c. viii. § 2: "The Church hath authority to establish that for an order at one time which at another time it may abolish, and in both may do well. But that which in doctrine the Church doth now deliver as a truth, no man will say that it may hereafter recall, and as rightly avouch the contrary. Laws touching matter of order are changeable by the power of the Church; Articles concerning doctrine not so."

expressed their meaning badly, it may turn out that they have passed something quite different, for to the judges alone belongs the power of interpreting the words of the statute and saying what they really involve. Just so, in the matter of necessary doctrine, the laws, so to speak, are contained in the written Scriptures; but, as human language is never quite free from ambiguity, an interpreter of them is required, and this is provided for us in "the Church," which "hath authority in controversies of faith." Instances of the exercise of this judicial authority are to be found in the dogmatic decisions of the General Councils defining the faith of the Church; and no better example can be given to illustrate how the authority differs from the legislative power than what occurred at Nicæa. Two questions came before the assembled Fathers for decision: (1) the faith of the Church in our Lord's Divinity, and (2) the time for the celebration of the Easter festival. In regard to the former they simply claimed to lay down what the faith as contained in the Scriptures really was. They did not make a new doctrine. In regard to the latter, they laid down a new rule to govern the Church for the future. The distinction is pointed out by Athanasius himself in a well-known passage. "Without prefixing consulate, month, and day, they wrote concerning Easter: 'It seemed good as follows'; for it did then seem good that there should be a general compliance in this matter. But concerning the faith they wrote not 'It seemed good,' but 'Thus the Catholic Church believes'; and thereupon they confessed how they believed, in order to show that their own sentiments were not novel but apostolical; and what they wrote down was no discovery of theirs, but the same as was taught by the apostles."¹

(b) That this authority belongs to the Church would

¹ Athanasius, *De Synodis*, § 5.

seem to follow of necessity from many passages of Scripture. Unless the Church possesses it, it would be impossible for her to exercise properly the function of teaching which is distinctly laid upon her. She is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15). The power of "binding and loosing"¹ was granted to her by the Lord Himself (S. Matt. xviii. 18). It was exercised at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), when the question was raised whether circumcision was to be enforced upon Gentile converts, and the decision was arrived at under the guidance of the Holy Spirit ("it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," ver. 28) that there was no necessity for it. S. Paul charges Timothy to "hold the pattern of sound words" which he had received from him (2 Tim. i. 13); to "present himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth" (ii. 15); to "shun vain babblings"; to "charge others that they strive not about words, to no profit, to the subverting of them that hear them" (*ib.*); to "refuse ignorant and foolish questions" (ver. 23); to "reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and teaching, for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine" (iv. 2). To Titus he writes that the bishop is to "hold the faithful word which is according to the teaching, that he may be able both to exhort in the sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers" (i. 9); vain talkers are to be "reproved sharply, that they may be sound in the faith, not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men" (ver. 13); he is to "shun foolish questionings and genealogies" (iii.

¹ J. Lightfoot (*Horæ Hebraicæ* on S. Matt. xvi. 19) shows very fully that to "bind" and "loose" were familiar Jewish expressions for to forbid and allow. It is perhaps scarcely necessary to add that this power, given first to S. Peter in xvi. 19, but extended to the Church generally in xviii. 18, is entirely different from the power of retaining and remitting sins given in S. John xx. 23.

10), and to "reject a man that is heretical after the first and second admonition" (*ib.*). All such language as this plainly implies a power of discrimination, and authority to judge and decide between the truth and falsehood. Unless the Church and her representatives possess such authority, who is to say what is "the sound doctrine" which is to be taught? or who can tell which is "the man that is heretical," and which the man that is orthodox?

(c) It was shown above that the "power to decree rites or ceremonies" might be exercised by national Churches, and that it is not necessary that ceremonies should be everywhere the same. With regard to this "authority in controversies of faith," the case is obviously different. Although "particular and national Churches" have frequently exercised this authority, yet it has always been subject to the judgment of the whole Church, and liable to revision by this. To the whole Church it is that the presence of Christ is pledged (S. Matt. xxviii. 19); and to this alone is the promise made that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (S. Matt. xvi. 18). Thus, while on various matters of doctrine the decision was made by local or provincial Councils, before ever the whole Church had an opportunity of expressing her mind,¹ yet only so far as these local decisions have subsequently been found to be in accordance with the mind of the universal Church have

¹ Thus the Council of Constantinople (381), which condemned Apollinarianism and Macedonianism, was not apparently summoned as a *General* one, but has only come to be so regarded in consequence of its subsequent acceptance by the whole Church. *Local* Councils were naturally summoned to condemn Montanism (Eusebius, *H. E.* v. xvi.); for in the second century no others were possible. But even after the age of *General* Councils had begun, local ones frequently considered and decided on doctrinal questions, *e.g.*, in the case of Pelagianism, it was at once condemned by the Council of Carthage, 412,

they been regarded as binding. In the present unhappy and abnormal state of a divided Christendom it is, of course, impossible to obtain a judgment from the *whole* Church on any matter in dispute; but it must always be remembered that while the English Reformers in the sixteenth century claimed and exercised this "authority," as is shown by the promulgation of the Articles, yet they did this *subject to their appeal to a free General Council*, which Cranmer and his colleagues never entirely lost sight of.¹

(d) But this "authority in controversies of faith" which belongs to the Church is not unlimited; and just as the Article stated two constitutional checks on the legislative power, so also it lays down two definite limitations to the judicial power.²

(1) **The Church may not so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.**

(2) **Besides the same (Holy Scripture), ought it**

¹ See Cranmer's "Remains" (Parker Society), i. pp. 224 and 455.

² The following arrangement of the Article will show the bearing of the several clauses, the exact force of which is often missed, and (so far as I am aware) not noticed in any of the commentaries on the Articles:—

The Legislative Power.

The Judicial Authority.

The Church hath

(1) power to decree rites or ceremonies, and

(2) authority in controversies of faith.

And yet it is not lawful for the Church

(1a) to ordain anything contrary to God's word written;

(2a) neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.

Wherefore

although the Church be a witness and a keeper

of Holy Writ,

yet as

(1b) it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so

(2b) besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

These limitations follow naturally from the position claimed for Holy Scripture in Article VI., and would seem to require no further comment or illustration here.

(e) But there are difficult questions which it is possible to raise concerning the exercise of the authority thus limited, which it may be well briefly to consider. Who is to decide whether the Church has exceeded the powers thus conceded to her? And what is to be done if it should appear that as a matter of fact she has exceeded them? On these points the Article is silent. They raise the whole subject of the relation of Church authority to private judgment. Obviously there is no other body or society on earth with the right of reviewing the judgments of the Church and pronouncing upon them. But still the case may occur when it appears to some individuals, perhaps only to a very few, that the judgment of the Church is wrong. To say that it is an impossibility that God would allow His Church thus to err, is to be untrue to the whole teaching of history. There was a time when "the world groaned and found itself Arian," and when Athanasius stood *contra mundum*; and what has occurred once may occur again. With our eyes, then, open to the teaching of history, we cannot insist that a man *must* bow to the judgment of the Church. He is not called on to accept as truth that which his deliberate conviction tells him is false. While he will rightly and naturally give the greatest weight to the judgment thus expressed, feeling that it is far more probable that he should be mistaken than that the whole Church should be wrong, yet in the last resort he himself must be the judge. He must be true to his conscientious and candid convictions. The right of

private judgment is inalienable. He cannot divest himself of it.¹ "To his own master he standeth or falleth." He will feel in his inmost heart with Liberius before his fall, when taunted with the fact that he was the sole Western champion of the Catholic faith, that "the cause of the faith is none the worse because he happens to be left alone,"² and "with a sorrowful heart" will "refer all to God."³ And, if the future may be prophesied from the past, it will always be found that the error is of no long duration, and that the truth which has been kept alive by the few faithful ones in a period of general falling away, will presently be accepted by the Church at large, and recognised as "the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints."

III. *The Office of the Church with regard to Holy Scripture.*

There is one clause of the Article on which nothing has yet been said, viz. that which states that **the Church is a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ.** A twofold office is here assigned to her. She is (a) a *witness*, as testifying to us what books are to be regarded as Scripture, for "in the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical books of the Old Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church" (Article VI.), and also as declaring to us what is the meaning of Scripture; for, as we have already seen, she "hath authority in controversies of faith." Besides this, she is (b) a *keeper* of holy writ; for just as to the Jews of

¹ Cf. Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 46 seq.

² Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. II. c. xvi.

³ Cf. William of Occam, *Dial.* bk. V. par. i. c. 23. I owe this and the previous reference to *The Church Historical Society Lectures*, Series ii. p. 78, a valuable lecture on the "Teaching Power of the Church," by Professor W. E. Collins.

old "were committed the oracles of God" (Rom. iii. 2), so now that there is a "New Testament" as well as an "Old," the completed Canon is to be regarded as a treasure committed to the custody of the Church, who is responsible for preserving it entire, and free from admixture with other books, as well as for transmitting it and proclaiming it to each generation in turn. It is in these ways that the Church fulfils her office as "a witness and a keeper of holy writ," and from what has now been said the respective offices of the Church and Holy Scripture may be clearly seen. The Church is the ordained *teacher* of truth; Holy Scripture is the *criterion* of truth by which the doctrines of the Church are proved and tested. To make Scripture, in the first instance, the teacher, is entirely to mistake its true office and function. The Gospels were written, not to convert unbelievers, but that those who had been already orally instructed (*i.e.* who had received the teaching of the Church) might know the certainty of those things which they had been taught.¹ So also the Epistles were addressed to regularly organised Churches, and were written to confirm those who had previously received apostolic teaching. Indeed, it is everywhere the case that "the Bible assumes the existence of a living instructor in the truth, who will indoctrinate us into the rudiments of it, and refer us to the Scriptures themselves for the proof of what he teaches. If the instructor is dispensed with, and the disciple thrown back merely on the Bible and his natural faculties, he will be very liable to stumble, and almost certain to do so as regards those more recondite definitions of doctrine which the Church's experience of heresies has shown her to be necessary, and has taught her to make."² These offices of "the

¹ See S. Luke i. 1-4.

² Goulburn's *Holy Catholic Church*, p. 294.

Church to teach, the Bible to prove," may be illustrated from the incident recorded in Acts viii. 26-40. The Ethiopian eunuch was "sitting in his chariot, and was reading the prophet Isaiah." He was, then, in possession of the Scriptures, and, according to the rather foolish saying, "the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants," these ought to have been sufficient for him. But plainly they were not; for in answer to Philip's question, "Understandest thou what thou readeſt?" the answer is returned, "How can I, except someone should guide me?" and this is followed by the further question, "Of whom speaketh the prophet this? Of himself, or of some other?" Something more was needed than the possession of the Scriptures, and that something was supplied by Philip, the representative of the *ecclesia docens*, who "opened his mouth, and beginning from this scripture preached unto him Jesus." Here we see the Church at work, and the right method to be followed, as it is seen throughout the Acts of the Apostles, where we everywhere find them stating the facts, and teaching with authority, while they prove their statements from the Scriptures, and refer their hearers to these as confirming them.¹ And if this method was employed when only the Old Testament was in existence, it seems natural to suppose that much more should it be followed now, when the fuller revelation is also committed to writing.²

¹ See Acts ii. 14-36, iii. 12-26, xiii. 16-42, xvii. 2, 3, 11, xviii. 28.

² See on this subject Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, c. iii. and iv.

ARTICLE XXI

*De autoritate Conciliorum
Generalium.*

Generalia Concilia sine jussu et voluntate principum congregari non possunt, et ubi convenerint, quia ex hominibus constant, qui non omnes spiritu et verbo Dei reguntur, et errare possunt, et interdum errarunt, etiam in his quæ ad normam pietatis pertinent: ideo quæ ab illis constituuntur, ut ad salutem necessaria, neque robor habent, neque auctoritatem, nisi ostendi possint e sacris literis esse desumpta.

*Of the authority of General
Councils.*

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the spirit and word of God) they may err, and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

SINCE the Forty-two Articles were first published in 1553 this Article has remained practically unchanged.¹ But *before publication* a clause had been wisely omitted from the close of it, which, as we find from the MS. signed by the six royal chaplains,² had stood in the original draft: "Possunt reges et pii magistratus, non expectata conciliorum generalium sententia aut convocazione, in

¹ In the *English* edition of 1553 "not only in worldly matters, but also" stood before "in things pertaining unto God." There was nothing corresponding to these words in the Latin, and they were accordingly omitted in 1563. In the Latin "verbis Dei" stood in 1553 and 1563, being altered to the singular "verbo" in 1571.

² *State Papers*, "Domestic," Edward VI. vol. xv. No. 28. Cf. p. 14, and Hardwick, p. 283.