

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.**Of the authority of General
Councils.*

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 robur habent, neque auctoritatem, nisi ostendi possint e sacris literis esse desumpta.

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. 23. Cf. p. 14, and Hardwick, p. 283.

republica sua juxta Dei verbum de rebus religionis constituere." The gravest objection might have been taken to such a clause, and we may be thankful that it was withdrawn before the Articles were published.

Perhaps no Article gains more than this from being read in the light of the history of the time when it was drawn up, and from being illustrated by contemporary documents. Had we nothing but the bare letter of the Article itself to consider, it might be plausibly maintained that by saying that "General Councils have erred," it condemns those Councils which the whole Church has ever revered as truly general, and expressing her mind, such as Nicæa (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451). Nothing, however, is more certain than the fact that no such sweeping condemnation is intended, for contemporary with the Forty-two Articles, and drawn up to a great extent by the very same men who are responsible for them, is the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*;¹ and in this there is a remarkable section which runs parallel with the Article, amplifying its statements, and affording a practical exposition of it, and commentary upon its meaning. It runs as follows:—

"De conciliis quid sentiendum.

"Jam vero conciliis, potissimum generalibus, tametsi ingentem honorem libenter deferimus, ea tamen longe omnia infra Scripturarum canonicarum dignitatem ponenda judicamus: sed et inter ipsa concilia magnum discrimen ponimus. Nam quædam illorum, qualia sunt præcipua illa quatuor, Nicenum, Constantinopolitanum primum, Ephesinum, et Chalcedonense, magna cum reverentia amplectimur et suscipimus. Quod quidem iudicium de

¹ See p. 28 seq.

multis aliis quæ postea celebrata sunt ferimus, in quibus videmus et confitemur sanctissimos patres de beata et summa Trinitate, de Jesu Christo Domino et servatore nostro, et humana redemptione per eum procurata, juxta Scripturas divinas multa gravissime et perquam sancte constituisse. Quibus tamen non aliter fidem nostram obligandam esse censemus, nisi quatenus ex Scripturis sanctis confirmari possint. Nam concilia nonnulla interdum errasse, et contraria inter sese definivisse, partim in actionibus juris, partim etiam in fide, manifestum est. Itaque legantur concilia quidem cum honore atque Christiana reverentia, sed interim ad Scripturarum piam certam rectamque regulam examinentur."¹

The Article must beyond question be interpreted by this longer statement. It is certain, therefore, that it does not intend to cast any slur upon those Councils which are received "magna cum reverentia," but that it uses the term "General Councils" in a loose and popular way, of Councils which claimed to be "general," as well as of those which are truly representative of the mind of the whole Church. The necessity for such an Article is seen in the circumstances of the time. From the early days of Luther, the Reformers, both on the Continent and in England, had persistently appealed to a free General Council, and finally the Pope (Paul III.) had been driven, in 1545, to summon a "General Council." But (1) it was called by the Pope alone, who claimed the right to cite to it, in person or by proxy, the king of England among other Christian princes;² and (2) it consisted only of bishops of the Roman obedience. It was therefore not such a Council as the Reformers could regard as truly "general," or feel themselves compelled

¹ *Ref. Legum Eccles.*, De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica, c. xiv.

² Cf. Dixon's *History of the Church of England*, vol. i. p. 425.

to accept. But in view of the fact that it was actually being held when the Articles were drawn up, and that its decrees were certain to be appealed to as authoritative by the opponents of the Reformation, it was important that in the Anglican formulary a statement should be found, asserting, in terms such as would justify a refusal to be bound by the decisions of Trent, the abstract position maintained with regard to "the authority of General Councils."

Three principal statements are made concerning them—

1. They may not be gathered together without the consent of princes.
2. They are liable to err.
3. As a matter of history they actually have erred.

I. They may not be gathered together without the consent of Princes.

General Councils may not (non possunt) be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. It is sometimes inferred from the Latin "non possunt" that what is here meant is that as a matter of fact they *cannot* be so gathered together. This appears doubtful, for it is more probable that "non possunt" means "cannot lawfully," *i.e.* "may not."¹ But, however this may be, either statement is true, for princes alone have it in their power to compel or to prohibit the attendance of their subjects, and therefore obviously have the right not only to be consulted as a matter of courtesy, but also to say

¹ Cf. Article XX., where "nec exponere potest" is equivalent to "neither may it so expound," and XXXVII., where "Leges civiles possunt," etc. can only mean as the English renders it, "the laws of the realm may punish," etc.

whether a Council shall or shall not be held.¹ As a matter of history there is no question that all the early General Councils were summoned by the Emperor and not by the Pope.² Indeed, the idea of a General Council seems to have originated, not with the Church, but with the Emperor;³ and although, after the decline of the Empire and the division of Europe into several kingdoms, since there was no longer any one supreme power, capable of commanding and enforcing the attendance of bishops from various countries, it was natural that the Pope, whose power was steadily growing, should not only preside at the Council when summoned, but actually issue the invitations to it; yet it stands to reason that even so this could only be properly done with "the consent of princes."⁴

¹ As a matter of fact, even so late as 1870 the various Governments of modern Europe played an important part in determining whether or no the "Vatican Council" should be held. See Purcell's *Life of Archbishop Manning*, vol. ii. c. xvi.

² That of Nicæa by Constantine I.; Constantinople by Theodosius I.; Ephesus by Theodosius II.; Chalcedon, *at the request and instigation of Pope Leo I.*, by Marcian. So the *second* Council of Constantinople (553) was summoned by the Emperor Justinian, and the *third* (680) by Constantine Pogonatus; so also the Synod of Nicæa (787), regarded by both the Greeks and Latins as the seventh General Council, was summoned by the Empress Irene. Thus *every Council* which has any fair claim to represent the undivided Church was called together "with the commandment and will of princes."

³ "The conception of a General Council did not give rise to Nicæa, but *vice versa*," Robertson's *Athanasius*, p. lxxv., and there can be little doubt that the idea of the Council was due to Constantine himself. Cf. *Church Historical Lectures*, Series 2, p. 164.

⁴ So early as 1533 the question was raised in England in consequence of Henry VIII.'s appeal from the Pope to a General Council, and a declaration was put forth signed by nine bishops and four other divines to the effect that though in old times Councils were "called and gathered together by the Emperor's commandment. . . . Yet now, forasmuch that the empire of Rome and the monarchy of the same has no such general dominion, but that many princes have absolute power in their own realms, and a whole entire monarchy, no other prince may by his authority call a General

II. *General Councils are liable to err.*

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. On this matter the verdict of history is conclusive. Had we not the experience of the past to teach us, it might have seemed, *a priori*, probable that God would not have allowed a body that is summoned as representative of the whole Church to err. But as it is, there can be no question on the subject. The record of Councils, summoned as "General" ones and conducted with proper forms, is often a painful one to read; and the exhibitions of human passion and prejudice sometimes exhibited in them have certainly shown that all their members are not necessarily "governed by the spirit of God." Moreover, they have always been treated by the Church as liable to err,¹ for many of them have been reviewed by later Councils, and sometimes their verdicts have been reversed.²

Council" (Collier, *Records*, xxxviii.). Three years later a more authoritative "judgment concerning General Councils" was put forth by Convocation, in which the divines of both houses gave their opinion that "neither the Bishop of Rome ne any one prince, of what estate, degree, or pre-eminence soever he be, may, by his own authority, call, indict, or summon any General Council, without the express consent, assent, and agreement of the residue of Christian princes, and especially such as have within their own realms and seignories *imperium merum*, that is to say, of such as have the whole, entire, and supreme government and authority over all their subjects, without knowledging or recognising of any other supreme power or authority," Burnet, I. ii. p. 301 *seq.*

¹ See the letter of Pope Julius in Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, § 20-25. In this Julius says that it is unreasonable that what has been established by Councils should be set aside by "a few individuals," but treats the decision of Councils as liable to be reviewed by others, referring to the Council of Nicæa as having decided that this should be done (see Robertson's note, *in loc.* and p. lxxvi.).

² Thus the "Latrocinium" was summoned as a General Council, but its decisions were reversed by the Council of Chalcedon, 451. So also in

Thus the Article is perfectly justified, not only in its *second* statement, but also in its *third*.

III. *As a matter of History, General Councils have erred.*

That they sometime have erred, even in things pertaining unto God (etiam in his quæ ad normam pietatis pertinent), is a matter which can easily be shown when it is remembered that the Article is referring to any Councils which claimed to be General. Thus Ariminum and Seleucia were summoned as General Councils representative of the whole Christian world, but they went fatally wrong "even in things pertaining to God." The same is true of many later Councils; and if the position taken up in Articles VI. and XX. with regard to Holy Scripture is sound, there can be no doubt that the closing words of the Article now under consideration are justified, and that **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.**

The language of the Article itself and all that has here been said in the commentary upon it, is, of course, only *one side* of the whole truth about Councils, and that the least pleasant to dwell upon. It must never be forgotten that there is another side, and that the Church owes very much to the work of Councils which were truly "General" and representative. Nor has the Church of England been slow to acknowledge this. The language of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* has

the Iconoclastic Controversy, the seventh Council of Constantinople (754) condemned image-worship; but its decrees were reversed by the second Council of Nicæa, which sanctioned the practice in 787. Frankfort (794) condemned the practice, but the eighth of Constantinople (869) sanctioned it.

been already cited. The Homily "Against peril of Idolatry" speaks of the six Councils which were allowed and received of all men; and it may be added that by an Act of Parliament passed in the first year of Elizabeth's reign it was determined that "nothing is to be adjudged heresy, but that which heretofore has been so adjudged by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or the first four General Councils, or some other General Council, wherein the same has been declared heresy by the express word of Scripture."¹

The question remains, How is it to be known whether a Council is truly "General" and representative of the mind of the whole Church? To this it is believed that no answer can be returned *at the moment*. However large may be the number of the bishops present, no guarantee is thereby afforded that they faithfully represent the mind of the universal Church. That which alone can show this, is the *after-reception of the decisions of the Council by the different parts of the Church*. Where the decisions win their way to universal acceptance, there we have the needful guarantee that the Council has faithfully reflected the mind of the universal Church, and we may well be content to believe that the Council has not erred. But "the inerrancy of a Council can never be guaranteed at the moment. The test of the value of a Council is its after-reception by the Church."²

¹ 1 Eliz. cap. 1. Some Anglican divines, as Hooker and Andrews, seem to recognise but *four* General Councils; others, as Field and Hammond, recognise *six*. See Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, part IV. c. ix.

² Bishop Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 298. On this, which is sometimes called the Gallican theory of the test of the authority of General Councils, see Sir W. Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, part IV. c. vii.; R. L. Ottley, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, vol. i. p. 321 *seq.*; and *Church Historical Society Lectures*, series 2, p. 147 *seq.*

ARTICLE XXII

De Purgatorio.

Doctrina Romanensium de Purgatorio, de Indulgentiis, de veneratione et adoratione tum Imaginum tum Reliquiarum, nec non de invocatione Sanctorum, res est inutilis, inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innititur, imo verbo Dei¹ contradicit.

Of Purgatory.

The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping, and Adoration, as well of Images, as of Reliques, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.

THIS Article differs in one important point from the original one as first published in 1553, for in that the teaching condemned was termed "the doctrine of school-authors" (*doctrina scholasticorum*). The effect of the substitution of "the Romish doctrine" (*doctrina Romanensium*, 1563) for this is to make the Article condemn a *present* current form of teaching rather than the formal system of doctors whose day was past.²

There is another matter in the history of the Article which deserves to be noticed, viz. that in the Article as originally drafted was included a condemnation of the scholastic doctrine *de precatone pro defunctis*. These words are found in the MS. signed by the six royal chaplains,³

¹ The edition of 1553 has "perniciose contradicit"; but the adverb was struck out in 1563, there being nothing corresponding to it in the English Article.

² "The words 'Romanenses' and 'Romanistæ' were already used as far back as 1520 by Luther and Ulrich von Hutten, to designate the extreme mediæval party."—Hardwick, p. 410.

³ See above, p. 13 and p. 529.

but they disappeared before the Article was published,—a fact which is highly significant, as it shows that the Church of England deliberately abstained from seeming to express any condemnation of the practice of praying for the departed, and that it is impossible to strain the words of this Article on Purgatory to indicate such a condemnation.¹

With regard to the doctrines here condemned, it is important to bear in mind that when the Article was originally drawn up, and even when it was revised and republished in 1563, none of them had been considered by the Council of Trent. The Article cannot, then, have been deliberately aimed at the formal decrees of that Council; and, as a matter of fact, the decrees on these particular subjects, which were published during the last session of the Council in December 1563, were drawn up with studied moderation, and some of the strong language of our Article could hardly be truthfully said to apply to the doctrine as stated in them, though it certainly was not one whit too strong in its condemnation of the current practice and teaching which the Reformers had before them. It will be convenient at this point to quote so much of the Tridentine decree as bears on the subject before us, as the language used in it bears striking testimony to the existence of the errors which called forth the vigorous protest of our own Reformers.

On *Purgatory* the decree simply lays down that “there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there retained are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful, but chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar.” It then proceeds: “Among the uneducated vulgar, let the more difficult and subtle questions, and those which tend not to edifi-

¹ It follows from this that the subject of prayer for the departed does not come before us for consideration here. Reference may, however, be made to an article on “the Church of England and Prayers for the Departed” in the *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. x. p. 1.

cation, and seldom contribute aught towards piety, be kept back from popular discourses. Neither let them suffer the public mention and treatment of uncertain points, or such as look like falsehood. But those things which tend to a certain kind of curiosity or superstition, or which savour of filthy lucre, let them prohibit as scandals and stumbling-blocks of the faithful.”¹

With regard to *Pardons*, it was stated that as the power of granting indulgences was granted by Christ to His Church, the use of them was to be retained; and those were to be anathematised who either assert that they are useless, or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them. “In granting them, however, it desires that, according to the ancient and approved custom in the Church, moderation be observed, lest by excessive facility ecclesiastical discipline be enervated. And desiring the amendment and correction of the abuses which have crept into these matters, and by occasion of which this excellent name of indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, it ordains generally by this decree, that all evil gains for the obtaining of them, whence a most abundant cause of abuses among Christian people has been derived, be utterly abolished. But as regards other matters which have proceeded from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or from any other cause,

¹ “Cum Catholica Ecclesia . . . docuerit Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas, fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari; præcipit sancta Synodus Episcopis ut sanam de Purgatorio doctrinam, a sanctis Patribus et sacris Conciliis traditam, a Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, et ubique prædicari, diligenter studeant. Apud rudem vero plebem difficiliore ac subtiliore quæstiones, quæque ad ædificationem non faciunt, et ex quibus plerumque nulla sit pietatis accessio, a popularibus concionibus secludantur. Incerta item, vel quæ specie falsi laborant, evulgari, ac tractari non permittant. Ea vero, quæ ad curiositatem quamdam, aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tanquam scandala, et fidelium offencula prohibeant.”—*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xxv., *Decretum de Purgatorio*.

since, by reason of the manifold corruptions in the places and provinces where the said abuses are committed, they cannot conveniently be specially prohibited; it commands all bishops diligently to collect all abuses of this nature, and report them in the first provincial synod," etc.¹

On the *adoration of images and relics* it says that due honour and veneration is to be awarded to the images of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and the saints, "not that any virtue or divinity is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped; or that anything is to be asked of them; or that confidence is to be reposed in images, as was done of old by the heathen, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is shown to them is referred to the prototypes which they represent; so that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ, and venerate the saints whose similitude they bear. . . . And if any abuses have crept in amongst these holy and salutary observances, the holy

¹ "Cum potestas conferendi Indulgentias a Christo ecclesiæ concessa sit, atque hujusmodi potestate, divinitus sibi tradita, antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit; sacrosancta Synodus indulgentiarum usum, Christiano populo maxime salutarem et sacrorum Conciliorum auctoritate probatum, in ecclesia retinendum esse docet, et præcipit, eosque anathemate damnat, qui aut inutiles esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in ecclesia potestatem esse negant. In his tamen concedendis moderationem juxta veterem et probatam in ecclesia consuetudinem adhiberi cupit; ne nimia facilitate ecclesiastica disciplina enervetur. Abusus vero, qui in his irrepserunt, quorum occasione insigne hoc Indulgentiarum nomen ab hæreticis blasphematur, emendatos et correctos cupiens, præsentî decreto generaliter statuit pravos quæstus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in Christiano populo abusuum causa fluxit, omnino obolendos esse. Cæteros vero, qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut aliunde quomodo-cumque provenerunt, cum ob multiplices locorum et provincialiter prohiberi; mandat omnibus Episcopis, ut diligenter quisque hujusmodi abusus ecclesiæ suæ colligat, eosque in prima synodo provinciali referat," etc.—*Continuatio Sessionis xxv., Decretum de Indulgentiis.*

Synod earnestly desires that they be utterly abolished; in such wise that no images conducive to false doctrine, and furnishing occasion of dangerous error to the uneducated, be set up. . . . Moreover, in the invocation of saints, the veneration of relics, and the sacred use of images, every superstition shall be removed, all filthy lucre be abolished, finally all lasciviousness be avoided; in such wise that figures shall not be painted or adorned with a wantonness of beauty, nor shall men pervert the celebration of the saints and the visitation of relics into revellings and drunkenness; as if festivals were celebrated to the honour of saints by luxury and wantonness."¹

So on the subject of *invocation of saints* the Council enjoins that the people be taught "that the saints reigning with Christ offer their prayers for men to God, and that it is good and useful to invoke them as suppliants, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help for obtaining benefits from God through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour; and that

¹ "Imaginibus Christi, Deiparæ Virginis, et aliorum sanctorum in templis præsertim habendas et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam, non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis Divinitas, vel virtus, propter quam sint colendæ; vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum; vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda, veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quæ in idolis spem suam collocabant; sed quoniam honos qui eis exhibetur, refertur ad prototypa, quæ illæ representant: ita ut per imagines quæ osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus et procumbimus, Christum adoremus, et sanctos, quorum illæ similitudinem gerunt veneremur. . . . In has autem sanctas et salutare observationes, si qui abusus irrepserint, eos prorsus aboleri sancta Synodus vehementer cupit, ita ut nullæ falsi dogmatis imagines, et rudibus periculosi erroris occasionem præbentes, statuuntur. . . . Omnis porro superstitio in sanctorum invocatione, Reliquiarum veneratione, et imaginum sacro usu tollatur, omnis turpis quæstus eliminetur, omnis denique lascivia vitetur, ita ut procaci venustate imagines non pingantur, nec ornentur, et sanctorum celebratione, et reliquiarum visitatione homines ad comessiones atque ebrietates non abutantur, quasi festi dies in honorem sanctorum per luxum, ac lasciviam agantur."—Sess. xxv. *De Invocatione, etc.*

they think impiously who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invocation of them to pray for each of us in particular is idolatry; or that it is repugnant to the word of God, and is opposed to the honour of the one Mediator between God and men, Christ Jesus; or that it is a fond thing to supplicate orally or inwardly those who reign in heaven.”¹

It is impossible to read these extracts without feeling how gross must have been the abuses which called forth such language, and it would be unfair to neglect to take into account the fact that our own Article was drawn up prior to these definitions and the practical reforms which the Council of Trent endeavoured to bring about. We proceed now to the consideration of the “Romish doctrines” condemned in the Article. Four of them are specified.

1. Purgatory.
2. Pardons.
3. Adoration of images and relics.
4. Invocation of saints.

I. *Purgatory.*

The Romish doctrine of Purgatory . . . is a

1. . . “Docentes eos, sanctos una cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre: bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare, et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per filium ejus Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster Redemptor, et Salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere: illos vero, qui negant sanctos, æterna felicitate in cælo fruentes, invocandos esse; aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idolatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi; vel stultum esse, in cælo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare, impie sentire,” etc.—*Id.*

fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God. It will be convenient to consider this subject under the two following heads: (a) the history of the doctrine; (b) the scriptural arguments on the subject.

(a) *The History of the Doctrine.*—During the first three centuries there are only to be found a few traces of a belief in anything like a purgatory between death and judgment. Three indications of such a belief are all that can fairly be claimed during this period, two of which come to us from the same quarter and from a Montanistic source.

Tertullian in his treatise *De Anima*, written after he had joined the Montanists, says that in Hades (penes inferos) there are rewards and punishments, as may be learnt from the parable of Dives and Lazarus; and as he interprets the words, “Thou shalt not come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing,” to mean that “small offences must be expiated by delay of resurrection,” it is probable that he looked on the punishments as, at any rate, to some extent purgatorial.¹

To the same period belong the Acts of the martyr Perpetua and her companions, and in one of Perpetua’s visions we have what is generally taken to be an indication of a belief in something like a purgatory. Perpetua in her vision sees her brother Dinocrates, who had died early from a gangrene in the face, in a dark place, hot and thirsty, dirty and pale, with the wound still in his face. He is trying in vain to get at the

¹ *De Anima*, c. lviii.: “In summa, cum carcerem illum, quem evangelium demonstrat, inferos intellegimus, et novissimum quadrantem modicum quoque delictum mora resurrectionis illic luendum interpretamur, nemo dubitabit animam aliquid pensare penes inferos salva resurrectionis plenitudine per carnem quoque.” Cf. c. xxxv.

water in a "piscina," the rim of which is above his head. Perpetua, grieving for her brother, prays much for him, and in a subsequent vision she sees him cleansed, well clothed, and refreshed. Only the scar remains where the wound was. The rim of the piscina is lowered to his waist; he drinks out of a golden goblet that never fails, and departs to play after the manner of children with glee. "Then," she adds, "I understood that he was released from punishment."¹

This certainly looks very much like a belief in a purgatory, and it is so understood by Augustine.² But this interpretation of the vision is not unquestioned, as some take it to mean that Dinocrates had died unbaptized, and was therefore in a place of torment.³ If, however, we admit the view that it *does* refer to a purgatory, a vision such as this must be allowed to be a very precarious ground on which to base the doctrine.

The third passage is in the writings of Clement of Alexandria (200), where, in speaking of Hades, he says that "the punishments of God are saving and reformatory, and lead to repentance."⁴

Beyond these it is thought that no passage can fairly be quoted as implying a belief in a purgatory between death and judgment till we come to the fourth century. For though Origen undoubtedly believed in temporary chastisements after death, and in a cleansing by fire, yet this does not seem to have been placed by him *before* the judgment. Rather, it *is* the judgment, through which all men have to pass, and by which those in need of

¹ *Passio S. Perpetuæ*, cs. vii. viii.

² *De Anima ad Renatum*, I. x.

³ It is so taken by Prof. J. Armitage Robinson, *Texts and Studies*, I. p. 29; cf. Dr. Mason's *Lectures on Purgatory, The State of the Faithful Departed, Invocation of Saints* (1901), p. 23.

⁴ *Stromateis*, VI. c. vi. § 46: ἐπεὶ σωτήριοι καὶ παιδευτικοὶ αὐτὸν κολάζουσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ἐπιστροφήν ἀγούσαι. See, further, Mason (*op. cit.*), p. 3 *seq.*

purification are at once both chastened and healed.¹ But there can be no doubt, (1) that the whole Church from the very first practised and encouraged prayers for the departed; and (2) that the judgment day was commonly regarded as a fiery ordeal, such as that spoken of by S. Paul in 1 Cor. iii. 13, through which all would have to pass, some passing through the fire unharmed, others suffering loss, but none failing who were built on the right foundation. This, however, is very different from purgatory. Not only is it placed at the judgment, whereas the purgatorial fire is regarded as cleansing those subjected to it *before* the final award is made at the judgment day, but, further, it is an ordeal through which *all*, the greatest saints and the greatest sinners, will have to pass, while purgatory is not for the saints, who are supposed to pass straight to the beatific vision, nor for those who die out of a state of grace, whose final condemnation is assured, but only for those who die in grace, but in a state of imperfect sanctification.

Nor does prayer for the departed by any means involve of necessity a belief in purgatory. Indeed, many of the prayers of the early Christians are quite inconsistent with it, for they include petitions for the Blessed Virgin and other great saints, of whom no one would venture to maintain that they were in purgatory.

Passing on to the fourth century we still find but few traces of a belief in the doctrine in question, nor is there anything authoritative laid down concerning it. Indeed, the hesitating and varying language employed by S. Augustine early in the fifth century shows clearly that he did not regard it as a formal doctrine of the Church, but only at best as a "pious opinion."² Thus in his *Encheiridion*, published in 416, he speaks of it as "not

¹ See Bp. Westcott in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iv. p. 138.

² Cf. Mason, p. 29 *seq.*

incredible.”¹ But in his great work, *De Civitate Dei*, issued a few years later (426), he speaks more strongly in favour of it, though even here his language is not altogether consistent. In Book XXI. c. xiii., after speaking of the opinion of some who “would have all punishments after death to be purgatorial,” he says definitely that “temporary punishments are suffered by some in this life only, by others after death, by others both now and then; but all of them before the last and strictest judgment. But of those who suffer temporary punishments after death, all are not doomed to those everlasting pains which are to follow that judgment; for to some, as we have already said, what is not remitted in this world is remitted in the next, that is, they are not punished with the eternal judgment of the world to come.”² But after speaking thus positively he elsewhere utters a note of hesitation on the subject, for in c. xxvi. of the same book he writes as follows: “If it be said that in the interval of time between the death of this body and that last day of judgment and retribution which shall follow the resurrection, the spirits of the dead shall be exposed to a fire of such a nature that it shall not affect those who have not in this life indulged in such pleasures and pursuits as shall be consumed like wood, hay, stubble, but shall affect those others who have carried with them structures of that kind—if it be said that such worldliness, being venial, shall be consumed in the fire of tribulation here

¹ *Encheiridion ad Laurent.* c. lxix.

² “Sed temporarias pœnas alii in hac vita tantum, alii post mortem, alii et nunc et tunc, verumtamen ante iudicium illud severissimum novissimumque patiuntur. Non autem omnes veniunt in sempiternas pœnas, quæ post illud iudicium sunt futuræ, qui post mortem sustinent temporales. Nam quibusdam, quod in isto non remittitur, remitti in futuro sæculo, id est, ne futuri sæculi æterno supplicio puniantur, jam supra diximus.”—*De Civitate Dei*, XXI. c. xiii.

only, or here and hereafter both, or here that it may not be hereafter, I do not argue against it, for perhaps it is true.”¹ Plainly there was no formal doctrine of the Church on the subject when a Father of the weight and learning of Augustine could write in this way; and not till a century and a half after his death do we find anything approaching to an assertion with any claim to authority. At the close of the sixth century Gregory the Great, in his “Dialogues,” lays down distinctly that “a purgatorial fire before the judgment for certain light faults is to be believed.”² But even so this is only the dictum of a single writer, however great his authority may be, and it would seem that there is nothing which can be regarded as in any way a judgment of the Church upon the subject till we come to the Council of Florence in 1439. At this Council the representatives of the Greeks were persuaded to admit that “the middle sort of souls were in a place of torment, but whether that were fire or darkness and tempest, or something else, they would not contend,”³ and accordingly, when the decree of union was drawn up, it was asserted in it that “if such as be truly penitent die in the grace of God before they have made satisfaction for their sins by

¹ “Post istius sane corporis mortem, donec ad illum veniatur, qui post resurrectionem corporum futurus est damnationis et remunerationis ultimus dies, si hoc temporis intervallo spiritus defunctorum ejusmodi ignem dicuntur perpeti, quem non sentiant illi qui non habuerunt tales mores et amores in hujus corporis vita, ut eorum ligna, fœnum, stipula consumatur, alii vero sentiant qui ejusmodi secum ædificia portaverunt, sive ibi tantum, sive et hic et ibi, sive ideo hic ut non ibi, sæcularia, quamvis a damnatione venalia, concremantem ignem transitorie tribulationis inveniant, non redarguo, quia forsitan verum est.”—*Op. cit.* c. xxvi.

² “Sed tamen de quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante iudicium purgatorius ignis credendus est. Sed tamen hoc de parvis minimisque peccatis fieri posse credendum est; sicut est assiduus otiosus sermo, immoderatus risus,” etc.—*Dial.* IV. c. xxxix. See, further, Mason, p. 39 seq.

³ “Αἱ δὲ μέσαι ὑπάρχουσι μὲν ἐν βασανιστηρίῳ καὶ εἶτε πῦρ ἐστίν, εἶτε ζόφος καὶ θύελλα, εἶτε τι ἕτερον, οὐ διαφερόμεθα.”—*Concil. Florent.* Sess. xxv.

worthy fruits of penance, their souls are purged after death with purgatorial punishments.”¹ But long before this decree was issued the doctrine had been universally accepted throughout the West, and had assumed a prominence which led to the gravest practical results. The original teaching had been strangely and terribly corrupted. “It had come to take the place of a living faith in the eternal pains of hell in the case of most men: there was a perfect traffic in masses for the souls, and men fancied that by leaving money to the Church at the hour of death and at the expense of their heirs, they might purchase mitigation or exemption from pains which in degree, though not in duration, were said to equal the pains of hell.”² It is, unhappily, only too easy to illustrate the truth of these words from known and admitted facts of history and from documents which were before those who drew up our Articles; but since the existence of such abuses in connection with the doctrine is so universally acknowledged, there is no need to cite evidence of it here.

(b) *The Scriptural arguments on the subject.*—It is now generally admitted by Roman Catholic writers that

¹ “Si vere poenitentes in Dei charitate decesserint, antequam dignis poenitentiae fructibus de commissis satisfecerint et omissis, eorum animas poenis purgatoris post mortem purgari.”—Eugenii IV. *Bulla Unionis*, Labbe and Cossart, vol. vii. p. 422. On the Council of Florence see Plumptre’s *Spirits in Prison*, p. 296 seq., and Creighton’s *History of the Papacy*, vol. ii. p. 179 seq. It is well known how the representatives of the Greeks were received on their return to Constantinople, and how the decrees were rejected throughout the East. But in spite of this the Greek Church of the present day, though not *formally* committed to a doctrine of purgatory, and while guarding itself against the notion of a *material* fire, appears generally to teach that there is a process of purification after death, and that the souls of the departed profit by the Eucharists, prayers, and alms of the living, and are thereby freed from the bonds of Hades. See Plumptre, *l.c.*, and Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 312.

² Bp. Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 309.

there is but little in Holy Scripture which can be quoted as bearing directly upon the doctrine. Of the “twenty passages” of which Bellarmine boasts,¹ there are very few which any controversialist would venture to cite at the present day. Indeed, some of them are so weak (*e.g.* “We went through *fire* and water, and Thou broughtest out into a wealthy place”) that they only indicate into what desperate straits the man who could urge them as serious arguments was driven in order to find any scriptural proof whatever. It is not too much to say that, when once it is recognised that prayer for the departed does not necessarily involve any belief in purgatory,² there are not more than three or four passages which require any consideration whatever.

The following are perhaps the most important, and are sometimes quoted at the present day, as implying a terminable punishment, which is said to be purgatorial only, after death:—

S. Matt. v. 26: “Thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the last farthing.” Cf. S. Luke xii. 59.

S. Matt. xviii. 34: “His lord delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due. So likewise shall also my heavenly Father do unto you,” etc.

S. Matt. xii. 32: “It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come.”

¹ *De Purgatorio*, I. c. xv. The twenty passages are these,—ten from the Old Testament and ten from the New Testament,—2 Macc. xii. 44; Tobit iv. 17; 1 Sam. xxxi. 13; Ps. xxxviii. 1, lxvi. 12; Is. iv. 4, ix. 18; Mic. vii. 8, 9; Zech. ix. 11; Mal. iii. 3; S. Matt. xii. 32; 1 Cor. iii. 12–15, xv. 29; S. Matt. v. 25, 26, v. 22; S. Luke xvi. 9, xxiii. 43; Acts ii. 24; Phil. ii. 10; Rev. v. 3. See the discussion of them in *op. cit.* c. iii.—viii.

² 2 Macc. xii. 44 certainly shows the belief of the ancient Jews in the efficacy of prayer for the departed in the first or second century B.C.

In the case of the first two passages cited, it is urged that they place a term to the punishment, and therefore imply a purgatory from which men will at some time be delivered. But such an inference is extremely precarious, and those who rely on it would probably be the last to apply a similar method of arguing to the parallel phrase in S. Matt. i. 25. The exegesis of S. Chrysostom is surely sound, which takes it as a form of expression intended to indicate the perpetual duration of the penalty, *τούτεστι διηρέκως, οὐδέπω γὰρ ἀποδώσει*.¹ While in the case of the third passage, the form of expression is evidently intended as an emphatic way of stating the irremediableness of the condition, and there is nothing in it to warrant the inference that some sins are forgiven in the world to come which are not forgiven in this world.²

There remains the passage in 1 Cor. iii. 10-15; and this, if carefully considered, will be seen to have no bearing whatever on the doctrine. It stands as follows in the Revised Version:—

“According to the grace of God which was given unto me, as a wise master-builder I laid a foundation; and another buildeth thereon. But let each man take heed how he buildeth thereon. For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ, But if any man buildeth on this foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble, each man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide, which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward.

¹ *Hom. in loc.* Cf. Augustine, “Miror si non eam significat poenam que vocatur eterna.”—*De Sermone Domini in Monte*, I. xi.

² See Salmond's *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 380, for a good statement of this.

If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire.”

It is probable that it is from this passage, more than from any other, that the idea of a purgatorial *fire* has arisen. But, as a matter of fact, whatever the passage may mean,—and there are different interpretations of it which are possible,—the one thing it cannot refer to is a purgatory between death and judgment. According to the Apostle, it is “the day” which “is to be revealed in fire” (*ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται*), and such an expression is never used of the intermediate state. It can only refer to the judgment day, or to the day of persecution in this life. It appears to signify the former here; and if so, the Apostle is here regarding the day of judgment as a fiery ordeal which will test the work of Christian ministers. If the structure they have reared be durable, “it shall abide.” If, however, through weakness and incompetence, they have built one of perishable material, it shall be burnt, and the careless builder shall “suffer loss,” even though (since he built on the right foundation) “he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.”¹ This appears to be the general drift of the passage; and, as was said above, it cannot fairly be used in support

¹ Cf. Bp. Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of S. Paul*, p. 193: “That the Apostle does not intend any purgatorial fire by this expression will appear from the following considerations:—(1) Fire is here simply regarded as a destructive agency; there is no trace here of the idea of refining or purging, an attribute elsewhere given to it, as in Mal. iii. 3, though even there the prophet seems to speak of purging the whole nation by destroying the wicked, not of purging sin in the individual man. (2) The whole image implies a momentary effect, and not a slow, continuous process. The Lord shall appear in a flash of light and a flame of fire. The light shall dart its rays into the innermost recesses of the moral world. The flame shall reduce to ashes the superstructure raised by the careless or unskilful builder. The builder himself shall flee for his life. He shall escape, but scorched, and with the marks of the flames about him.”

of the doctrine we are now considering. The fire is *probatory*, not purgatorial; and it is placed at the last day, not in the interval between death and judgment.

Since, then, these passages, which have sometimes been urged in favour of the doctrine, have broken down, it is now generally acknowledged that there is little or nothing directly bearing on the subject in Scripture. The question must, therefore, be decided by broad considerations, and by reference to the general tenor of Scriptural teaching on the state after death, and man's relation to God. In this the following points, which bear on the matter before us, seem to stand out clearly:—

1. *This life* is the time of man's probation; and no countenance is given to the view that a "second chance," or time of probation, is to be looked for after death.¹ "We must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. v. 10). The award will, then, be made for *things done in the body*, *i.e.* in this life.

2. The "dead which die in the Lord" are in a state of peace; "they rest from their labours" (Rev. xiv. 13). So for S. Paul "to depart" is "to be with Christ" (Phil. i. 23). But the dead are not yet made perfect. The souls of the martyrs are represented as "under the altar," and crying unto God—"and there was given them to each one a white robe; and it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little time, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, which should be killed even as they were, should be fulfilled" (Rev. vi. 9-11; cf. Heb. xi. 40).

The teaching summed up under this last head seems

¹ On 1 Pet. iii. 18, which is sometimes referred to in this connection, see p. 170 *seq.*

entirely inconsistent with any notion of a purgatory of pain, to be endured by the great majority of those who die in grace, before they are admitted to the rest of Paradise. But we are told that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. xii. 14); and since the vast mass of the faithful pass out of this life in a state of very imperfect holiness, it is inferred that there is "a place in which souls who depart this life in the grace of God suffer for a time because they still need to be cleansed from venial, or have still to pay the temporal punishment due to mortal, sins, the guilt and the eternal punishment of which have been remitted."¹ In this form the doctrine is stated by modern Romanists. But even in this form (which is very different from the current medieval teaching) it must be rejected as wanting in Scriptural and Patristic authority, as well as because it involves a purgatory of *pain*. That there is *progress* after death would seem to be implied in Scripture;² and it is probable that this may involve a process of gradual purification, only it cannot be said that so much is actually revealed. The possibility remains, that the stains of sin, which cling even to the best, may be removed in the moment of death, so that the sanctification may be complete, "without which no man shall see the Lord." But to many minds it will appear far more probable, and far more in accordance with what we know of God's dealings with men, that as the stains were gradually acquired, and were gradually being removed during this life, so still after death their removal should be gradual. Such a view is certainly not condemned by the terms of the Article before us.³ But

¹ Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 766.

² See Phil. i. 6: "Being confident of this very thing, that He which began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ."

³ Cf. *The Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, vol. ii. p. 336: "Nothing,

even though it should appear to be highly probable, it cannot be regarded as revealed doctrine. It is but a "pious opinion," and not a matter which ought to be taught as part of God's certain truth. We may fairly conclude, with Bishop Andrewes: "Whatever has not a stronger basis in Holy Scripture may have a place among the opinions of the school, which are not without fear of the contrary being true; but among Articles of faith it cannot. Let it therefore occupy its own place; let it be an opinion . . . but let it not pertain to the faith, nay, let it not even be accounted an ecclesiastical doctrine."¹

II. Pardons (*Indulgentiæ*).

The **Romish doctrine of pardons** is so closely connected with the theory of "works of supererogation," that in discussing the fourteenth Article it was necessary to anticipate much that would naturally have found a place here. There is no need to repeat the sketch there given of the growth of the system of granting indulgences; or of the Scriptural arguments against the practice. All that seems to be required here is (a) to give an explanation of the word "indulgences," and (b)

I think, can be clearer than that the Article does *not* condemn *all* doctrine that may be called a doctrine of purgatory. . . . 'Purgatory' is not a word that I should myself spontaneously adopt, because it is associated with Roman theories about the future state for which I see no foundation. But the idea of purgation, of cleansing as by fire, seems to me inseparable from what the Bible teaches us of the Divine chastisements; and though little is said directly respecting the future state, it seems to me incredible that the Divine chastisements should in this respect change their character when this visible life is ended. Neither now nor hereafter is there reason to suppose that they act mechanically as by an irresistible natural process, irrespectively of human will and acceptance." Reference may also be made to Plumptre's *Spirits in Prison*, p. 307 *seq.*; and Mason's *Purgatory*, etc.: Lect. II.

¹ *Responsio ad Bellarminum*, c. viii. p. 287 (A. C. Lib.).

to add a brief description of the "Romish doctrine" against which the terms of the Article are directed.

(a) *The word "Indulgences."*—The word "indulgentia," which was originally used of gentleness and tenderness, had come in the language of the Latin jurisconsults to signify definitely a remission of taxation or of punishment;¹ and in all probability this suggested the technical use of the word which grew up in course of time within the Christian Church. But for centuries before any such technical use can be traced, the word had been a familiar one in Christian circles, in the sense of God's *pardon* and *forgiveness*. It is used in the Vulgate in Is. lxi. 1, "to proclaim liberty to the captives" (et prædicarem captivis *indulgentiam*), as well as in a few other passages;² and is a common word in the writings of the Christian Fathers from the earliest times:³ *indulgentia*, *relaxatio*, *remissio*, and *venia*, all being used generally of the pardon and forgiveness of God, sometimes in connection with the penitential system, and sometimes not. It was shown under Article XIV. that all these words were employed of the formal grants of "pardon" or "indulgence" dispensed by the Pope from the eleventh century onwards; and (probably for the reason stated above) the word "*indulgentiæ*" became in course of time the technical name by which they were known.

In England we find both words, "pardon" and

¹ Ammianus Marcellinus, XVI. v. 16; *Cod. Theod.* IX. xxxiv., *De indulgentiis criminum*.

² *Viz.* Judith viii. 14; Is. lxiii. 7, 9; 1 Cor. vii. 6.

³ Tertullian has it more than once: *De Exhort. Cast.* iii.; *Adv. Valent.* xxix.; *Adv. Marc.* IV. xxix.; and Cyprian uses it, not only of "favour" and "goodness," but definitely of "forgiveness." *De bono patientiæ*, viii. (*indulgentia criminis*); *De lapsis*, xvi. (*remittere aut donare indulgentia sua*); *Ep.* lv. § 7. See *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. iv. p. 248.

“indulgence,” freely used from the days of Langland downwards.

(b) *The Romish doctrine of pardons condemned in the Article.*—The sketch which has been already given of the growth of the system will have shown pretty clearly what the claims made for the indulgences granted by Tetzl and the preachers were.¹ Luther in his famous theses (1517) was prepared to admit them as a relaxation of canonical penance, but no further.² But, as is well known, this was totally insufficient for the ecclesiastical authorities. The decree of Leo x. (1518) reasserted the medieval doctrine, and the papal Bull of excommunication (*Exsurge Domine*, 1520) condemned as pestiferous, pernicious, and scandalous the assertions of Luther on this subject.³ The Council of Trent (1563), as we have seen, retained the custom, though frankly acknowledging the abuses. But unhappily the Roman Church still stands committed to the view that they can avail to help the souls in purgatory, though, as formally held, only *per modum suffragii*; and though the worst scandals have disappeared since the Tridentine decrees were issued, yet it is clear that Rome has retained only too much of the medieval system, and that the indulgences still granted are far more than a mere remission of ecclesiastical penance imposed by the Church. They differ, then, entirely from their original form, having practically little or nothing to do with ecclesiastical censures on the living, but being mainly concerned with God’s chastisement in the intermediate state. And while we frankly admit the power of “binding and loosing” which belongs

¹ Cf. also Creighton’s *History of the Papacy*, vol. v. p. 58 *seq.*, for an admirable sketch of the development of practice and teaching concerning indulgences.

² The theses are given in full in Schaff’s *History of the (Lutheran) Reformation*, vol. i. p. 160 *seq.*

³ See the Bull itself in Schaff, *op. cit.* p. 235.

to the Church, we are compelled to reject altogether the theological defence for indulgences constructed by the schoolmen, and with it the whole practical system of granting them which it was constructed to support.

III. *The Adoration of Images and Relics.*

In considering **the Romish doctrine . . . of the worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of relics**, it will once more be convenient to make a further division, and to consider separately (a) the history of the practice, and (b) the Scriptural arguments concerning it.

(a) *The history of the practice.*—In the earliest ages of the Church there was some not unnatural hesitation as to the use of art in connection with Christian worship.¹ It had been so steeped in the spirit of an impure heathenism, that the Church was shy of consecrating it for religious purposes. The Catacombs, however, reveal to us the beginnings of a Christian art; and we find from Tertullian that, by the end of the second century, it was customary to paint the figure of the Good Shepherd on the Eucharistic chalice.² In the fourth century, pictures began to be more freely introduced into the churches, though not without protest from various Fathers;³ and

¹ The language of Irenæus on the followers of Carpocrates does not look as if he approved of religious images and pictures, or as if such were usual among Christians: “Etiam imagines, quasdam quidem depictas, quasdam autem et de reliqua materia fabricatas habent, dicens formam Christi factam a Pilato, illo in tempore quo fuit Jesus cum hominibus. Et has coronant, et proponunt eas cum imaginibus mundi philosophorum, videlicet cum imagine Pythagoræ, et Platonis, et Aristotelis, et reliquorum; et reliquam observationem circa eas similiter ut gentes faciunt.”—*Adv. Her.* I. xx.

² “Pastor quem in calice depingis.”—*De pudic.* c. x.; cf. c. vii. “picturæ calicum.”

³ *E.g.* Epiphanius (390) describes how he found a painting of Christ or

from this time forward the cultus of both images and relics seems steadily to have increased. A great impetus was given to the latter by S. Helena's discovery of the remains of the true cross in 326. By the close of the fourth century it was believed that miracles were wrought by the relics of the saints and martyrs;¹ and by the eighth century, in spite of protests raised from time to time,² the practice of paying "worship" and "adoration" to images and relics had reached such a height that a reaction set in, and a vigorous protest was made against it. Whereas originally pictures and images had been but the "books of the unlearned," by this time they had come to be regarded with such superstitious reverence, and such acts of homage and "worship" were paid to them, that the Church could with difficulty be cleared from the charge of idolatry. Hence the great "iconoclastic controversy" of the eighth century, in which for the most part the Emperors at Constantinople (*e.g.* Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Copronymus) took the lead in destroying the images, and the Popes at Rome constituted themselves the champions of the cultus. Into the dreary history of the controversy there is no need to enter here.³ It will be sufficient to mention that the

some saint on a curtain in a church at Anablatha in Palestine, and tore it down because it was contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, in *S. Hieronymi Epistolæ*, li. 9. So the Council of Elvira (A.D. 305) forbade pictures to be placed in churches: "Placuit picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur."—Canon xxxvi. This was "evidently not directed against a prospective or imaginary danger, but against an actual and probably a growing practice."—Westcott, *Epp. of S. John*, p. 329.

¹ See Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, XXII. viii., and *Confessions*, IX. vii., for notices of some of these.

² See the letters of Gregory the Great to Serenus, *Epp.* VII. ii. 3, and IX. iv. 9.

³ See Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 339 *seq.*, and the excellent lecture in Archbp. Trench's *Medieval Church History*, Lect. vii.

decisions of the iconoclastic Council of 754 at Constantinople (which claimed to be a general one) were reversed by the Council of Nicæa in 787, which has been finally accepted by both Greeks and Latins as the seventh General Council. At this the worship of images was decreed, and the following canon was passed:—

"With the venerable and life-giving Cross shall be set up the venerable and holy images, whether in colour, in mosaic work, or any other material, within the consecrated churches of God, on the sacred vessels and vestments, on the walls, and on tablets, on houses, and in highways—the images, that is to say, of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, of the immaculate mother of God, of the honoured angels, of all saints and holy men. These images shall be treated as holy memorials, worshipped, kissed, only without that peculiar adoration (*λάτρευσις*) which is reserved for the Invisible, Incomprehensible God."¹

Even after this the struggle lasted a short time longer. In 814 a Council was held at Constantinople under the Emperor Leo the Armenian, which confirmed the decrees of the previous Council of 754 and anathematised the image worshippers. But, finally, in the reign of Michael Porphyrogenitus (840) the iconoclastic party entirely collapsed, and the "feast of orthodoxy" was established to commemorate the triumph of their

¹ Ὅριζομεν οὖν ἀκριβεῖα πάση καὶ ἐμμελεῖα παραπλησίως τῷ τυπῷ τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ ἀνατίθεσθαι τὰς σέπτας καὶ ἀγίας εἰκόνας, τὰς ἐκ χρωμάτων καὶ ψηφίδος καὶ ἐτέρας ὅλης ἐπιτηδέως ἐχούσης ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις, ἐν ἱεροῖς σκεύεσι καὶ ἐσθῆσι, τοίχοις τε καὶ σαρίαις, οἴκοις τε καὶ ὁδοῖς· τῆς τε τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνας, καὶ τῆς ἀχράντου δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἀγίας Θεοτόκου, τιμιῶν τε ἀγγέλων, καὶ πάντων ἁγίων καὶ δούλων ἀνδρῶν . . . καὶ ταύταις ἀσπασμῶν καὶ τιμητικῆν προσκύνησιν ἀπονέμειν οὐ μὴν τὴν κατὰ πᾶσιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, ἣ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θεῷ φύσει.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. iv. p. 456. The translation given above is in Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 391.

opponents. From this time forward we hear but little of any opposition to image worship,¹ and the practice was generally accepted without question in both East² and West, until S. Thomas Aquinas lays down definitely that "the same reverence should be displayed towards an image of Christ and towards Christ Himself; and seeing that Christ is adored with the adoration of *latria*, it follows that His image is to be adored with the adoration of *latria*"; and again, "the Cross is adored with the same adoration as Christ, that is, with the adoration of *latria*, and for that reason we address and supplicate the Cross just as we do the Crucified Himself."³ In accordance with this we find in the Roman Missal an office for the adoration of the Cross on Good Friday, in which full directions are given for the adoration of the Cross, and an antiphon is sung, beginning, "Crucem tuam adoramus

¹ The Council of Frankfort (794), however, rejected the second Council of Nicaea, and the Caroline books absolutely condemned any adoration or worship of images. See Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, vol. ii. p. 153 seq.

² The Eastern Church, it should be mentioned, while it encourages the veneration of pictures, does not admit sculptured or hewn images. The "icons" of the East are really pictures. For the Greek teaching on the subject see Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 76. One quotation may suffice here. 'Ἡμεῖς ἔβαν τιμῶμεν τὰς εἰκόνας καὶ τὰς προσκυνούμεν, δὲν προσκυνούμεν τὰ χρώματα ἢ τὰ ξύλα. μὰ τοὺς ἁγίους ἐκείνους, τῶν ὁποίων εἶναι αἱ εἰκόνας, δοξάζομεν μὲ προσκύνησιν δουλείας, βάλλωντας μὲ τὴν νοῦν μας τὴν ἐκείνων παρουσίαν εἰς τὰ δμῶντιά μας.—*Conf. Orthod.* p. 328.

³ "Sequitur quod eadem reverentia exhibeatur imagini Christi et ipsi Christo. Cum ergo Christus adoretur adoratione latriæ consequens est quod ejus imago sit adoratione latriæ adoranda." "[Crux] utroque modo adoratur eadem adoratione cum Christo, scil. adoratione latriæ. Et propter hoc etiam crucem alloquimur et deprecamur quasi ipsum crucifixum."—*Summa* III. Q. xxv. arts. iii. iv. In view of the distinction drawn by Romanists between *latria*, the worship due to God alone, *hyperdulia*, that due to the Blessed Virgin, and *dulia*, that which is due to the saints, these words have caused no little difficulty, and are frequently explained away. But the statement of S. Thomas is clear enough and gives to the Cross *latria*.

Domine";¹ and in our own country the Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel, in 1408, emphatically urge the practice. "From henceforth let it be taught commonly, and preached by all, that the Cross and the image of the Crucified, and the rest of the images of the saints, in memory and honour of them whom they figure, as also their places and relics, ought to be worshipped (*venerari*) with processions, bendings of the knees, bowings of the body, incensings, kissings, offerings, lightings of candles, and pilgrimages, together with all other manners and forms whatsoever as hath been accustomed to be done in our predecessors' times."² It is needless to add illustrations of the gross abuses and superstitions, such as that of the "Rood of Boxley,"³ which had been exposed in the early years of the sixteenth century,—abuses which afford a painfully strong justification of the vigorous language in condemnation of this worshipping and adoration of images and relics contained in the Article before us.⁴

(b) *The Scriptural arguments concerning the practice.*—It might have been supposed that it would be sufficient to quote the language of the second commandment as entirely prohibiting worship in any form being offered to

¹ *Missale Romanum*. Feria vi. in Parasceve.

² "Ab omnibus deinceps doceatur communiter atque prædicetur, crucem et imaginem crucifixi cæterasque imagines sanctorum, in ipsorum memoriam et honorem quos figurant, ac ipsorum loca et reliquias, processionibus, genuflexionibus, inclinationibus, thurificationibus, deosulationibus, oblationibus, luminarium accensionibus, et peregrinationibus, nec non aliis quibuscunque modis et formis quibus nostris et predecessorum nostrorum temporibus fieri consuevit, venerari debere."—See Johnson's *English Canons*, vol. ii. p. 469, and Lyndwood's *Provinciale*, V. De hæret. cap. *Nullus quoque*.

³ See Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, vol. ii. p. 52 seq.

⁴ It should also be mentioned that in the Second Book of the Homilies there is a lengthy Homily on this subject, entitled "Against Peril of Idolatry."

images;¹ but since it has appeared to Roman Catholics that the Scriptures contain instances of image worship and exhortation to it, it may be well to examine the passages alleged by them. The action of David in dancing before the ark (2 Sam. vi.) has been referred to, but it is difficult to see what justification there is for the assertion that any *worship*, be it *latrìa* or *dulia*, was paid by him to it. But it is said that the 99th Psalm contains a direct charge to "adore His footstool, for it is holy," and that the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that Jacob "adored the top of his rod."² These two instances shall be considered, and if nothing stronger is forthcoming it may safely be concluded that there is not a shred of evidence in favour of the practice to be adduced from Holy Scripture, or to be set against the emphatic condemnation of it in the Decalogue.³

¹ It need hardly be said that the second commandment cannot be strained into a condemnation of images and pictures as works of art, or for purposes of instruction. Had this been so, the figures of the cherubim, oxen, and lions would never have found place in the Tabernacle or Temple.

² Both of these passages are referred to as authorising "relative honour to the images of Christ and the saints" in a table of references at the end of a copy of the Douay Bible lying before me; and to the passage in Heb. xi. 21 is appended the following note: "The apostle here follows the ancient Greek Bible of the Seventy interpreters (which translates in this manner Gen. xlvii. 31), and alleges this fact of Jacob, in paying a relative veneration to the top of the rod or sceptre of Joseph as to a figure of Christ's sceptre and kingdom, as an instance and argument of his faith. But some translators, who are no friends to this relative honour, have corrupted the text by translating it, *he worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff*: as if this circumstance of leaning upon his staff were any argument of Jacob's faith, or worthy the being thus particularly taken notice of by the Holy Ghost." The remarks above will show who are the real "corrupters of the text."

³ It is, to say the least, unfortunate that in the great majority of Roman Catholic Catechisms the Commandments are given in an abbreviated form, and, since according to the reckoning which obtains among them our *first* and *second* commandments form but one, the condemnation of image worship is *practically* unknown by the vast mass of the laity among them.

Ps. xcix. 5 in the English version stands as follows: "Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at His footstool, for He is holy" (margin: *it is holy*). In the "Douay version," however, which is commonly used by Roman Catholics, it stands thus: "Adore His footstool, for it is holy." The origin of the difference is this. The English version is taken from the Hebrew, and adequately represents the original $\text{הִתְחַוְּהוּ לְרַגְלָיו}$. The Douay version is translated from the Vulgate (Ps. xcvi. 5), where the preposition is ignored and the words rendered, "Adorate scabellum pedum ejus quoniam sanctum est."¹ Thus *the argument rests entirely on a mistranslation*. The same is true of the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 21). Here again the Vulgate, "adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus," *entirely misrepresents the meaning of the original*. The Greek is *προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ*, words which can only mean that Jacob worshipped *upon* (*i.e.* as the A.V. and R.V. "*leaning upon*") the top of his staff. With regard to the Scriptural argument for the adoration of relics, from the miracle wrought by the bones of Elisha (2 Kings xiii. 21) and the "handkerchiefs and aprons" brought from the body of S. Paul (Acts xix. 12), it cannot be said that they are worth anything. Neither the bones nor the handkerchiefs were preserved to be adored;² and until

¹ The construction in the original is precisely the same as in ver. 9, where both the Douay version and the Vulgate render correctly enough "Adore at His holy mountain," "Adorate in monte sancto ejus." Whereas, if only they were consistent, the mountain would have to be adored as well as the footstool.

² Cf. the Martyrdom of Polycarp, c. xvii., where the Christians pour scorn on the notion that they would want to worship the body of the saint, or worship any other than Christ. *Τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ προσκυνούμεν, τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας ὡς μαθητὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀγαπῶμεν ἄξιως ἐνεκεν εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον βασιλεῖα καὶ διδασκαλον.* — Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part II. vol. ii. § ii. p. 979.

something stronger is adduced by our opponents, we may safely rest satisfied that nothing stronger can be found.

III. *The Invocation of Saints.*

Once more we must consider separately (*a*) the history of the practice, and (*b*) the Scriptural argument concerning it.

(*a*) *The history of the practice.*—In tracing out the growth of the custom of invoking the saints at rest, it will be well to start from the fact that the early Church undoubtedly believed that they were still engaged in interceding for those whose warfare was not yet accomplished,¹ and very generally *prayed to God* to be benefited by a share in the prayers of the saints.² But there can also be no doubt that the early Christians did not think it right directly to ask the saints to use those intercessions, in whose efficacy she yet believed. The only writer during the first three centuries who has been quoted in favour of direct invocation is Origen (220), and it seems almost certain that in the passage in question he is really referring, not to the saints at rest, but to those still on earth. His words are these: "It is not improper to offer supplication, intercession, and thanksgiving to saints: and two of these—I mean intercession and thanksgiving—not only to saints, but to mere men; but supplication to saints only, if any Peter or Paul can be found, that they may help us: making us worthy to enjoy the licence which was granted them of forgiving sins."³ This passage, says Dean Luckock,

¹ See Origen, *In Jesu Nave*, Hom. xvi. c. 5; *In Cant.*, Lib. iii.; *Ep. ad Rom.*, Comment. ii. 4; Cyprian, *Ep.* lx.; *De Mortalitate*, ad fin. etc.; and cf. Luckock, *After Death*, part II. c. i.

² Such prayers are found in all the ancient Liturgies, in which there is no direct invocation of the saints themselves.

³ Δέησιν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐντευξίν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν οὐκ ἄτοπον καὶ ἁγίους προσ-

"seems to have been quite unjustly claimed in favour of addressing petitions to departed saints. It is next to certain, as the whole context shows, that he had in his mind none but living saints."¹ And this explanation is confirmed by words which he uses elsewhere, saying of the "ten thousand sacred powers" which men "have on their side when they pray to God," that *uninvoked* (ἀκλητοί), these pray with them and bring help to our perishable race, and, if I may so speak, take up arms alongside of it."²

It is, then, only in the latter part of the fourth century that the evidence for direct invocation really begins.³ The Fathers of this age who have been cited in favour of the practice are these: in the East, S. Basil the Great (370), Gregory Nazianzen (370) and Gregory Nyssen (370), Ephraem the Syrian (370) and S. Chrysostom (390). In the West, S. Ambrose (380) and S. Augustine (400). Their testimony has been carefully examined by Dean Luckock in his volume *After Death*, and the conclusion at which he arrives is that "S. Chrysostom's contradictions are such as to invalidate his evidence, that S. Gregory Nazianzen speaks doubtfully, that S. Ambrose, in the little which he has said upon the subject, is inconsistent with himself; but that the testimony of SS. Basil, Gregory Nyssen, Ephraem, and Augustine remains so far unshaken."⁴ Some of the

ενέκειν ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν δύο, λέγω δὴ ἐντευξίν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν οὐ μόνον ἁγίοις ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ ἀνθρώποις, τὴν δὲ δέησιν μόνον ἁγίοις, εἴ τις εὐρεθῆη Παῦλος ἢ Πέτρος ἵνα ὠφελήσωσιν ἡμᾶς ἁγίους ποιῶντες τοῦ τυχεῖν τῆς δεδομένης αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίας πρὸς τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἀφιέναι.—*De Oratone*, 14.

¹ *After Death*, p. 187. Cf. Mason, p. 115.

² ὥστε τολμᾶν ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ἀνθρώποις, μετὰ προαιρέσεως προτιθεμένοι τὰ κρείττονα, εὐχομένοι τῷ Θεῷ μυρία δσαι ἀκλητοὶ συνεύχονται δυνάμει ἱερᾷ, συμπαρέχουσαι τῷ ἐπικρηφῷ ἡμῶν γένει, καὶ ἴν' οὕτως εἴπω, συναγωνιάσαι.—*Contra Celsum*, viii. 64.

³ It ought to be mentioned that such prayers are found (undated) in the Catacombs. See, however, Mason, p. 117.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 197.

passages in these Fathers certainly appear to be nothing more than rhetorical appeals, which can scarcely have been intended to be taken as seriously implying that the person so addressed was expected to be cognisant of the utterance,—as when S. Gregory Nazianzen apostrophises Constantius: "Hear, O soul of great Constantius (if thou hast any faculty of perception), and ye souls of all the kings who before him loved Christ."¹ Concerning the intention of others, however, there is no room for doubt;² and it cannot be denied that by the time of Augustine the practice of directly invoking the saints was firmly established as a popular one, though even so there is no trace of such invocations being admitted into the formal services of the Church. Rather, it would appear from the language of Augustine that they were not allowed; for in a passage in which he is speaking of the miracles wrought by the martyrs, "or rather," as he corrects himself, by "God who does them, while they pray and assist," he says, "we do not erect altars at these monuments that we may sacrifice to the martyrs, but to the one God of the martyrs and of ourselves, and in this sacrifice they are named in their own place, and rank as men of God who conquered the world by confessing Him, but they are not invoked by the sacrificing priest" (non tamen a sacerdote qui sacrificat invocantur).³ After this time it would seem

¹ *Adv. Jul. Imp. Invect.* i. *Orat.* iv. 3.

² Thus S. Basil says: "I accept also the holy apostles, prophets, and martyrs, and I invoke them (ἐπικαλοῦμαι) for their supplication to God, that by them, that is, by their mediation, the merciful God may take compassion upon me, and that there may be granted to me redemption for mine offences."—*Ex epist. ad Julian Apost.* cclx.; cf. *De Mart. Mamante, Hom.* xxiii. and *Hom. in xl. Mart.* § 8. These and the other passages from the Fathers mentioned in the text are all quoted in full in Luckock, *op. cit.*; and cf. Mason, p. 132 *seq.*

³ *De Civit. Dei*, Bk. xxii. c. x.: "Just before this (c. viii.) Augustine his told a story of a tailor who had lost his coat, and had prayed to the

that the custom grew apace. The practice having once established itself spread throughout the East and West,¹ and became part of the system of the Church. By the eighth century the invocations were introduced into the Litanies of the Church,² the only public authorised service in which they have ever been prominent, except later devotions in honour of the Blessed Virgin. Nor, unhappily, did the system long remain what it had been at first, *i.e.* merely asking the saints to pray for us. In time the saints were often invoked as if they were the authors of benefits; and the Blessed Virgin, in particular, was addressed in language which (with every wish to be charitable) it is impossible to avoid stigmatising as blasphemous and idolatrous. Thus in Bonaventura's *Crown of the Blessed Virgin Mary* we read: "O Empress and our most kind lady, by the authority of a mother command thy most beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ, that He would vouchsafe to lift up our minds," etc.³ Much more of the same character may be found in the *Psalter of the Blessed Virgin*,⁴ attributed to the same writer. And it cannot be doubted that in the sixteenth century

twenty martyrs, begging in a distinct voice that he might be heard." The sequel was evidently regarded by Augustine as a direct answer to his petition. Cf. also *De Cura pro mortuis*, c. iv.

¹ At the present day the doctrine of the Eastern Church on this subject differs in no respect from the formal teaching of the Latin Church. See Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 70, where citations are given from the "Orthodox Confession" of 1643, and that of Metrophanes Critopulus (1625). Cf. also the *Longer Catechism of the Russian Church* (translated by R. W. Blackmore), p. 78.

² It is hard to say exactly when they were introduced; but it was certainly some time before the middle of the eighth century. See the seventeenth canon of the Council of Clovesho (A.D. 747), which orders the name of Augustine to be introduced into the Litany, "post Sancti Gregorii vocationem." Haddan and Stubbs, vol. iii. p. 368.

³ See Usher's *Answer to Jesuit*, p. 424, where this and much more of the same kind is quoted.

⁴ Usher, *l.c.*

the practical system connected with the invocation of saints was grossly superstitious.¹ It naturally excited the indignation of our Reformers, and hence the emphatic condemnation of the "Romish doctrine" on the subject in the Article before us, and the vigorous polemic contained in the Homily "Concerning Prayer" which was issued in the reign of Elizabeth.²

(b) *The Scriptural argument concerning invocation of saints.*—In considering the teaching of Scripture on this subject, it is well to remember that it is admitted by all parties that to regard the saints as the *authors* of the benefits which they are asked to obtain is wrong,³ and contrary to Scripture, which distinctly forbids the worship of a creature, and contains striking instances of the refusal of worship by both men and angels. Thus in Acts x. 25 we read: "When it came to pass that Peter entered, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet and

¹ Thus Erasmus writes: "I call it superstition when all things are asked from the saints as if Christ were dead; or when we implore the aid of the saints with the idea that they are more easily intreated than God; or when we seek some particular thing from each, as if S. Catherine could bestow what S. Barbara could not; or when we call upon them, not as intercessors, but as authors of those good things which God grants us. I think that it may seem impious to thee to animadvert upon these things, but I well know that it would not seem superfluous, if thou knewest the prodigious superstition of our fellow-countrymen on this matter."—*Epist. ad Jac. Sadolet.*, quoted in Forbes, *Considerationes Modestæ*, vol. ii. p. 310. Cf. the "Ten Articles" of 1536, where, though direct invocation is retained, a caution is added, that "it be done without any vain superstition, so as to think that any saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ, or that one saint doth serve for one thing more than another, or is patron of the same."—*Formularies of Faith*, p. 15.

² See the "second part of the Homily Concerning Prayer," *The Homilies*, p. 341 (S.P.C.K.).

³ Bellarmine says, that as far as words go, it is lawful to say: "S. Peter pity me, save me, open for me the gate of heaven"; also "give me health of body, patience, fortitude," etc., provided that we mean "save and pity me by praying for me"; "Grant me this or that by thy prayers and merits."

worshipped him (*προσεκύνησεν*). But Peter raised him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man."¹ So in the Revelation, twice over S. John "fell down before the feet of the angel to worship him" (*προσκυνῆσαι*), and twice over the angel refuses the worship. "See thou do it not; I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren that hold the testimony of Jesus" (xix. 10). "See thou do it not: I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren the prophets, and with them which keep the words of this book: worship God" (xxii. 9). The advocates of the invocations would not attempt to justify more than the "Ora pro nobis" or its equivalent (since they explain away the far stronger language habitually used in their popular devotions). And even here they are compelled to admit that there is nothing in Scripture which *directly* sanctions the practice. It is based by them (1) on the evidence that the saints at rest are engaged in interceding for us, and (2) on the admitted power of intercessory prayer. To these arguments we reply, *first*, that it may be freely conceded that Holy Scripture does appear to imply that the saints at rest do pray for those still on earth,² and

¹ Acts xiv. 13 *seq.*, which is sometimes quoted against the invocation of saints, seems really not to bear upon the subject, for the men of Lystra desired to offer to the apostles divine honour, as to heathen deities; which under no circumstances could they have accepted. It is very different, therefore, from the passages cited in the text.

² This was certainly the belief of the Jews, as is shown by more than one passage in the Apocrypha. See 2 Macc. xv. 12–14: "And this was his vision: that Onias, who had been high priest . . . holding up his hands prayed for the whole body of the Jews. This done, in like manner there appeared a man with grey hairs, and exceeding glorious, who was of a wonderful and excellent majesty. Then Onias answered, saying, This is a lover of the brethren, who prayeth much for the people, and for the holy city, to wit, Jeremias, the prophet of God." Cf. Tobit xii. 12, where Raphael, "one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints," speaks of "bringing the remembrance" of Tobit's prayers "before the Holy One." Cf. also Rev. viii. 3, 4, and v. 8.

that therefore it cannot be wrong to ask God for a share in their prayers.¹ But when we are asked to go further, and address the saints themselves, we may well hesitate; for though, *secondly*, we fully believe in the power of intercessory prayer, yet if we wish to ask an earthly friend to exercise it for us, we take care that our words can reach him; and so, before asking the saints to do the same, we require evidence that they are cognisant of our prayers. With Bishop Richard Montague (1624) we say: "Demonstrate unto me infallibly by reason, Scripture, authentic tradition, that saints departed are all of them, or any of them, interested ordinarily *rebus viventium*; that by either evening or morning knowledge, natural endowment, or acquired accruments, by Divine revelation, angelical revelation, or other means, they do or can know and understand my necessities, exigencies, prayers, or practice in any time or place when I call upon them, or unto them, and I will unfeignedly join hands of fellowship, and say, 'Saint *Peter*, Saint *Paul*, pray for me.' Until that, *ἐπέχω*; and so I think will any desire to be excused for invocation; for to be persuaded, as some have told me that in their opinion saints nor do nor can be privy unto my necessities, nor hear my prayers, and yet to pray unto them, is to my understanding so poor a part of piety that it is without warrant of common sense."²

It does not appear that there is any evidence in Holy

¹ Cf. Field, *Of the Church*, bk. iii. Appendix: "That the saints do pray for us *in genere*, desiring God to be merciful to us, and to do unto us whatsoever in any kind He knoweth needful for our good, there is no question made by us; and therefore this prayer wherein the Church desireth God to be gracious to her and to grant the things she desireth, the rather for that the saints in heaven also are suppliant for her, will not be found to contain any point of Romish doctrine disliked by us."

² *A Treatise of the Invocation of Saints*, p. 218, quoted in H. R. Percival's *Invocation of Saints*, p. 111.

Scripture that the saints are already admitted to the beatific vision, or that they are cognisant of our prayers, such as would warrant us in addressing them.¹ Nor can it be said that there has been any certain and consistent tradition of the Church on the subject which would justify us in regarding it as "a Catholic practice." As we have already seen, there is no trace of direct invocation before the last half of the fourth century. In the fifth century S. Augustine uses language which betrays considerable doubt when discussing the question whether the saints know what is passing on earth.² In the twelfth century, all that Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, can say with regard to the theory which obtains most widely at the present day, is that "it is *not incredible* that the souls of the saints, which in their secret dwelling rejoice in the illumination of the true light of the face of God, do in the contemplation thereof understand the things which are done in this outer world, as much as pertaineth either to them for joy or to us for aid. For as to the angels, so also to the saints, who stand before God, our petitions are made known in the word of God which they contemplate."³ Still later, Dun Scotus maintains "that it does not belong to the essence of blessedness that the blessed

¹ Cf. Mason, p. 145 *seq.* It would be precarious in the extreme to build anything upon Heb. xii. 1, where the word for "witnesses" is *μαρτύρες*.

² The question is discussed by Augustine in *De cura pro mortuis*, c. xiii. *seq.*; and though Augustine believed that the martyrs were able to help the living, he confesses that he is utterly unable to solve the question how they are made aware of what passes on earth.

³ "Sed forte quæris, Num quid preces supplicantium sancti audiunt, et vota postulantium in eorum notitiam perveniunt? Non est incredibile animas sanctorum, quæ in abscondito faciei Dei veri luminis illustratione letantur, in ipsius contemplatione ea quæ foris aguntur intelligere, quantum vel illis ad gaudium vel nobis ad auxilium pertinet. Sicut enim angelis, ita et sanctis qui Deo assistunt, petitiones nostræ innotescunt in Verbo Dei quod contemplantur."—*Sentent.* IV. *dist.* xlv. 6.

hear our prayers, though it is *probable* that God reveals them to them";¹ and even so late as the sixteenth century Cardinal Cajetan is forced to admit that "we have no certain knowledge as to whether the saints are aware of our prayers, *though we piously believe it.*"²

In the absence, therefore, of any distinct revelation, and in the face of so much doubt and uncertainty, it would appear that the Church of England is amply justified (1) in removing from the public services of the Church all traces of such direct invocations, including the "Ave Maria" as well as the "Ora pro nobis";³ and (2) in condemning in round terms in the Article before us the current teaching and practice, which can be abundantly shown to be a **fond⁴ thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.**

¹ "Non esse ex ratione beatitudinis, quod beati audiant orationes nostras, probabile tamen esse quod Deus ipse revclat."—*In Sent. IV. dist. xlv. q. 4*, quoted in Forbes, *Consid. Modest.* vol. ii. p. 178.

² "Certa ratione nescimus an sancti nostra cognoscant, quamvis pie hoc credamus."—*In 2a 2æ, q. lxxxviii. art. 5*, quoted in Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 176.

³ When the English Litany was first published in 1544, all the invocations of saints (which had formed so prominent a feature in this service) were deleted, except three clauses, namely—

"Saint Mary, mother of God our Saviour Jesu Christ, pray for us.

"All holy angels and archangels, and all holy orders of blessed spirits, pray for us.

"All holy patriarchs and prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors and virgins, and all the blessed company of heaven, pray for us."

On the publication of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. in 1549 these three clauses were omitted, and all trace of the direct invocation of the saints was removed from the public offices of the English Church.

⁴ Fond (*inanis*), *i.e.* foolish. Shakespeare uses the word in the same sense—

"Thou *fond* mad man, hear me but speak a word."

Romeo and Juliet, III. iii. 52.

"And for his dreams, I wonder he is so *fond*
To trust the mockery of unquiet slumber."

Richard III. III. ii. 26.

ARTICLE XXIII

De vocatione Ministrorum.

Non licet cuiquam sumere sibi munus publice prædicandi, aut administrandi Sacramenta in Ecclesia, nisi prius fuerit ad hæc obeunda legitime vocatus et missus. Atque illos legitime vocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas vocandi Ministros atque mittendi in vineam Domini publice concessa est in Ecclesia, cooptati fuerint et asciti in hoc opus.

Of Ministering in the Congregation.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

THERE has been no change in the substance of this Article since it was first published in 1553. In that edition, however, and also in that of 1563, the title ran: "Nemo in ecclesia ministret nisi vocatus" ("No man may minister in the congregation except he be called"). The present title was substituted for this at the final revision in 1571.

The ultimate source of this Article is the fourteenth, "De ordine ecclesiastico," of the Confession of Augsburg: "De ordine ecclesiastico docent quod nemo debeat in ecclesia publice docere aut sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus." Its debt to this Confession is, however, only indirect; for there can be little doubt that its immediate origin was the corresponding Article in the unfinished series of 1538, agreed upon by a joint

committee of Anglican and Lutheran divines.¹ This document adopts the language of the Augsburg Confession, but adds additional matter to it, which suggested the latter part of our own Article: "De ministris ecclesiæ docemus, quod nemo debeat publice docere, aut sacramenta ministrare, nisi rite vocatus, et quidem ab his, penes quos in ecclesia, juxta verbum Dei, et leges ac consuetudines uniuscujusque regionis, jus est vocandi et admittendi."² Since the Lutherans were lacking in episcopal government, it is obvious that in any common formula to be agreeable to both parties refuge must be taken in language of a vague and general character. Hence the reference to "the laws and customs of each country," which was omitted when the Article was remodelled for the use of the Anglican Church alone.

The object of the Article is to condemn the theory held by many of the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, that "anyone believing himself to be called to the ministry, was bound to exercise his functions as a preacher in defiance of all Church authority."³ The same error is condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in which, after the mention of various Anabaptist errors, we come to the following passage:—

"Similis est eorum amentia qui institutionem ministrorum ab ecclesia disjungunt, negantes in certis locis certos doctores, pastores atque ministros collocari debere; nec admittunt legitimas vocationes, nec solemnem manuum impositionem, sed per omnes publice docendi potestatem divulgant, qui sacris literis utcunque sunt aspersi, et Spiritum sibi vendicant; nec illos solum adhibent ad docendum, sed etiam ad moderandam ecclesiam, et distribuenda sacramenta; quæ sane universa cum scriptis Apostolorum manifeste pugnant."⁴

¹ See p. 6.

² See Hardwick, p. 270.

³ Hardwick, p. 102.

⁴ *Ref. Leg. Eccles., De Hæres. c. xvi.*

So in Hermann's *Consultation* it is said of some of the Anabaptists, that they "dispise the outward ministerie and doctrine of the Church, they denie that God worketh by the same. They teache that we muste loke for private illuminations and visions. Wherefore thei avoyed the common sermons of the Church, and holye assembles of the people of Christe, they wyth-drawe from the sacraments," etc.¹

Such a view as that here condemned can only lead to confusion and disorder, for according to it anyone who claims for himself the Spirit may set himself up as a minister of the word and sacraments, with no commission whatever from any external authority. In opposition to this the statement of the Article is clear and decisive. It falls into two parts, each of which requires some little consideration—

1. The need of an external call and mission.
2. The description of those through whom the call comes.

I. *The Need of an external Call and Mission.*

It is not lawful² for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the sacraments in the congregation (in ecclesia),³ before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. "Called and sent." The two words (which are repeated in the second part of the Article) should be carefully noticed. They refer to distinct things: the *call*, to the original

¹ English translation of 1548, fol. cxlii.

² Evidently, though this is not stated, by the law of God.

³ It is not clear why throughout this Article, in the heading as well as in the body of the Article, *ecclesia* is rendered by *congregation* and not by *Church*.

summons to enter the ministry: the *mission*, to the commission to execute it in a particular sphere. Unless the need of each of these is recognised there can only arise confusion, as if only the *call* were necessary different ministers properly ordained might assert rival claims to execute their office in the same place, and the whole principle of Church order would be destroyed. To obviate this they must be "*sent* to execute the same," as well as "*called*" to the office. Thus the requirement of "*mission*" follows from the general principle that "God is not a God of confusion, but of peace"; and from the necessity that "all things" should "be done decently and in order."¹ With regard to the "*call*" to the ministry, all Christians are agreed that a call from God is necessary before a man can presume to teach and minister in His name. "No man taketh the honour unto himself, but when he is called of God, even as was Aaron," and "how shall they preach except they be sent"?² So much is admitted by all. The question really is whether the "*inward call*" requires to be supplemented by an external one. And here all the evidence from Scripture and antiquity is in favour of insisting upon one from properly constituted authorities. While it cannot be doubted that under the Old Covenant in addition to the regularly constituted priesthood and Levitical ministry, God did from time to time raise up the prophets as His messengers, and send them forth with no commission from men, as he did afterward at the beginning of the gospel in the case of S. Paul, who always claimed to hold his apostolate "not from (*ἀπό*) men, neither through (*διά*) men, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father,"³ yet in these cases the call was authenticated by signs which could be recognised and

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 33, 40.

² Heb. v. 4; Rom. x. 15.

³ Gal. i. 1.

known by men.¹ The gift of prophecy and the power of working miracles no longer remaining with the Church, it can easily be seen that unless the necessity of an external call were insisted on, the Church would be at the mercy of any religious fanatic who might be pleased to claim to be taught by the Spirit of God.² And so we find that, as a matter of fact, from the very first men were set apart by the properly constituted authorities of the Church, and did not take upon themselves the ministerial office without such a call. Thus the seven were "appointed" (*οὐδς καταστήσωμεν*) to the ministry by the Apostles, after they had been "chosen" (*ἐξελέξαντο*) by the whole multitude.³ Paul and Barnabas "appointed" elders in every church (*χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*).⁴ Timothy received the gift "through (*διά*) the laying on of" S. Paul's hands, or, as it is elsewhere said, "through (*διά*) prophecy, with (*μετά*) the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."⁵ Titus is commissioned to "appoint elders in every city,"⁶ and Timothy receives full instructions as to the character and qualifications of those who are to be admitted into the ministry.⁷ These facts seem quite decisive, and it is a simple fact of history that from the Apostles' day to the present time the Church has always required an

¹ See Deut. xviii. 20-22.

² It will be remembered that the Church of England is equally emphatic in insisting on the need of an "*inward*" call, the first question addressed to candidates for the ministry being this—"Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration to serve God for the promoting of His glory and the edifying of His people?" Not till this has been satisfactorily answered is the further question put concerning the external call—"Do you think that you are truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the due order of this realm, to the ministry of the Church?"

³ Acts vi. 1-6.

⁴ Cf. 2 Tim. i. 6 with 1 Tim. iv. 14.

⁵ Titus i. 5.

⁶ Acts xiv. 23.

⁷ 1 Tim. iii.

external call in the case of all those whom she has recognised as Christian ministers. There is no necessity to prove this at length; but a single passage may be quoted from the first of the Christian Fathers to indicate how the matter was regarded in the very early times, and the principle of succession laid down—

“Our apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop’s office. For this cause therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards they provided a continuance, that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministration. Those, therefore, who were appointed by them, or afterward by other men of repute with the consent of the whole Church, and have ministered unblameably to the flock of Christ . . . these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out from their ministration.”¹

II. *The Description of those through whom the Call comes.*

While the Article is perfectly clear in asserting the need of an external call, it cannot be maintained that it

¹ Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἐγνώσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἐρίσ ἐσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπιμονὴν δεδώκασιν ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ’ ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ’ ἑτέρων ἑλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . τούτους οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας.—*Ad Cor.* I. xlv. On the reading and difficult word ἐπιμονὴν see Lightfoot’s note, *ad loc.* The old Latin published by Dom Morin (*Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. ii.) seems to have had ἐπιμονίῳ, which it rendered by “legem.” Whichever be right, and whether κοιμηθῶσιν refers to the death of the presbyters or of the apostles themselves, the principle of succession to the ministry, and of the need of an external call to it, is here clearly traced to the appointment of the apostles themselves.

is equally clear in its description of those who are empowered to give this call. **Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard.** Who are these men “who have public authority given them in the congregation” (*ecclesia*)? The Article fails to tell us, and its silence on this point is to some extent explained (as we have seen) by the source to which it can be traced. But though an Article on the subject of the ministry, designed to be subscribed by Lutherans and Anglicans, must needs be vague and indefinite, the question may fairly be asked, Why, when the Article was to be signed by Anglicans alone, was not the indefiniteness removed, and a plain statement describing the proper authorities inserted? To this it may be answered that Article XXXV. of 1553 referred definitely to the “book of ordering ministers of the Church” as “godly and in no point repugnant to the wholesome doctrine of the gospel, but agreeable thereto,” while the corresponding Article (XXXVI.) of the Elizabethan revision supported the claims of the Ordinal more definitely, asserting that it “doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering: neither hath it anything that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And, therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the second year of the aforementioned King Edward unto this time, or shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.” These citations show that the omission in the Article before us is made up elsewhere, and that the words under consideration are intended to refer to

the bishops, to whom alone is given in the Church of England this "public authority to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." And, since the reference of the terms was thus rendered unmistakable, it was probably considered unnecessary to introduce a more formal mention of the Episcopate here.¹ It will therefore be more convenient that in this Commentary upon the Articles the discussion of the questions connected with the Episcopate and the threefold ministry should be reserved until they can be treated of in connection with that Article in which they are distinctly mentioned.

¹ It must be remembered that the Articles were not designed to be a complete system of theology. Originally they were merely intended to be a *practical* test, called forth by the exigencies of the times. At the time when they were first drawn up in 1553 there was no practical question at issue in this country between Episcopal orders and Presbyterian; and all that was really necessary was to assert against the Anabaptists the need of an external call.

ARTICLE XXIV

De precibus publicis dicendis in lingua vulgari.

Lingua populo non intellecta publicas in ecclesia preces peragere, aut Sacramenta administrare, verbo Dei et primitivæ Ecclesiæ consuetudini plane repugnat.

Of Speaking in the Congregation, in such a tongue as the people understandeth.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.

THIS Article was rewritten and brought into its present form by Archbishop Parker in 1563. The corresponding Article in the Edwardian Series was this: "*Men must speak in the congregation in such tongue as the people understandeth.*"¹ It is most seemly and most agreeable to the word of God, that in the congregation nothing be openly read or spoken in a tongue unknown to the people, the which thing S. Paul did forbid, except some were present that should declare the same." The difference is practically this: Whereas in 1553 the Church of England contented herself with asserting that it was "most seemly and most agreeable to the word of God" that public worship should be held in a tongue familiar to those present, since 1563 she has maintained the position that the contrary is "plainly repugnant to the word of God and the custom of the primitive Church." It is necessary, therefore, to consider separately—

¹ This title was allowed to remain in 1563, the present one not being substituted for it till 1571.

1. The evidence of Scripture on this subject.
2. The custom of the primitive Church.

I. *The Evidence of Scripture.*

The only passage in the Bible which can be thought to bear directly upon the subject is 1 Cor. xiv., where S. Paul is speaking of the gift of tongues, and laying down rules for its exercise. His language implies that the "tongue" was ordinarily not intelligible to those present, and he expresses a strong preference for the gift of prophecy, on the ground that it conduces to the edification, comfort, and consolation of those present (ver. 3), whereas the speaker in a tongue speaketh to God only and not to men, "for no man understandeth" (ver. 2). "He that speaketh in a tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the Church" (ver. 4); and thus, "in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (ver. 19). For this reason he further charges the man that "speaketh in a tongue" to "keep silence in the church, *if there be no interpreter*" (ver. 28). In all this the general principle is laid down that it is right not only to "pray with the spirit," but to "pray with the understanding also," and to "sing with the understanding also," as well as to "sing with the spirit." But it is obviously impossible for this to be done where the service is held "in a tongue not understood of the people." In such a case "the spirit" may "pray," but "the understanding" will be "unfruitful" (ver. 14).

It may be admitted that by the aid of a version in the vernacular, which shall be placed in the hands of the laity, the disadvantages of worship conducted in a dead language may be to some extent obviated. But even so

the broad principle laid down by the Apostle remains untouched: nor does it appear possible that the bulk of the congregation can really join in intelligently unless the language is one that is familiar to them; and however much the idea that the unity of the Church should be expressed by the unity of the language in which her prayers everywhere ascend to God may appeal to us, this is, after all, a matter of *sentiment*, and S. Paul's ruling distinctly places *edification* as the first consideration. We conclude, then, that **it is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God . . . to have public prayer in the Church or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.**

II. *The Custom of the Primitive Church.*

It is also repugnant to **the custom of the primitive Church.** This assertion is scarcely open to question. The evidence of the ancient Liturgies, as well as of incidental statements in the writings of early Fathers,¹ is amply sufficient to prove that as various countries were evangelised, the services of the Church, including the administration of the Sacraments, were held in whatever language was familiar to the people of the country. Thus there still exist Liturgies, not only in Greek, but also in Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, etc.; and it was only in the same way that Latin came to be employed in worship at all, as the general language in use throughout the West.

¹ *E.g.* Origen, *Contra Celsum*, viii. 37: "The Greeks use Greek in their prayers, the Romans Latin, and so everyone in his own language prays to God, and gives thanks as he is able. And He that is Lord of every tongue hears that which is asked in every tongue." Cf. S. Jerome, *Ad Eustoch.*, *Epitaph. Paulæ*. The evidence of the Fathers is set out at length in the Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments, a large part of which is devoted to the consideration of the position maintained in this Article. See the Homilies, p. 378 *seq.* (S.P.C.K.).

Originally the Roman Church was Greek-speaking; and so long as this was the case the Liturgy there used was, not Latin, but *Greek*.¹ But by degrees, as Latin became universal in the West among all classes, so the use of Latin in public worship spread, although it was never adopted in the East. Its retention throughout the Western Church, after the dialects spoken in different quarters had diverged so greatly as to become different languages, as French, Spanish, and Italian, and after the conversion of the Teutonic races and the growth of their several languages, was for a time a real convenience, as Latin was the one language that was generally understood in all parts, and formed the medium of intercourse among educated people. But, as the old order changed, the disadvantages became greater than the advantages, though by a not unnatural conservatism the Church clung tenaciously to what was customary. Then, when the inconveniences were complained of, it was found necessary to justify the existent practice, and arguments were urged in its favour which are clearly afterthoughts, and if seriously pressed would be fatal to the use of Latin, and compel us to revert to the original language in which the Scriptures were written and the Eucharist instituted. But there is no need to enter into these here. Sufficient has been said to justify the position taken up in the Article, and that is all that is required from us.²

¹ A trace of this still remains in the *Kyrie Eleison*, which has never been translated into Latin, but is still used in its Greek form.

² The formal statement of the Roman Church is, "If anyone shall say that . . . the Mass ought only to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue . . . let him be anathema."—*Decrees of the Council of Trent*, Session XXII. canon ix. This session was held in Sept. 1562, shortly before the revision of the Articles in Elizabeth's reign. It is therefore possible that the alteration then made in the terms of the Article was in consequence of the promulgation of this canon.

ARTICLE XXV

De Sacramentis.

Sacramenta a Christo instituta, non tantum sunt notæ professionis Christianorum, sed certa quædam testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiæ atque bonæ in nos voluntatis Dei, per quæ invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostramque fidem in se, non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

Duo a Christo Domino nostro in Evangelio instituta sunt Sacramenta, scilicet Baptismus et Cœna Domini.

Quinque illa vulgo nominata Sacramenta, scilicet, Confirmatio, Pœnitentia, Ordo, Matrimonium, et Extrema Unctio, pro Sacramentis Evangelicis habenda non sunt, ut quæ partim a prava Apostolorum imitatione proflexerunt, partim vitæ status sunt in Scripturis quidem probati, sed Sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Cœna Domini rationem non habentes: ¹ ut quæ signum aliquod visibile seu cæremoniam a Deo institutam non habeant.

Sacramenta non in hoc instituta sunt a Christo, ut spectarentur, aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis iteremur: et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent

Of the Sacraments.

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

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

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

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about: but that we should duly use them. And in

¹ The edition of 1563 adds here: "quomodo nec pœnitentia."

effectum: qui vero indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsi acquirunt.

such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith.

THIS Article has undergone considerable alteration since the publication of the series of 1553. In that year it began with a quotation from S. Augustine: "Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit together a company of new people, with sacraments most few in number, most easy to be kept, most excellent in signification, as is Baptism, and the Lord's Supper."¹ Then followed the *last* paragraph of our present Article, with the insertion (after the words "wholesome effect or operation") of the following words: "and yet not that of the work wrought, as some men speak, which word, as it is strange and unknown to Holy Scripture: so it engendereth no godly, but a very superstitious sense."² After this paragraph there stood what is now the *first* clause, with which the whole Article was concluded. In 1563 it was brought into the form in which it now stands by means of the following alterations: (1) The quotation from S. Augustine and the clause condemning the theory of grace *ex opere operato* were omitted; (2) the order of the two main paragraphs was reversed; and (3) between them two fresh paragraphs were inserted on (a) the number of sacraments ordained

¹ Cf. Augustine, *Epist.* liv.: "Sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatione facillimis, significatione præstantissimis, societatem novi populi colligavit, sicuti est Baptismus Trinitatis nomine consecratus, communicatio Corporis et Sanguinis Ipsius; et si quid aliud in Scripturis Canonicis commendatur." Cf. also *De Doctr. Christiana*, III. c. ix.

² "Idque non ex opere (ut quidam loquuntur) operato; quæ vox ut peregrina est et sacris literis ignota, sic parit sensum minime pium, sed admodum superstitiosum."

by Christ, and (b) the five rites "commonly called Sacraments."¹

The origin of what now stands as the first clause may be found in the Confession of Augsburg,² from which it was taken through the medium of the thirteen Articles of 1538, where we read: "Docemus, quod Sacramenta quæ per verbum Dei instituta sunt, non tantum sint notæ professionis inter Christianos, sed magis certa quædam testimonia et efficacia signa gratiæ et bonæ voluntatis Dei erga nos, per quæ Deus invisibiliter operatur in nobis, et suam gratiam in nos invisibiliter diffundit, siquidem ea rite susceperimus; quodque per ea excitatur et confirmatur fides in his qui eis utuntur. Porro docemus, quod ita utendum sit sacramentis, ut in adultis, præter veram contritionem, necessario etiam debeat accedere fides, quæ credat præsentibus promissionibus, quæ per sacramenta ostenduntur, exhibentur, et præstantur. Neque enim in illis verum est, quod quidam dicunt, sacramenta conferre gratiam *ex opere operato* sine bono motu utentis, nam in ratione utentibus necessarium est, ut fides etiam utentis accedat, per quam credat illis promissionibus, et accipiat res promissas, quæ per sacramenta conferuntur."³ A comparison of this with the corresponding passage in the Confession of Augsburg shows the stronger position on the reality of sacramental grace which the Anglican

¹ The addition may perhaps have been suggested by the fact that the Confession of Württemberg contained a long section on the subject.

² *Conf. Augustana*, art. xiii.: "*De usu Sacramentorum.* De usu Sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his qui utuntur proposita. Itaque utendum est sacramentis, ita ut fides accedat, quæ credat promissionibus, quæ per sacramenta exhibentur et ostenduntur. Damnant igitur illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta ex opere operato justificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quæ credat remitti peccata."

³ See Hardwick, p. 270.

divines maintained. There is nothing in the purely Lutheran document answering to the "efficacia signa gratiæ," which has been transferred from this unfinished series to our own Article.

The object of the Article is (1) to condemn the inadequate views of sacraments held by the Anabaptists, and to state their true position; (2) to distinguish between the two "Sacraments of the Gospel" and the other five "commonly called Sacraments"; and (3) to insist upon the necessity of a right disposition on the part of the recipients of them. It consists of four paragraphs, treating respectively of the following subjects, which shall be here considered separately:

1. The description of sacraments ordained of Christ.
2. The number of such sacraments.
3. The five rites "commonly called Sacraments."
4. The use of sacraments.

I. *The Description of Sacraments ordained of Christ.*

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

Each phrase in this description requires careful consideration. Sacraments ordained of Christ are—

(a) **Badges or tokens of Christian men's profession** (notæ professionis Christianorum). This was the regular phrase descriptive of sacraments among the Zwinglians,¹ and adopted also by the Anabaptists,

¹ The language of Zwingli himself sometimes gave to sacraments the lowest position possible. In the *Ratio fidei* he says boldly: "Credo,

who regarded the Eucharist and baptism as *nothing more* than such tokens. So we read in Archbishop Hermann's *Simplex ac pia deliberatio* (which was translated into English in 1547), that they "withdrowe from the sacramentes, which they wil to be nothyng els than outward sygnes of our profession and felowship, as the badges of capitaines be in warre; thei deni that they be workes and ceremonies instituted of God for this purpose; that in them we shulde acknowledge, embrace, and receyve thorough fayth the mercie of God and the merite and communion of Christ; and that God worketh by these signes and exhibiteth unto us the gyftes in dede, which He offereth wyth these signes."² Similarly, the same view is condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, in the following words: "Magna quoque temeritas illorum est, qui sacramenta sic extenuant ut ea pro nudis signis, et externis tantum indiciis capi velint, quibus tanquam notis hominum Christianorum religio possit a cæteris internosci, nec animadvertunt quantum sit scelus, hæc sancta Dei instituta inania et vacua credere."³ According to this Anabaptist theory, baptism was merely a "mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened," and the Eucharist was nothing more than "a sign of the love that imo scio, omnia sacramenta tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne adferant quidem aut dispensent" (see Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 24), and elsewhere (*De peccato originali declaratio*): "Symbola igitur sunt externa ista rerum spiritualium et ipsa minime sunt spiritualia, nec quidquam spirituale in nobis perficiunt: sed sunt eorum qui spirituales sunt, quasi tesserae." But his followers were to a great extent influenced by Calvin's teaching, and in the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549) they admit that they are more than "marks or badges of profession." "Sunt quidem et hi sacramentorum fines ut notæ sint ac tesserae Christianæ professionis et societatis sive fraternitatis, ut sint ad gratiarum actionem incitamenta et exercitia fidei ac piæ vitæ, denique syngraphæ ad id obligantes. Sic hic unus inter alia præcipuus ut per ea nobis gratiam suam testetur Deus, repræsentet atque obsignet."—Niemeyer, p. 193.

² English translation (ed. 1548) fol. cxlii.

³ *De Hæres.* c. xvii.

Christians ought to have among themselves one to another." Our Article condemns this view of sacraments as "notæ professionis" (not only in the Article before us, but also in XXVII. and XXVIII.), as not in itself untrue, but simply as inadequate. As Hooker says, they are "marks of distinction to separate God's own from strangers." But they are **not only** this. Far more important is it to remember that they are—

(b) **Certain sure witnesses . . . of grace and God's goodwill towards us.** This view of sacraments as "witnesses" (testimonia) is one to which special prominence was given by both Lutheran and Calvinistic divines upon the Continent. Sometimes they spoke as if they were witnesses chiefly of *past* mercies, outward acts testifying to God's redeeming love, and assuring us of it in order to excite and confirm our faith in Him.¹ Sometimes, however, they regarded them also as witnesses of *present* blessings, testifying by outward ceremonies to that blessing which the grace annexed to the sacrament confers.² So also our own Hooker speaks of them as "marks *whereby to know when* God doth impart the vital or saving grace of Christ unto all that are capable thereof";³ and, in the Order for

¹ "Baptism testifies that we have been cleansed and washed; the Eucharistic Supper that we have been redeemed."—Calvin's *Institutes*, IV. xiv. 22. "Circumcision is nothing; so is baptism nothing; the communion of the Lord's Supper is nothing: they are rather testimonies and seals of the Divine will towards thee; through them is thy conscience assured, if it ever doubted, of the graciousness and the goodwill of God in thy regard."—Melancthon, quoted by Moehler, *Symbolism*, p. 202 (Eng. Tr.). Cf. the 13th Article of the Confession of Augsburg, quoted above, p. 587.

² So the *Apology for the Confession of Augsburg*: "Sacramentum est ceremonia vel opus, in quo Deus nobis exhibet hoc, quod offert annexa ceremoniæ gratia."

³ *Ecc. Polity*, bk. V. c. lvii.

Holy Communion we are reminded that the holy mysteries are "pledges of His love," and that by them God "assures us of His favour and goodness towards us."

But this is not all. They are also to be regarded as—

(c) **Effectual signs of grace** (efficacia signa). An "effectual sign" is a sign that carries its effect with it. As the Church Catechism teaches us, it is something more than a mere "pledge." It is also "a means whereby we receive the same" spiritual grace, of which it is "an outward visible sign." A sacrament, then, is "not only a picture of grace, but a channel of grace."¹ It "not only typifies, but conveys."² As Hooker puts it, the sacraments are "means effectual whereby God, when we take the sacraments, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify."³ This phrase, "effectual signs of grace," first makes its appearance, as we have already seen, in the incomplete formulary of 1538, and it marks out very clearly the determination of the Anglican Divines to insist upon the truth that the sacraments are real *means of grace*.⁴

(d) By means of these effectual signs God **doth work invisibly in us**. In them "it pleaseth God to communicate by sensible means those blessings which are incomprehensible."⁵ Once more the words seem to have been inserted with the express purpose of laying stress on the reality of the Divine gifts which man

¹ Bp. Alexander.

² Bp. A. Forbes.

³ Hooker, *l.c.*

⁴ The phrase is a scholastic one (see Occam, *Sent.* IV. 9. 1), which had not commended itself to Luther, and he was only willing to accept it with some qualification. "Nec verum esse potest, sacramentis inesse vim efficacem justificationis, seu esse signa efficacis gratiæ. Hæc enim omnia dicuntur in jacturam fidei, ex ignorantia promissionis divinæ. Nisi hoc modo efficaciam dixeris, quod si adsit fides indubitata, certissime et efficacissime gratiam conferunt."—*De Capt. Babyl. Ecc. Opp.* vol. ii. fol. 272 (Jenæ, 1600).

⁵ Hooker, *l.c.*

receives from God in and through the sacraments,¹ in which He "embraceth us, and offereth Himself to be embraced by us."²

(e) Lastly, by them God **doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.** In this phrase it appears to be natural to refer the first expression "quicken" (*excitat*) to the action of God's grace in Holy Baptism, and the second, "strengthen and confirm" (*confirmat*), to the action of the same grace in the Eucharist.

We have now gone through the description of sacraments ordained of Christ point by point. But before passing on to consider the next paragraph of the Article, it will be well to cite the definitions given in the Church Catechism and in the Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments, and to compare them with that in the Article before us. If we take the most familiar of them, viz. that in the Catechism, as the standard, and refer the other two to it, it will easily be seen that, though the forms are different, and belong to different dates,³ yet in each case *the same five points are brought out.*

According to the Church Catechism a sacrament is "(1) an outward and visible sign of (2) an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, (3) ordained by Christ

¹ These words, as well as "efficacia signa," have nothing corresponding to them in the Confession of Augsburg, being first inserted in the joint Confession of 1538. It is curious, however, to find something very similar to them in the *Confessio Belgica* (1562). "Sunt enim sacramenta signa ac symbola visibilia rerum internarum et invisibilium, per quæ, ceu per media, Deus ipse virtute Spiritus Sancti in nobis operatur."—Art. XXXIII. (On this Confession see p. 10.)

² *Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments*, p. 376 seq. (S.P.C.K.).

³ The Article to 1553 (or indeed to 1538); the Homily in question to the early years of Elizabeth's reign; the part of the Catechism treating of the sacraments to 1604.

Himself as (4) a means whereby we receive the same, and (5) a pledge to assure us thereof."

According to the Homily, sacraments, "according to the exact signification," are "(1) visible signs (3) expressly commanded in the New Testament, (4 and 5) whereunto is annexed the promise of (2) free forgiveness of our sins, and of our holiness and joining with Christ."¹

To the same effect the Article says that sacraments (3) "ordained of Christ are . . . (5) certain sure witnesses, and (4) effectual (1) signs of (2) grace and God's goodwill towards us, (4) by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

There are, of course, differences of detail, e.g. the Homily leaves us free to look for the outward sign anywhere "in the New Testament," whereas the Catechism, with which agrees the Article,² requires it to be ordained "by Christ Himself." The Catechism leaves the nature of the inward spiritual grace undefined. The Homily accurately makes it include, not only pardon, but sanctification and incorporation in Christ. Thus the different descriptions may be regarded as supplementing each other, and for teaching purposes none should be lost sight of.

II. *The Number of Sacraments ordained of Christ.*

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

¹ *Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments*, p. 376 (S.P.C.K.).

² Though the first paragraph does not mention the outward sign as "ordained by Christ Himself," yet the phrases used in the second and third paragraphs, "ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel," and "any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God," indicate agreement with the Catechism on this point.

In considering this statement it will be convenient (*a*) to trace out the history of the word sacrament, and (*b*) to endeavour to set forth the precise difference between England and Rome on the number of the sacraments.

(*a*) *The history of the word sacrament.*—The word *Sacramentum* is a familiar classical one, with two well-defined uses. It means either (1) a gage of money laid down by parties who went to law, or (2) the military oath taken by soldiers to be true to their country and general. The idea which is common to both these meanings is that of a *sacred pledge*. The earliest occurrence of the word in connection with Christianity and Christian associations is in Pliny's famous letter to the Emperor Trajan, in which he says that the Christians of Bithynia bound themselves *sacramento* not to commit any wrong.¹ It may be a matter of doubt to what precisely Pliny was referring, but there can be no doubt that his use of the word "sacrament" is little more than an accident. It can scarcely have been the word which the Bithynian Christians used. In a letter at the beginning of the second century from a Roman governor to a Roman emperor the word can only be interpreted in its classical sense of an oath or obligation. Ecclesiastical Latin was not yet in existence: indeed, it is almost certain that there was as yet no Latin-speaking Church; and thus, though it is interesting to find the word employed in connection with a Christian rite, yet later associations which have grown up round it must not be suffered to influence our interpretation of it. As an ecclesiastical term, its true home is *North Africa*, which

¹ Pliny, *Epist.* xvi.: "Affirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ vel erroris quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem, seque *sacramento* non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent." See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. II. vol. i. p. 51.

was the first Latin-speaking Church. Here we find it used from the first as the equivalent of the Greek *μυστήριον*, and as such it is employed with a wide latitude of meaning, for either a religious rite or a religious truth; generally, however, with the idea that some sacred meaning lies under a visible sign. So Tertullian (200) uses the word again and again, sometimes of the military oath,¹ sometimes of a sacred truth, or a mystery, sometimes of a sacred rite, and even of the rite of infanticide with which the Christians were charged.² Similarly with Cyprian (250) it means a sacred symbol, a sacred bond, or a sacred truth.³ From North Africa the word passed into the common language and familiar speech of Western Christendom through the Latin versions of the Scripture, in which it appears in several passages always as the rendering of *μυστήριον*.⁴ In Patristic writers the same latitude in the use of the term, which has been already noticed, may constantly be

¹ *De Spectaculis*, xxiv. *Scorpiace*, iv.

² See *Apol.* vii. (*Sacramentum infanticidii*); xv. (*Sacramenti nostri*); xix. (*Judaici Sacramenti*); xlvii. (*nostris Sacramentis*); *Adv. Marc.* V. viii. (*panis et calicis Sacramento*); *De Bapt.* i. (*aquæ Sacramentum*), etc.

³ Cyprian uses it twice of the military oath: *De lapsis*, xiii.; *Ep.* lxxiv. Elsewhere with wide latitude of meaning. Of Baptism, *Ep.* lxxiii.; of the Eucharist, *De zelo et livore*, xvii., *De lapsis*, xxv.; of the Passover, *De unitate*, viii.; of a sacred bond, *Ep.* lix., *De unitate*, vi. etc.; of doctrines, *De Dominica Oratione*, ix., *Testim. Prof.* etc. See the very careful note on his use of the word, which was "in many instances used with intentional vagueness," in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. iv. p. 253.

⁴ "Sacramentum" appears in the Vulgate (1) in the Old Testament in Dan. ii. 18, 30, 47, iv. 6 (A.V. 9), each time as the equivalent of *ἕρως*, a secret (Greek *μυστήριον*); and also in Tobit xii. 7; Wisd. ii. 22, vi. 24 (A.V. 22); in all of which places it represents the same Greek word, *μυστήριον*, as it does also (2) in the eight passages in which it is found in the New Testament, viz. Eph. i. 9, iii. 3, 9, v. 32; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. i. 20, xvii. 7. It is also found occasionally in other passages in the "Old Latin," e.g. in Rom. xvi. 25.

observed. It is used frequently of sacred truths, as well as of sacred rites of mystic meaning. Even as late as the eleventh century it is applied by S. Bernard to the rite of feet washing.¹ But in comparatively early times there had been a tendency to contrast the sacraments or sacred rites of the Jews with those of the Christian Church, and to point to the former as numerous and burdensome, and the latter as few in number. Thus Augustine, in the passage quoted in the original Article of 1553, says that "under the new dispensation our Lord Jesus Christ has knit together His people in fellowship, by sacraments which are very few in number, most easy in observance, and most excellent in significance, as baptism solemnised in the name of the Trinity, the Communion of His Body and Blood, and also whatever else is commended to us in Canonical Scripture, apart from those enactments which were a yoke of bondage to God's ancient people, suited to their state of heart and to the times of the prophets, and which are found in the books of Moses."² Elsewhere in his book on Christian Doctrine he draws a similar contrast, pointing out how "our Lord Himself and apostolic practice have handed down to us a few significant rites (*signa*) in place of many, and these at once very easy to perform, most majestic in their significance, and most sacred in their observance. Such as the Sacrament of Baptism, and the Celebration of the Body and Blood of the Lord."³ From this contrast between the multiplicity of sacred rites imposed upon the Jews and the fewness of those enjoined in the gospel to Christians, there grew up in time a disposition to use the word *sacramentum* more particularly of those rites which could claim the authority of the New Testament, and to speak of the "Sacraments

¹ *Sermo in Coena Domini*, § 24.

² See above, p. 586.

³ *De Doctrina Christiana*, III. ix.

of the Church" as limited in number. So in the East, "Dionysius the Areopagite" (c. 500), who is followed by later writers, describes in his book on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchies *six* Christian *μυστήρια*, Baptism, the Eucharist, Unction, Orders, Monastic Profession, and the Rites for the Dead. In the West, Paschasius Radbert¹ and Rhabanus Maurus,² in the ninth century, both speak of *four* sacraments, Baptism, Unction, the Body, and the Blood of the Lord. Not till the eleventh century is the number fixed at the mystic number *seven*, to correspond with the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit. The earliest writer to speak of this number (so far as is known) is Gregory of Bergamo,³ in his book, *De Eucharistia*. In this he says definitely that the sacraments of the Church instituted by our Saviour were *seven*;⁴ but in the next chapter he speaks of *three*, Baptism, Unction, and the Eucharist, as more worthy, and contradicts what he has said before, by maintaining that of these three, only the first and third were instituted by the Redeemer Himself, for unction has only apostolic authority.⁵ A few years later than Gregory was Peter Lombard,⁶ to whom it is generally stated that

¹ *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, iii. 2.

² *De Clericorum Institutione*, I. xxiv.

³ Gregory became Bishop of Bergamo in 1133, and died in 1146. His book, *De Eucharistia*, was first published in 1877, and since then has been included in Hurter's *Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta*, vol. xxxix.

⁴ *De Euch.* c. xiii.: "Verum ne quis occasione dierum existimet tot esse sacramenta ecclesie, quot sunt quibus congruit sacramenti vocabulum, scire debemus ea solum esse ecclesie sacramenta a servatore nostro Jesu instituta quæ in medicinam nobis tributa fuere, et hæc numero adimplentur septenario."

⁵ *De Euch.* c. xiv.: "Tria siquidem in ecclesia gerimus sacramenta quæ sacramentis aliis putantur non immerito digniora, scilicet baptismum, chrisma, corpus et sanguis Domini. Quorum trium primum et ultimum ex ipsius Redemptoris institutione percepimus, ex apostolica vero traditione illud quod medium posuimus."

⁶ Peter Lombard became Bishop of Paris in 1159, and died in 1164.

the limitation of the number to seven is due. It is found in his writings,¹ and it was probably through his influence that it became generally accepted. From him it passed into the writings of the schoolmen, Aquinas² and others. It was laid down in the "decree to the Armenians" sent in the name of Pope Eugenius IV. from the Council of Florence (1439);³ and was definitely adopted by the Council of Trent at the seventh session of the Council (1547), when the following canon was passed: "If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; or that they are more or less than seven, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, or Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament: let him be anathema."⁴ It will be seen from this brief sketch that our Reformers had a double use of the word before them. On the one hand, there was the wider sense given to it by the Fathers; on the other, the more restricted scholastic use. They

¹ *Sentent.* IV. *dist.* ii. § 1.

² *Summa*, III. Q. lxxv.

³ *Decretum Eugenii Papæ IV. ad Armenios*, Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix. pp. 434 and 437.

⁴ *Conc. Triid.* Sess. VII. canon 1: "Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta; aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, extremam Unctionem, Ordinem, et Matrimonium, aut etiam aliquod horum septem, non esse vere, et proprie sacramentum, anathema sit." It should be mentioned that the Greek Church agrees with the Roman in reckoning the sacraments of the Church as seven in number; for though the Confession of Cyril Lucar says that only two sacraments were ordained of Christ (c. xv., see Kimmel's *Libri Symbolici*, p. 34), the "Orthodox Confession recognises the ἐπὶ τὰ μυστήρια τῆς ἐκκλησίας (q. xviii. *ib.* p. 170 *seq.*), as does also the Confession of Dositheos (*Decret.* xv. *ib.* p. 448); and see also "the Longer Catechism of the Russian Church" (Blackmore's *Doctrine of the Russian Church*, p. 84). The Confession of Metrophanes Critopolus calls Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἀναγκαῖα μυστήρια. See Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 241.

recognised frankly that it was largely a question of definition. What they were concerned for was that Baptism and the Eucharist, as the two great rites ordained for all Christians by Christ Himself, should be put on a different footing from all others.¹ The medieval teaching about the seven sacraments might seem to obscure this; and therefore they felt that if the word was to be restricted to a limited number of rites, it would be well to restrict it to these two. But they

¹ According to the teaching of the earlier period, during the Reformation three sacraments were recognised as pre-eminent, Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance. These alone are mentioned in the Ten Articles of 1536, while in the "Institution of a Christian Man," or "the Bishops' Book," issued in the following year, they are expressly separated off from the others, and it is said that "although the sacraments of Matrimony, of Confirmation, of Holy Orders, and of Extreme Unction have been of long time past received and approved by the common consent of the Catholic Church to have the name and dignity of sacraments, as indeed they are well worthy to have . . . yet there is a difference in dignity and necessity between them and the other three sacraments, that is to say, the sacraments of Baptism, of Penance, and of the Altar, and that for divers causes," etc.—See *Formularies of Faith*, p. 128. In 1540 a series of questions was propounded, probably by the Archbishop of Canterbury, to a number of Bishops and Divines, and their answers revealed a great variety of opinions on the number of the sacraments, and the proper use of the word (see the answers in Burnet, "Records," Nos. xxi. and lxxix., and of Dixon, vol. ii. p. 303 *seq.*). Cranmer and others denied that it should be rigidly used of seven. However, in the reactionary "King's Book" of 1543 the whole passage on the number of sacraments in the Bishops' Book is entirely rewritten, and the medieval view is more rigidly adhered to (see *Formularies of Faith*, p. 293). In the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, as might be expected, a great change of view is manifest, as the following extract will show: "Ad sacramenti perfectionem tria concurrere debent. Primum evidens est et illustris nota, quæ manifeste cerni possit, secundum est Dei promissum, quod externo signo nobis representatur et plane confirmatur. Tertium est Dei præceptum quo necessitas nobis imponitur, ista partim faciendi, partim commemorandi: quæ tria cum autoritate Scripturarum in Baptismo solum occurrant, et Eucharistia, nos hæc duo sola pro veris et propriis novi testamenti sacramentis ponimus."—*De Sacramentis*, c. ii. Similarly in the Catechism published with the Articles in 1553, only two sacraments are expressly recognised.

were perfectly willing to extend it to other rites also—indeed, to “anything whereby an holy thing is signified”—provided that it was made clear that the word was only used in a general sense. Thus the Article before us, after speaking of the five rites, “commonly called Sacraments,”¹ proceeds, not to deny the name to them altogether, but only to assert that they “have not the *like* nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord’s Supper,” *i.e.* they are not to be put on a level with them. Still clearer, perhaps, is the teaching of the Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments, which puts the matter so admirably that the passage must be quoted here in full.

“As for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a sacrament, namely for visible signs, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin, and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. For although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign (I mean laying on of hands) is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are; and therefore Absolution is no such sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are. And though the ordering of ministers hath His visible

¹ It cannot be said that this expression discourages the application of the name to them, any more than it can be maintained that the parallel form of expression in the Prayer Book, “The Nativity of our Lord, or the Birthday of Christ, *commonly called* Christmas Day,” discourages the use of the popular name for the festival.

sign and promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other sacraments except the two above named do. Therefore neither it, nor any other sacrament else, be such sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are. But in a general acceptation the name of a sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified. In which understanding of the word the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five, commonly of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven sacraments; but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby to repute them as sacraments in the same signification that the two forenamed Sacraments are. *Dionysius; Bernard, De Cæna Domini, et Ablut. pedum.*”¹

It is perfectly clear from this that *in some sense* other sacraments are recognised by those who are responsible for the Homilies besides the two great ones, Baptism and the Communion.

We are now in a position to pass to the consideration of the next point:

(b) *The precise difference between England and Rome on the number of the sacraments.*—It is largely but not entirely a question of definition—not entirely, for, even admitting the Roman description of sacraments, we could not accept the Tridentine statement upon them. The real difference appears to be this: Rome says that the sacraments of the new law are *neither more nor less than seven*, and that they were *all* instituted by Christ. The Anglican Church maintains that the word should either be restricted to *two* rites with outward visible signs ordained by Christ Himself,² or else that sacraments are

¹ *Homily on Common Prayer and the Sacraments*, p. 376 *seq.* (S.P.C.K.).

² It must be remembered that the statement of the Catechism, “Two

not seven, but simply sacred rites, the number of which is not limited. Two points in the Roman position may be added, as they are sometimes overlooked. *First*, though the Tridentine divines have committed the Roman Church to the position that all the seven sacraments were instituted by Christ Himself,¹ yet they have never asserted that in every case the outward visible sign is of His institution; *secondly*, they asserted definitely that all the seven are not to be regarded as exactly on the same level of equality. "If anyone shall say that these seven sacraments are equal to each other in such wise as that one is not in any way more worthy than another: let him be anathema."² When these two points are remembered, it will be found that the difference between the two branches of the Church on this matter is comparatively small.

III. *The five Rites "commonly called Sacraments."*

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that

only as generally necessary to salvation," is not made in answer to the question, "How many sacraments are there!" but "How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church!" Moreover it is not said absolutely that these are "two only," but "two only as generally necessary for salvation," *i.e.* as necessary for all men. Cf. Taylor's *Dissuasive from Popery*, p. 240. "It is none of the doctrine of the Church of England that there are two sacraments only; but that of those rituals commanded in Scripture, which the ecclesiastical use calls sacraments (by a word of art), two only are generally necessary to salvation." So Archbp. Secker in his *Lectures* (xxxv.), "Our Catechism doth not require it to be said absolutely that the sacraments are *two only*, but two only necessary to salvation, leaving persons at liberty to comprehend more things under the name if they please, provided that they insist not on the necessity of them, and of dignifying them with this title."

¹ Before the Council of Trent it was regarded as an open question whether they were all instituted by Christ; and some divines, as Bonaventura, Hugo, and Durandus, have questioned whether Confirmation and Unction were instituted by Him.

² *Conc. Trident.* Sess. VII. canon iii.

is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles (a prava apostolorum imitatione), partly are states of life allowed (probat) in the Scriptures: but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

It cannot be said that the account given in this paragraph of the five rites is quite exact. It is said that they are (1) **such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles**, *i.e.* from a bad imitation of them, a *prava apostolorum imitatione*. This would well apply, as will be shown below, to Extreme Unction, and perhaps also is intended to refer to Penance in its medieval form, in view of the superstitions connected with it. (2) They are **partly states of life allowed in the Scriptures**. "Allowed," it must be remembered, meant a good deal more in the sixteenth century than it does now. It did not stand for "permitted," but was equivalent to "approved of" (Latin, *probat*).¹ Thus "states of life allowed in the Scriptures" involves no lack of appreciation of the rites so described. The phrase may be taken to refer to Matrimony and Holy Orders, both of which can be spoken of as "states of life." But it cannot include Confirmation, which is

¹ So in Art. XXXV. of 1553 it is said that the "Book of prayers and ceremonies of the Church of England" ought to be received and *allowed* (approbandi). In XXXVI. of the same series, that "the civil magistrate is ordained and *allowed* (probat) of God." A similar use of the word is found in the Baptismal Service in the Book of Common Prayer: "He favourably *alloweth* this charitable work of ours"; and cf. Ps. xi. 6 (P.B.V. "the Lord *alloweth* the righteous"), and S. Luke xi. 48, 1 Thess. ii. 4 in the A.V.

not a "state of life" at all. Nor does it seem probable that this apostolic ordinance, which the Church of England has always maintained and insisted upon, can be included under the first head.¹ It remains, then, that the description is somewhat carelessly drawn, and that one of the five rites is not really included in it. This, however, is not a matter of great importance, for **Confirmation**, equally with the others, fails to answer to the description of "Sacraments of the Gospel"; for although it is an apostolic rite, with its "outward visible sign" and its "inward spiritual grace," yet as it is only traceable to the Acts of the Apostles (see Acts viii. 17, xix. 6, and cf. Heb. vi. 2), we cannot positively say that it was "ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel," or that it has an "outward visible sign ordained by Christ Himself."

It will also be found that each of the other rites fails to answer to the restricted definition. **Penance**, of which absolution is the "form in which its chief force consists,"² most certainly was "ordained by Christ Himself" (see S. John xx. 23), but it cannot honestly be said to have "any visible sign or ceremony ordained of

¹ It is *possible*, however, as Dr. Mason thinks, that Confirmation is intended to be described as having grown out of "the corrupt following of the apostles," since "in the official language of the time, Confirmation meant distinctly the rite of unction, after a certain form, with a chrism elaborately compounded." See "The relation of Confirmation to Baptism," p. 426. I cannot, however, think that this view is probable, since "Confirmation" had been deliberately retained as the official title of the rite of laying on of hands in the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1559. It is curious to notice that at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, the Puritans complained that this phrase in the Articles involved a contradiction with the teaching of the Prayer Book, and that their complaint was dismissed as a "mere cavil." Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 182.

² *Conc. Trid.* Sess. XIV. cap. iii. : "Dócet præterea sancta synodus sacramenti penitentiae formam, in qua præcipue ipsius vis sita est, in illis ministri verbis positam esse: Ego te absolvo," etc.

God." **Orders**, again, was "ordained by Christ Himself" on the same occasion (S. John xx. 21-23). It has its "inward spiritual grace," and from the days of the Apostles has had as its "outward visible sign" the laying on of hands. But once more the outward visible sign cannot be traced back to the Gospel, or to our Lord's own ordinance. Moreover, the grace given in it is official, rather than for the personal sanctification of the recipient. **Matrimony** is "an honourable estate, instituted of God in the time of man's innocency, signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church"; and though "Christ adorned and beautified" it "with His Presence,"¹ it cannot be said that it was ordained of Him in the Gospel, nor has it any "outward visible sign" of Divine appointment.² **Extreme Unction** may seem to require further consideration; for whereas the other four rites are retained and "had in reverend estimation" by the Church of England, this one has been entirely disused, and no authority whatever is given for the application of oil to the sick by the formularies of this branch of the Church. The Scriptural authority that is pleaded for the rite is, of course, the injunction of S. James in his Epistle.

"Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders

¹ The Book of Common Prayer. The Order for the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony.

² In Eph. v. 32, after speaking of the union in marriage, S. Paul says τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, which is rendered by the Vulgate "Sacramentum hoc magnum est," and consequently by the Douay version, "This is a great sacrament." It is, however, perfectly obvious that the Apostle's use of the word μυστήριον in this connection ("This mystery is great," R. V.) has no real bearing on the question whether marriage is a "sacrament" in the later technical sense of the word, though, as Bishop Ellicott notes (*in loc.*), the very fact of the comparison which the Apostle makes ("but I am speaking in reference to Christ and His Church") "does place marriage on a far holier and higher basis than modern theories are disposed to admit."

of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him" (v. 14, 15).¹ It may be granted that this looks very much like an injunction to the Church for all time; but even so, if this were allowed, it would not give the unction a right to be regarded as a Sacrament of the Gospel, for it is not "ordained by Christ Himself." We find, however, in the writings of early Fathers so remarkable and complete a silence upon the subject that we can only conclude that it was not regarded by them as enjoining a rite to be continued after the *χαρισματα ιαμάτων* (1 Cor. xii. 9) had disappeared from the Church. There is, indeed, a constant stream of testimony to the use of oil for healing purposes by Christians in early ages;² but there is no evidence for its application as a religious rite until we come to the well-known letter of Innocent I. to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, early in the fifth century. Decentius had written to ask whether the bishop might anoint the sick. Innocent replies, and, referring to the passage in S. James, tells him that he might do so, that the oil should be blessed by the bishop and used by all Christians in their hour of need, and that it is "a kind of sacrament."³ Now, even if it be

¹ The only other passage in the New Testament where such unction can possibly be referred to is S. Mark vi. 13, where it is said that the Apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them"; but this is so definitely *for healing*, that it is not generally regarded by Roman divines as "the sacrament of Unction."

² *H. g.* Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam*, c. iv.; *Vita Eugenix*, c. xi. (Rosweyd, 343).

³ *Ep. ad Decent.* § 8: "Sane quoniam de hoc, sicuti de cæteris, consulere voluit dilectio tua . . . quod in beati apostolis Jacobi epistolæ conscriptum est: *Si infirmus aliquis in vobis est*, etc.: quod non est dubium de fidelibus ægrotantibus accipi vel intelligi debere, qui sancto oleo chrismatis perungi possunt, quod ab episcopo confectum, non solum

admitted that the letter is genuine, it is clear that it is fatal to any claim for this religious unction to be regarded as *primitive*; for, as Bishop Harold Browne truly says, "If extreme unction were then a sacrament of the Church, it is impossible that one bishop should have asked this question of another; or if he did, that the other should not at once have reminded him that it was a well-known sacrament of immemorial usage."¹ Further, it appears from the letter that even when the blessing of the oil was restricted to the bishop, it was still regarded as immaterial by whom the unction was administered;² nor do we meet with any injunction to the priest to administer it himself *before the ninth century*.

Again, whereas the original intention of the unction had been primarily for the saving of the sick person's life, by degrees this dropped out of sight, and the rite came to be regarded as part of the preparation for death, and was only administered when all hope of recovery seemed to have passed away; and thus that

sacerdotibus, sed et omnibus uti Christianis licet, in sua aut in suorum necessitate ungendum. Cæterum illud superfluum esse videmus adjectum, ut de episcopo ambigatur, quod presbyteris licere non dubium est. Nam idcirco presbyteris dictum est, quia episcopi occupationibus aliis impediti, ad omnes languidos ire non possunt. Cæterum si episcopus aut potest aut dignum ducit, aliquem a se visitandum, et benedicere et tangere chrismate, sine cunctatione potest, cujus est chrisma conficere. Nam penitentibus istud infundi non potest, quia genus est sacramenti. Nam quibus reliqua sacramenta negantur, quomodo unum genus putatur posse concedi?"

¹ *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 588.

² Even after the days of Innocent I. the oil was frequently blessed by laymen, and even *women*. Thus S. Monegund (570) on her deathbed "blessed oil and salt," which were afterwards given to the sick; see Greg. Turon. *Vite Patrum*, c. xix. In 813 the Council of Chalons lays down that the sick ought to be anointed by the presbyters with oil which is blessed by the bishop (canon xlviii.). To the same effect, Hincmar (852), *Capit.* 5, and others about the same time. See the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. ii. p. 2004.

which had been originally simply "the last unction" (*extrema unctio*), as being (presumably) applied after the unctions in Baptism and Confirmation, came to be looked upon as nothing but "unctio in extremis," and was deferred until death seemed imminent. The subject was considered by the Council of Trent at its fourteenth Session, in 1551, when it was laid down that "this sacred unction of the sick was instituted by Christ our Lord, as truly and properly a sacrament of the new law, hinted at, indeed, in Mark, but recommended and promulgated to the faithful by James the apostle and brother of the Lord." The unction was said to "represent the grace of the Holy Ghost with which the soul of the sick person is invisibly anointed." The "effect of this sacrament" was further said to be "the grace of the Holy Ghost, whose anointing cleanses away sins, if there be any still to be expiated, and the remains of sin; relieves and strengthens the soul of the sick, by exciting in him a great confidence in the Divine mercy, whereby the sick being relieved, bears more easily the inconveniences and pain of sickness; and more readily resists the temptations of the devil, who lies in wait for his heel;¹ and sometimes obtains bodily health, when it is expedient for the welfare of his soul." It is also said that "this unction is to be applied to the sick, but especially to those who lie in such danger as to seem placed at their departure from this life: whence also it is called the sacrament of the dying." But it is added that "if the sick should recover, after having received this unction, they may again be aided by the succour of this sacrament when they fall into another like danger of death."² These quotations show how far the Roman

¹ The reference is to the Vulgate of Gen. iii. 15.

² *Conc. Trid.* Sess. XIV., *Doctrina de sacramento extremæ unctionis*, cap. i.-iii.

use has departed from the intention of the rite described by S. James, and how what was originally a practice enjoined for *life* has become a "sacrament of the dying," only administered at the present day after the Viaticum has been received.¹ Turning now to the consideration of the practice in the Church of England, it may be noticed that the "Bishops' Book" of 1537 contains a section devoted to the subject in which various abuses and superstitions connected with the rite are noticed,² though the practice is retained, and men are to be taught to repute it "among the other sacraments of the Church." But it is clearly stated that "the grace conferred in this sacrament is the relief and recovery of the disease and sickness wherewith the sick person is then diseased and troubled, and also the remission of his sins if he be then in sin."³ All this passage was considerably modified in the "King's Book" of 1543, which refers far less to the prospect of restoration to bodily health, and is, as might be expected, decidedly more medieval in tone.⁴ When the first English Prayer Book was pub-

¹ It is clear from the language of S. Thomas that in the thirteenth century extreme unction was administered *before* the Eucharist was given to the sick, for he says: "Per poenitentiam et extremam unctionem preparatur homo ad digne sumendum corpus Christi."—*Summa*, III. Q. lxxv. art. 3.

² "No man ought to think that by receiving of this sacrament of anointing the sick man's life shall be made shorter, but rather that the same shall be prolonged thereby,—considering the same is instituted for the recovery of health both of the soul and body. Second, that it is an evil custom to defer the administration of this sacrament unto such time as the sick persons be brought by sickness unto extreme peril and jeopardy of life, and be in manner in despair to live any longer. Thirdly, that it is lawful and expedient to administer this said sacrament unto every good Christian man in the manner and form before rehearsed, so oft and whensoever any great and perilous sickness and malady shall fortune unto them."—*Formularies of Faith*, p. 127.

³ *Ib.* p. 125.

⁴ See *Formularies of Faith*, pp. 123-128 and 290-293.

lished in 1549, a simple form of anointing was provided to be used "if the sick person desire it." It was, however, entirely omitted in the Second Prayer Book in 1552, and has never been restored. If any justification be needed for this complete disuse of the practice, it may reasonably be found in the absence of any early authority for it, and the entire lack of evidence from early writers that the words of S. James were regarded as enjoining a rite to be of lasting obligation in the Church.

IV. *The use of Sacraments.*

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

There is a slight difficulty concerning the first words used here, because Baptism cannot possibly be "carried about," nor does there appear ever to have been any superstitious practice of "gazing upon" it. The custom of carrying about the Eucharist is referred to again in Article XXVIII., and it is easy to see that, in view of the superstitions of the day, it may well have been thought necessary to point out that this holy sacrament **was not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about;** and the probability is that the words are intended to refer specially to it.¹ This inter-

¹ Britton (*Horæ Sacramentales*, p. 97 *seq.*) argues that the plural "sacraments" may have been intended to refer to the two parts of the Eucharist which are spoken of in the Prayer Books of 1552 and 1559 as the *Sacraments* of His Blessed Body and Blood" (second exhortation to come to the Holy Communion). The word is altered into the singular in the edition of 1604.

pretation is confirmed by the fact that S. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xi. 29, to which allusion is made in the following sentence, are spoken only of the Eucharist.

It will scarcely be denied that the medieval system was exposed to serious danger of leading men to rest content with the mechanical act of receiving the sacraments, and of encouraging them to look on them almost as magical charms. Hence it was well that it should be definitely stated **that we should duly use them, and that in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation.** But it would seem superfluous to add proof of these statements here, for no Christian will be found to deny them.

With regard to the last words of the Article, which state that **they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith,** it will be sufficient to remind the reader that the "damnation" spoken of here and in the Authorised Version of 1 Cor. xi. 29 (the passage alluded to), is not necessarily final condemnation. It is rather that "judgment" with which "we are chastened of the Lord, *that we may not be condemned with the world*" (ver. 32); *i.e.* the Apostle is speaking of a temporal chastisement, the object of which was to wean the unworthy communicant from his sin, and lead him to repentance, so that he might escape what is commonly called "damnation." The mistranslation, which is found in the Book of Common Prayer, as well as in the Articles and the Authorised Version, has happily been altered in the Revised Version of 1881. It may be said in extenuation of it that "damnation" was by no means so strong a term in the sixteenth century as it is now;¹ but all the same the rendering of *κρίμα* as "judicium" by the

¹ See Wright's *Bible Word Book*, p. 181.

Vulgate in the passage in question ought to have prevented the mistranslation, the practical consequences of which have certainly been serious.

A few words may be added in conclusion concerning the doctrine of grace *ex opere operato*, for it will be remembered that the phrase was expressly condemned in the clause corresponding to that now under consideration, in the Article of 1553. It may therefore be fairly asked, why was the condemnation of it removed in 1563? Does the Church of England hold the doctrine, or does it not? In answer to this it may be pointed out that the phrase was an ambiguous one, capable of a perfectly innocent sense, and of expressing a real truth, but capable also of a meaning which was grossly superstitious. It was originally used by medieval Theologians, and after them by the Council of Trent (Session VII. canon viii.), to describe the nature of the effects which the "seven sacraments" produce. In the technical language of the schools, man can by his perversity and wilful hardness "put a bar" (*ponere obicem*) against their effect,¹ and certain dispositions, as faith and repentance, are required on the part of the recipient. But the grace comes not from them, but from Christ Himself through the sacraments of His institution; for, as our own Article XXVI. points out, the sacraments are "effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be administered by evil men." It was to guard this truth that the phrase that grace comes *ex opere operato* was invented; and it was intended to indicate that "grace

¹ Cf. the answer of the bishops at the Savoy Conference in 1661 to the objection of the Puritans to the statement that every child is regenerate in Baptism. "Seeing that God's sacraments have their effects where the receiver doth not 'ponere obicem,' put any bar against them (which children cannot do); we may say in faith of every child that is baptized, that it is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit."—Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 356.

is conferred by virtue of the sacramental act instituted by God for this end, not by the merits of the minister or the recipient."¹ But while, as employed by careful and instructed theologians, the phrase meant nothing more than this, yet in the mouths of ignorant and ill-instructed persons it was easily capable of "no godly but a very superstitious sense," and might be taken to imply that the grace was so tied to the sacraments that the sacramental act became almost of the nature of a magical charm, bringing grace to the recipient *ex opere operato*, whatever his spiritual condition might be.² It was this which led to the condemnation of the phrase in 1553. But by the time of the revision of 1563 it had been made abundantly clear that this superstitious use was not the only one which the phrase conveyed. Consequently there was a danger lest the language of the

¹ So Bellarmine (*De Sacram.* ii. 1) explains it: "Id quod active et proxime atque instrumentaliter efficit gratiam justificationis est sola actio illa externa, quæ sacramentum dicitur, et hæc vocatur *opus operatum*, accipiendo passive (operatum), ita ut idem sit sacramentum conferre gratiam ex opere operato, quod conferre gratiam ex vi ipsius actionis sacramentalis a Deo ad hoc institutæ, non ex merito agentis vel suscipientis. . . . Voluntas, fides, et penitentia in suscipiente adulto necessario requiruntur ut dispositiones ex parte subjecti, non ut cause activæ, non enim fides et penitentia efficiunt gratiam sacramentalem neque dant efficaciam sacramenti, sed solum tollunt obstacula, quæ impedirent, ne sacramenta suam efficaciam exercere possent, unde in pueris, ubi non requiritur dispositio, sine his rebus fit justificatio." And, among moderns, see the careful statement of Moehler, *Symbolism*, p. 198.

² This superstitious sense is indicated in the language of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, where the phrase is condemned (Art. IX.): "Neque enim in illis verum est, quod quidam dicunt, sacramenta conferre gratiam ex opere operato *sine bono motu utentis*, nam in ratione utentibus necessarium est ut fides etiam utentis accedat, per quam credat illis promissionibus et accipiat res promissas quæ per sacramenta conferantur." So in the "Apology for the Confession of Augsburg": "Damnamus totum populum scholasticorum doctorum qui docent quod sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferant gratiam ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis." Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 246.

Article might appear to condemn a real truth. Hence the clause was wisely omitted by Archbishop Parker,¹ and nothing whatever was said either to sanction or to condemn the phrase. The superstition which it was desired to guard against was effectually excluded by the statement that "in such only as duly receive" the sacraments "have they a wholesome effect or operation"; while the truth which the phrase had been originally intended to express was secured by the language of the following Article, which states "that they are effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be administered by evil men."

¹ Cf. Hardwick, pp. 129, 130.

ARTICLE XXVI

*De vi Institutionum Divinarum,
quod eam non tollit malitia
ministrorum.*

Quamvis in ecclesia visibili bonis mali semper sint admixti, atque interdum ministerio verbi et sacramentorum administrationi præsint, tamen cum non suo sed Christi nomine agant, ejusque mandato et autoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in verbo Dei audiendo, tum in sacramentis percipiendis. Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipiunt, quæ propter institutionem Christi et promissionem efficacia sunt, licet per malos administrantur.

Ad Ecclesiæ tamen disciplinam pertinet, ut in malos ministros inquiratur, accusenturque ab his, qui eorum flagitia noverint, atque tandem justo convicti judicio deponantur.

*Of the Unworthiness of the ministers,
which hinder not the effect of the
Sacraments.*

Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometime the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and Sacraments: yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the word of God, and in the receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.

THIS Article has remained practically unchanged¹ since

¹ "Malos ministros" was substituted for "eos" in the last paragraph in 1563, and in 1571 the English was brought into conformity with the

its first issue in 1553. It is drawn substantially from the fifth of the "Thirteen Articles of 1538,"¹ which in its turn rested to some extent on the eighth of the Confession of Augsburg.² Its object is to condemn the view maintained by the Anabaptists, that the ministry of evil ministers is necessarily inefficacious and ought to be rejected. The same view is expressly condemned in the Confession of Augsburg in the following words: "Damnant Donatistas et similes, qui negabant licere uti ministerio malorum in ecclesia, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse."³ Similarly the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* says that some of the Anabaptists "ab ecclesiæ corpore seipso segregant, et ad sacrosanctam Domini mensam cum aliis recusant accedere, seque dicunt detineri vel ministrorum improbitate vel aliorum fratrum."⁴

Latin by the alteration of "such" into "evil ministers." The title also in its present form only dates from 1571. In 1553 and 1563 it was "the wickedness of the ministers doth not take away the effectual operation of God's ordinances." "Ministrorum malitia non tollit efficaciam institutionum divinarum."

¹ "Quamvis in ecclesia secundum posteriorem acceptionem mali sint bonis admixti atque etiam ministeriis verbi et sacramentorum non nunquam præsent; tamen cum ministrent non suo sed Christi nomine, mandato, et auctoritate, licet eorum ministerio uti, tam in verbo audiendi quam in recipiendis sacramentis juxta illud: 'Qui vos audit me audit.' Nec per eorum malitiam minuitur effectus, aut gratia donorum Christi rite accipientibus; sunt enim efficacia propter promissionem et ordinationem Christi, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur."

² "Quamquam ecclesia proprie sit congregatio sanctorum et vere credentium; tamen cum in hac vita multi hypocritæ et mali admixti sint, licet uti sacramentis, quæ per malos administrantur, juxta vocem Christi: *Sedent Scribæ et Pharisei in Cathedra Moisis*, etc. Et sacramenta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi sunt efficacia, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur."

³ *Confessio Augustana*, Art. VIII. *sub fine*.

⁴ *Ref. Legum Ecclesiast.*, De *Hæres.* c. xv. Cf. Rogers *On the Articles* (published in 1586). "The Anabaptists will not have the people to use the ministry of evil ministers, and think the service of wicked ministers

It has been sometimes thought that the Article may have also been aimed at the doctrine of "Intention."¹ This, however, is unquestionably a mistake. The language of the Article in no way bears on the doctrine, and it is difficult to see how it could ever have been thought to do so. Certainly when the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 asked that a condemnation of the doctrine might be inserted in the Articles, it cannot have occurred either to them or to the Bishops who answered them that a condemnation of it was there already.² Moreover, when in 1633 Francis a Sancta Clara (Davenport) wrote his Commentary on the Thirty-Nine Articles, endeavouring to reconcile them with the Tridentine decrees, while some of the statements in the Articles were evidently stubborn facts which it was hard to manipulate, the Article before us gave him no trouble whatever. It appeared to him entirely satisfactory, and the only comment which he deemed necessary upon it was this: "This is the very doctrine of the Church and of all the Fathers."³

Taking, then, the Article as aimed solely against the notions of the Anabaptists, it needs but little comment

unprofitable and not effectual; affirming that no man who is himself faulty can preach the truth to others. . . . The disciplinary Puritans do bring all ministers who cannot preach, and their services, into detestation. For their doctrine is that where there is no preacher, there ought to be no minister of the sacraments. None must minister the sacraments which do not preach, etc. . . . So the Brownists: no man is to communicate (say they) where there is a blind or dumb ministry." Rogers *On the Thirty-Nine Articles* (Parker Society), p. 271.

¹ See Bishop Harold Browne *On the Articles*, p. 607.

² Cf. Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 185.

³ Davenport's book, which is more remarkable for ingenuity than for anything else, has been republished by the Rev. F. G. Lee (J. T. Hayes, 1872).

or explanation.¹ The opinions condemned in it, which have found favour with Puritan sects from the days of the Donatists onward, would, if admitted, make all ministerial and sacramental acts utterly uncertain, for no man can see into the hearts of the ministers, and say who are in the sight of God "evil" and who are not. Besides this, there is ample support in Holy Scripture for the position maintained in the Article. The principle underlying our Lord's words, "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all things, therefore, whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe; but do not ye after their works" (S. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3), may fairly be applied to the case of "evil ministers" in the Christian Church. When the Twelve were sent forth two and two, and given "power against unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease," the ministry of Judas must have been effectual like that of the rest of the Apostles, or suspicion would have been directed towards him. Again, our Lord lays down the rule with regard to "the Seventy" which must apply to Christian ministers also: "He that heareth you heareth Me; and he that rejecteth you, rejecteth Me; and he that rejecteth Me, rejecteth Him that sent Me" (S. Luke x. 16); and S. Paul teaches that the minister is nothing. "What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? ministers through whom ye believed; and each as the Lord gave to him. I planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase" (1 Cor. iii. 5, 6). Such passages when fairly considered seem sufficient to establish the position taken up in the Article, and to lead us to believe that even in an extreme case, when **the evil have chief authority in the ministration of**

¹The doctrine of "Intention" is noticed in connection with the question of the validity of Anglican Orders in the Commentary on Article XXXVI. See below, p. 755.

the word and sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the word of God, and in the receiving of the sacraments.

At the same time, important as it is that this principle should be established, it is no less necessary that the Church should guard herself with the utmost care from any suspicion of indifference to the character of the lives of her ministers, whom she charges before their ordination to the priesthood to "endeavour themselves to sanctify their lives, and to fashion them after the rule and doctrine of Christ, that they may be wholesome and godly examples and patterns for the people to follow"; and, therefore, it is well that the statement already considered should be followed by that in the last paragraph of the Article, which must commend itself to everyone, and seems to require no formal proof. **It appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.**

ARTICLE XXVII

De Baptismo.

Baptismus non est tantum professionis signum ac discriminis nota, qua Christiani a non Christianis discernantur, sed etiam est signum Regenerationis, per quod tanquam per instrumentum recte baptismum suscipientes, ecclesie inseruntur, promissiones de remissione peccatorum atque adoptione nostra in filios Dei, per Spiritum sanctum visibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et vi divinæ invocationis, gratia augetur.

Baptismus parvulorum omnino in ecclesia retinendus est, ut qui cum Christi institutione optime congruat.

Of Baptism.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened: but is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed: faith is confirmed: and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

THIS Article dates from 1553; but in the revision of Elizabeth's reign, ten years later, the last paragraph was rewritten, and the language on Infant Baptism was considerably strengthened. The earlier clause had simply stated that "the custom of the Church to christen young children is to be commended, and in any wise to be retained in the Church."¹ The language of the Article

¹ It should be mentioned that though the words "per Spiritum Sanctum" stand in the *Latin* edition of 1553, there is nothing to correspond to them in the English. The omission was rectified in the English edition of Jugge and Cawood in 1563.

has not been traced to any earlier source. There is nothing in the Confession of Augsburg¹ or in the Thirteen Articles of 1538 suggesting its phraseology; nor is there any resemblance between its language and that of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* on the same subject.²

The object of the Article is to state the Church's teaching on Holy Baptism, in view of the errors of the Anabaptists, who (1) maintained an utterly unspiritual view of the sacrament, and (2) denied that Baptism ought to be administered to infants and young children.³

There are two main subjects which come before us for consideration—

- (1) The description of Baptism and its effects.
- (2) Infant Baptism.

I. *The Description of Baptism and its Effects.*

Each phrase in the description requires separate consideration.

(a) **Baptism is . . . a sign of profession.** So much was admitted by Zwingli and the Anabaptists, who regarded Baptism as little more than this. The expression used in the Article may be illustrated by the language of the closing exhortation in the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants in the Book of Common Prayer, where it is said that "Baptism doth represent unto us our profession; which

¹ The Article in the Confession of Augsburg (IX.) is this: "De Baptismo docent, quod sit necessarius ad salutem, quodque per baptismum offeratur gratia Dei; et quod pueri sint baptizandi, qui per baptismum oblatis Deo recipiantur in gratiam Dei. Damnant Anabaptistas, qui improbant baptismum puerorum, et affirmant pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri."

² *Ref. Legum Ecclesiast., De Sacramentis*, cap. 3.

³ This, together with other errors on Baptism, is condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, De Hæres.* cap. 18; and cf. Hermann's "Consultation," fol. cxlii.

is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him: that as He died and rose again for us, so should we who are baptized, die from sin and rise again unto righteousness; continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."¹ This view of Baptism is based directly on the language of S. Paul in Rom. vi. 4, "We were buried with Him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (cf. also Col. ii. 12, "Having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God, Who raised Him from the dead").

(b) It is a **mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened** (a non Christianis). Just as circumcision was a mark distinguishing the Jews from all others, so also Baptism distinguishes Christians from non-Christians. It is the initial rite by which a man is, so to speak, made a Christian. But Baptism is much more than this. It is to be regarded **not only** as a badge or mark, for,

¹ Cf. also the Collect for Easter Even (1662), "Grant, O Lord, that as we are baptized into the death of thy blessed Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, so by continually mortifying our corrupt affections we may be buried with him; and that through the grave and gate of death we may pass to our joyful resurrection; for His merits," etc. Expression is also given to the same thought in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiast.*, *De Sacramentis*, cap. 3: "Dum autem in aqua demergimur et rursus ex illa emergimus, Christi mors nobis primum et sepultura commendantur, deinde suscitatio quidem illius, et reditus ad vitam," etc. See also Bishop Lightfoot on Col. ii. 12: "Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new. As he sinks beneath the baptismal waters the believer buries there all his corrupt affections and past sins; as he emerges thence, he rises regenerate, quickened to new hopes and a new life. . . . Thus Baptism is an image of his participation both in the death and in the resurrection of Christ." It is obvious how much the *dramatic* impressiveness of Baptism and its representative force is increased where immersion is the method employed.

(c) It is **also a sign of regeneration or new birth**. Here it must be remembered that sacraments have been already defined in Article XXV. as "effectual signs of grace," and therefore, since "Regeneration" is the word which the Church has ever used to describe the grace of Baptism, and to sum up the blessings conveyed in it, we must interpret "sign" in this clause as an effectual sign; and thus the whole expression will mean that in Baptism the blessings of regeneration are not only represented, but are also conveyed to the recipient. The word Regeneration is expanded in the Church Catechism into "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," and explained in the following words: "For being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace." It has been selected by the Church, not only because of its use by S. Paul, who speaks in Titus iii. 5 of a "laver of regeneration" (*λουτρὸν παλιγγεσεσίας*),¹ in a connection in which it can only refer to Baptism, but also because, previously to this, expression had been given to the thought of a "new birth" as requisite by our Lord Himself in His conversation with Nicodemus, where, after saying, "Except a man be born anew (or *from above*, *ἀνωθεν*) he cannot see the kingdom of God,"² He explains His words by adding the statement that a man must be

¹ The only other passage in the New Testament in which the word *παλιγγεσεσία* occurs is S. Matt. xix. 28, where it has no reference to Baptism.

² Thus among the Greek Fathers *ἀναγέννησις* occurs from the days of Justin Martyr onwards (*Apol.* I. lxi. : "Ἐπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννώμεθα"). (Cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* I. xiv. 1 : *eis ἐξάρτησιν τοῦ βαπτισματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως*). Indeed it is more common in this connection than *παλιγγεσεσία*. For these two words the Latins have but the one equivalent, *Regeneratio*, which is apparently first found of Christian Baptism in Tertullian, *De Resurr. Carnis*, xlvii. (its use in *De Carne Christi*, iv., is ambiguous).

"born of water and the Spirit" (*ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνευματός*), S. John iii. 3, 5.¹

But though the word Regeneration sums up the special grace of Baptism, yet the precise blessings conveyed by it may seem to demand more explicit statement, and therefore the Article proceeds to define them, and to state them under at least three distinct heads.

1. By it (Latin *per quod*, i.e. by the *signum regenerationis*), **as by an instrument,² they that receive Baptism rightly** (*recte*) **are grafted into the Church.** So in the Church Catechism (dating in this part from 1549), the child is taught to speak of "my Baptism wherein I was made *a member of Christ*," that is, a member of His mystical body, the Church; and the language of the Article is capable of abundant illustration from the Baptismal Offices in the Book of Common Prayer, which frequently speak of admission to the Church as one of the blessings of Baptism. Most pertinent are the words of the declaration of Regeneration to be used after the actual Baptism, which, as they date from the revision of 1552, are almost exactly contem-

¹ Since exception is sometimes taken to the reference of these words to Christian Baptism, it may be well to remind the reader of Hooker's forcible vindication of the Catholic interpretation of them, and the three arguments by which he supports it. (1) Where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst; (2) of all the ancients, there is not one that can be named that did ever understand it except of Baptism; and (3) "where the letter of the law hath two things plainly expressed, *water* as a duty on our part, *the Spirit* as a gift which God supplieth, there is danger in presuming so to interpret it as if the clause concerning ourselves were more than needeth. By such rare expositions we may perhaps in the end attain to be thought witty, but with ill advice."—*Ecc. Pol.* bk. V. c. lix.

² The phrase *tanquam per instrumentum* was perhaps suggested by the Confession of Augsburg, which says (Article V.) that "per verbum et sacramenta, *tanquam per instrumenta*, donatur Spiritus Sanctus." But the expression is not uncommon in contemporary writings. See Hardwick, p. 414.

porary with the Article before us. "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child *is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church*," etc. The metaphor of "grafting" employed here and in the Article is suggested by the language of S. Paul in Rom. xi. 17 *seq.*; but throughout the Acts of the Apostles, Baptism everywhere appears as the rite of admission into the Church. Our Lord's charge after the resurrection had been, "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, *baptizing them*," etc. (S. Matt. xxviii. 19, cf. [S. Mark] xvi. 16), and from the day of Pentecost onward the command was obeyed, and those that received the word were forthwith "baptized." See Acts ii. 38, 41, viii. 12, ix. 18, x. 47, xvi. 15.

2. **The promises of the forgiveness of sin . . . are visibly signed and sealed.** So in the "Nicene" Creed the Christian is taught to say, "I acknowledge one Baptism *for the remission of sins*," and Article IX. has already stated that "there is no condemnation to them that believe *and are baptized*" (*renatis et credentibus*). With regard to the expression employed in the Article, "signed and sealed" (*obsignantur*), its force will be clearly seen when it is remembered that "a seal is appended to a deed of gift or any other grant, when the donor, who has promised it, *actually makes the thing promised over to the receiver*, and thereby assures the possession of it to him."¹ Thus the

¹ Sadler's *Church Doctrine Bible Truth*, p. 120. It ought to be stated that what is called the "obsignatory" view of sacraments was widely held by many of the foreign reformers, who had a considerable following among our English divines. According to this theory, the sacraments were simply "seals of blessings which already appertained to the recipient as a child of grace" (see Hardwick, p. 94); and did this phrase in our Article stand alone, it might fairly be contended that it denoted the acceptance of this view. But the clause does not stand alone, and cannot be interpreted without regard to language previously used in this Article

words of the Article imply that Baptism is the moment in the spiritual life in which the forgiveness of sin is actually made over to us. It is not to be inferred that Divine grace has been altogether withheld from the Catechumen. In the case of adults it must have been present, or they would never have come forward "truly repenting, and coming to Christ by faith." But what is meant is that Baptism is the decisive moment in which a person passes out of the order of nature into that of grace, and in which, according to the teaching of Scripture and the Church, the forgiveness of his sins is "visibly signed and sealed." Very instructive is the language of Scripture on the case of S. Paul. There can be no question that he received Divine grace at the moment of his conversion. For three days after this he was left to himself, and grace was working in his heart: "For behold he prayeth," was the description of him given to Ananias (Acts ix. 11). But not till the time of his Baptism were his sins washed away, for the words of Ananias to him were these: "And now, why tarriest thou? arise, and *be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on His name*" (Acts xxii. 16). So on the day of Pentecost those who heard Peter speak received the grace of compunction, for "they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter, and the rest of the Apostles, Brethren, what shall we do?" but the forgiveness of their sin is connected by the Apostle with the decisive act of Baptism: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall

and also in Article xxv.; and when the teaching of the Sacramental Articles is taken as a whole, it is very clearly seen that the compilers definitely intended to maintain something more than the obnoxious theory, and that they held that "grace is conferred by means of the sacraments, and that children are not justified or regenerated prior to their baptism." See the letter from Peter Martyr to Bullinger, quoted in Hardwick, p. 95.

receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 37, 38).¹ With these passages before us there can be no doubt that the Church is right in thus connecting, as she has ever done, the promise of forgiveness of sin with the sacrament of Baptism.²

It may be added that even John the Baptist "preached the baptism of repentance *unto remission of sins*" (S. Mark i. 4), and that the natural action of water in cleansing would almost of necessity suggest that something analogous to this in the spiritual sphere was intended to be effected by Baptism, more especially as the symbolism had been so fully recognised under the Old Covenant, *e.g.* in the symbolic washings of the priests under the law (Lev. viii. 6); the cleansing of the leper (Lev. xiv. 8); the Psalmist's prayer, "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin" (Ps. li. 2); and many passages in the Prophets, such as Is. i. 16; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Zech. xiii. 1, and others.

¹ Cf. Eph. v. 25, 26: "Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word (*καθαρίας τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι*); that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish."

² The teaching of the Church may be illustrated from the Baptismal Offices, wherein we are taught to "call upon God for this infant, that he, coming to Thy holy baptism, may receive *remission of his sins* by spiritual regeneration," and pray that God would "*sanctify this water* to the mystical washing away of sins." Naturally there is even more emphasis laid on this in the form for the Baptism of such as are of riper years, in whose case there is actual as well as original sin to be washed away. See especially the exhortation after the Gospel: "Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe that He will favourably receive these present persons, truly repenting and coming unto Him by faith; *that He will grant them remission of their sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost*; that He will give them the blessing," etc. The words in italics are substituted for "that He will embrace him with the arms of His mercy" in the corresponding passage in the Office for the Baptism of Infants.

3. **The promises . . . of our adoption to be the sons of God . . . are visibly signed and sealed.** So in the Catechism we have the expression "my baptism wherein I was made . . . the child of God"—the child, that is, by adoption and grace, for we are all children of God by creation, and Christ alone is God's "Son" by nature and eternal generation; and so (to illustrate the language of the Article once more from the Book of Common Prayer) after a child has been baptized we are taught to thank God "that it hath pleased [Him] to regenerate this infant with [His] Holy Spirit, to receive him for [His] own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into [His] holy Church."¹ Again, the language used in the Article is entirely Scriptural. S. Paul tells us that "when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons" (*τὴν υἰοθεσίαν*), Gal. iv. 4, 5; and in Rom. viii. 15–17 he says, "Ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption (*πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας*), whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified with Him." It is true that there is no direct mention of the rite of Baptism in this passage; but the tense used (*ἐλάβετε*, Aorist) points to a *definite time*, and that can only be the time of Baptism,² with which the thought of sonship

¹ Compare the recognition of the same truth in the *Collect for Christmas Day*: "Almighty God . . . grant that we *being regenerate, and made thy children by adoption and grace*, may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit," etc.

² See Sanday and Headlam's *Commentary in loc.*

is connected by S. Paul in Gal. iii. 26, 27: "Ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. *For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ.*"

We now come to the consideration of the words **by the Holy Ghost** (*per Spiritum Sanctum*), which stand in the Article in the middle of the sentence now under consideration. As usually taken, they are connected with the words which immediately precede them, so that the Article is made to speak of "the promises of . . . our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost" being "visibly signed and sealed." It seems, however, unquestionable that they were originally intended to be construed with the words that follow, and to refer to the action of the Holy Ghost in signing and sealing the promises. "The promises of the forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed." The words are thus punctuated in the authoritative Latin edition of 1563, and in the earliest English translations.¹ And

¹ The evidence, so far as I have been able to collect it, is this—(1) In 1553 in the Latin MS. signed by the royal chaplains (*State Papers*, Edward vi. "Domestic," vol. xv. No. 28), as well as in the published Latin edition, there is no stop till after *obsignantur*, "*promissiones de . . . adoptione nostra in filios Dei per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur*," etc. In the *English* the words "per Spiritum Sanctum" are not represented at all. (2) In 1563 in the Latin Parker MS. at Corpus College, Cambridge, there is no stop till after *obsignantur*, but in the *printed* edition, published by Wolfe, there is a comma after "*filios Dei*," "*adoptione nostra in filios Dei, per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur*." This is also the case in the *English MSS.* in the State Paper Office belonging to the same year (Elizabeth, "Domestic," vol. xxvii. Nos. 40 and 41), "our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Spirit are visibly signed and sealed"; as well as in the *English* edition published by Jugge and Cawood. The Latin MS. among the *State Papers* (*ubi supra*, No. 41a) has no stop till after *obsignantur*, but the arrangement of the words in the lines looks as if the words "*per Spiritum Sanctum*" were intended to be read with what follows rather than with what precedes. (3) In 1571 the *English MS.* signed by some of the Bishops, now in the Library of Corpus College, Cambridge, has the

though in English the natural order, if this were the meaning, would be "visibly signed and sealed by the Holy Ghost," yet against this must be set the fact that in the edition of 1571 there stands a comma *before* as well as *after* the words, thus: "the promises . . . of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed," which does not look as if the translators intended them to be taken closely with the preceding words. Further, whatever may be the case elsewhere, in the instance before us the Latin is unquestionably the original, and in this there is nothing unnatural in the order of the words "per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur." The words, then, should apparently be taken as a *definite recognition of the action of the Holy Spirit in Baptism*. By Him the promises are visibly signed and sealed. The "new birth," as our Lord Himself teaches us, is one of "water and the Spirit" (S. John iii. 5); and as S. Paul says, "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13).¹ It is clear, then, from the teaching of Holy Scripture that a new relation is formed between the baptized person and the Holy Spirit who is the instrument of his regeneration, and that in some sense the Holy Spirit is "given" in Baptism. As

comma after "sons of God," "our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed." Of the published editions in this year the *Latin* (Daye) has no stop till after *obsignantur*; the English (Jugge and Cawood) punctuates as follows: "our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed." (4) The English reprint of 1628 with the Royal Declaration prefixed to it adopts the same punctuation as in the edition of 1571 by Jugge and Cawood. But (5) in a reprint of 1662 we find the modern punctuation. "Our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed." I cannot say whether it ever occurs earlier than this, but this is the earliest edition in which I have discovered it.

¹ "Ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι denotes the means, and the εἰς (into one body) the result attained," Godet *in loc.*

Hooker puts it with his usual accuracy, "Baptism was instituted that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life."¹ But it is a further question whether it is right to say precisely that the gift of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is given in Baptism apart from Confirmation. On the one hand, the gift of the Spirit is apparently definitely connected with Baptism (with no mention of Confirmation) in Acts ii. 38. On the other, though the action of the Holy Spirit might well be predicated, it is difficult to assert definitely the existence of the indwelling gift in the face of Acts viii. 15-17 and xix. 1-6, where the gift is distinctly connected with the "laying on of hands" which followed (in one case at least after some interval) after the actual Baptism. The question cannot be dealt with further here, as it is not directly raised by the terms of the Article. Indeed it appears to require a fuller consideration than it has yet received in the Church.²

There remain some other words of the Article of which it is hard to say what is the precise significance, **faith is confirmed: and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God** (vi *divinæ invocationis*). No Scriptural authority can be urged, as in the case of the statements already made, for connecting these blessings with the administration of Baptism. Moreover, the Article contemplates the Baptism of

¹ E. P. V. lx. 2.

² Reference should be made to A. J. Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*.

infants, in whose case faith cannot be looked for; and yet the expression before us is "faith is *confirmed* and grace *increased*"—words which of necessity presuppose an already existent "faith" and "grace" which can be "confirmed" and "increased." The difficulty is a real one, and is not easily solved. But, on the whole, it appears to the present writer that the best solution is to understand the words as descriptive of that which takes place in the baptized, and subsequent to Baptism.¹ So in the Baptismal Office, the baptized persons present are taught to use these words, which correspond in a remarkable manner to the expression before us: "Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we give Thee humble thanks, for that Thou hast vouchsafed to call us to the knowledge of Thy *grace*, and *faith* in Thee. *Increase* this knowledge, and *confirm this faith* in us evermore." It is not claimed that this explanation of the words is altogether satisfactory; but it appears to be more free from difficulty than any other which has yet been suggested.²

¹ The following arrangement of the Article may serve to bring out the view taken of it in the text:—

Baptism is not only

(a) A sign of profession, and

(b) Mark of difference, etc., but is also

(c) A sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument,

(1) They that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church.

(2) The promises of the forgive-
ness of sin, and

(3) Of our adoption to be the
sons of God,

} by the Holy Ghost are visibly
signed and sealed.

Faith is confirmed; and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

² Cf. Britton, *Horæ Sacramentales*, p. 185: "The Church ends her description of the graces conferred by the sacrament with the word 'sealed'; and here speaks of the wholesome effect of her ritual upon the persons present." The clause is considered by Bishop Harold Browne in his work *On the Articles*, p. 667, where it is stated that "the Latin and English do not correspond, and appear to convey different ideas. The former would indicate that the invocation of God, which accompanies the

Since in some minds there appears to exist a certain amount of confusion on the subject of this Article, and a prejudice against the Church's doctrine of baptismal Regeneration, largely due, it is believed, to a misunderstanding of the term, it may be well if, before the subject of Infant Baptism be considered, a few words are added on the distinction between regeneration, conversion, and renewal. *Regeneration*, as we have seen, is the Church's name for the special grace of Baptism, and in the Church's formularies is never used for anything else. What those blessings are has been already stated, and they need not be further described here. *Conversion* is in the Prayer Book spoken of but rarely: once the term is used of what we call the "conversion" of S. Paul;¹ once of a change of religion, the turning from heathenism to Christianity;² and once only in a more general sense of a turning from a life of sin to God.³ It is in this sense that it is popularly used now; and the word well expresses an experience which is needed by all save those who, like the Baptist, have been sanctified from their mother's womb. The difference between it and Regeneration may be expressed in this way. In Regeneration God gives Himself to the soul; in Conversion the soul gives itself to God. It may be illustrated from the Parable of the Prodigal Son. All the time that he was

act of Baptism, confirms faith and increases grace. The latter would imply that the prayers of the congregation might, over and above the ordinance of God, be blessed to the recipient's soul: so that, whereas he might receive grace by God's appointment, whether prayer accompanied Baptism or not, yet the addition of prayer was calculated to bring down more grace and to confirm faith."

¹ The Collect for the Festival of the Conversion of S. Paul: "Grant that we, having his wonderful *conversion* in remembrance."

² Preface to the Book of Common Prayer: "The baptizing of natives in our plantations, and others *converted* to the faith."

³ The third Collect for Good Friday: "Nor wouldst the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be *converted* and live."

in the "far country" the prodigal was still a son. So the man who has once been regenerated in Baptism is still a "child of God," even though, like the prodigal, he has wandered away from the Father's house, and is spending his substance in riotous living. And that which in the parable is represented as the "coming to himself" of the prodigal, when he realised his condition and determined to arise and go to his father, and confess his sin, that in the spiritual reality is Conversion. Thus there is no sort of inconsistency in proclaiming both Regeneration and Conversion. It was just because the prodigal *was* a son that he could venture to arise and go to his father, and say, *Father*. So also just because a person *is* a child of God in virtue of his Baptism, he can venture to arise and, confessing his sin, yet call God by the name of *Father*. *Renewal*, the third term mentioned above, should be distinguished from both Regeneration and Conversion, as that which, owing to man's natural infirmity, is constantly and even daily required in all Christians even after they are "converted." It is that for which we ask in the Collect for Christmas Day, in which we pray "that we, *being regenerate* and made [God's] children by adoption and grace, *may daily be renewed* by [His] Holy Spirit"; and again in the "Order for the Visitation of the Sick," even after the sinner is absolved there is a prayer that God will "*renew* in him whatsoever hath been decayed by the fraud and malice of the devil, or by his own carnal will and frailness." If the language of the Book of Common Prayer in the various passages that have been here referred to be carefully attended to, it is believed that confusion will be avoided, and that the distinction between these several terms will be clearly apprehended.

II. *Infant Baptism.*

The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

In considering the evidence for this assertion it may be well to begin with (*a*) the silence of Scripture. It is often said that there is no command to baptize infants, and therefore they are not proper subjects for the administration of the rite. In answer to this it may be pointed out that the charge to baptize is perfectly general. There is nothing in our Lord's words to *exclude* infants, and it is believed that had He intended them to be excluded, He would have expressly said so. Indeed the silence of Scripture, so far from being an argument against the practice, may really be turned into one in its favour, for the Apostles and all Jews were perfectly familiar with the idea of children being brought into covenant with God by means of circumcision; and therefore when Christ instituted Baptism as the rite of admission to the new Covenant, and said nothing expressly as to the age of those to whom it was to be administered, the natural inference must have been that children were proper subjects of it, else the new Covenant would be narrower than the old. Nor was the analogy of circumcision the only thing that would incline the Apostles to the practice, if, as seems almost certain, Baptism was already practised by the Jews in the admission of proselytes. The Talmud lays down the express rule that infants were to be baptized with their parents;¹ and though its evidence does not positively prove that the custom was already in existence at the time of our Lord's earthly ministry, yet the probability

¹ See the passages cited in Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ* on S. Matt. iii. 6 (vol. ii. p. 56).

is very strong that the Talmud is recording a tradition which dates back to so early a date. If, then, the Apostles were accustomed (1) to circumcision, and (2) in the case of proselytes to Infant Baptism, it can hardly be doubted that to them it would have seemed natural to include infants, and admit them into the new Covenant by means of the rite enjoined for "making disciples."

(b) But there is positive evidence to supplement the argument from silence. When S. John iii. 5 is connected with S. Mark x. 13-16, the inference that children are proper subjects for Baptism appears irresistible. "Except a man (*τις*) be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." These words teach the "necessity" of Baptism for admission into the Church. But in S. Mark we are expressly told that the kingdom is "of such" as children; and, as the Baptismal Office in the Book of Common Prayer reminds us, our Lord "commanded the children to be brought unto Him, blam'd those that would have kept them from Him, took them in His arms, and *blessed* them." Nor is the fact (mentioned by S. Mark) that He thus "blessed them" without its importance in this connection. It teaches us that children are capable of receiving spiritual blessings, and thus furnishes an answer to a question sometimes asked—What good can Baptism do to them?

Thus we may say that **the Baptism of young children is . . . most agreeable with the institution of Christ,** for

(1) It was instituted as the rite of admission to His kingdom;

(2) He Himself has laid down no limit of age; but

(3) Asserts that children are to be allowed to come to Him, and

(4) Teaches that they are capable of receiving spiritual blessings.

(c) When we pass from the Gospels to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, it is not surprising that there is but little which bears directly upon the subject. Wherever and whenever the Church is in a *missionary* stage, the Baptism of adults must be the rule—that of young children the exception. It is so in the present day, and must of necessity have been so in the days of the Apostles. But there are hints and indications which appear sufficient to warrant the inference that the Apostles must have admitted young children to Baptism where the opportunity of so doing was given them.

We shall, perhaps, be wise not to lay too much stress on the mention of *whole households* being baptized (Acts xvi. 15, 33; 1 Cor. i. 16), for it can never be proved that those particular households contained children (nor, however, on the other hand, is there the slightest evidence that they did *not*). But more to the point is it to notice that S. Peter in his address on the day of Pentecost seems expressly to point to the interest of children in the promise, and hence to their inclusion. "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ . . . for to you is the promise, *and to your children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him" (Acts ii. 38, 39). And in full accordance with this, we notice that S. Paul in his Epistles sends messages to children, treating them as within the Covenant, and therefore, according to all the evidence available, as already baptized (see Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 20).

(d) It may be said that these indications are but slight. But there is nothing to be set against them on the other side. And the inference here drawn from them is confirmed by the fact that there is sufficient evidence from the Fathers to show that from the second century onwards the Church was familiar with the idea

and practice of Infant Baptism, though, for the reason stated above, that she was still in her missionary stage, it must have been the exception rather than the rule. The Patristic evidence from the second and third centuries is here given. Beyond that period it is unnecessary to quote authorities for the practice.

Before the middle of the second century, the existence of the practice is implied in some words of Justin Martyr, who not only speaks of "many both men and women of sixty or seventy who had been Christ's disciples *from childhood*,¹ but also compares Baptism with circumcision, and speaks of it as the "spiritual circumcision." This is especially noteworthy, as it occurs in his *Dialogue with Trypho*,² who was a Jew; and if the analogy failed in so important a point, it could hardly have been pressed as it is by Justin.

Towards the close of the century (A.D. 180) Irenæus has these words: "He came to save all by Himself—all, I say, who are regenerated by Him unto God, *infants, and little children*, and boys, and young men, and those of older age."³

No less decisive is the language of Tertullian (200), who in his book on Baptism argues strongly against the practice, urging that the rite should be postponed till the recipients of it are growing up. But the whole force of his words depends upon the fact that Baptism was actually being administered to young children when he wrote.⁴

¹ Πολλοί τινες καὶ πολλὰ ἐξηγοντοῦται καὶ ἐβδομηγοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἀφθόροι διαμένουσιν.—*Απο.* I. xv.

² *Dial. cum Tryphone*, c. xliii.

³ "Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per Eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pueros et juvenes et seniores."—*Adv. Hæc.* II. xxxiii. 2.

⁴ "Itaque pro cuiusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est, præcipue tamen circa parvulos. . . . Veniant ergo dum adolescent, etc.—*De Baptismo*, xviii.

In the writings of Origen (220) there is more than one passage which bears on the subject. Thus in his Commentary on the Romans he says definitely that it is an apostolic tradition "to administer Baptism *even to little children*," and gives the reason for this;¹ and in the Homilies on S. Luke he speaks to the same effect, saying that "infants are baptized for the remission of sins."²

The last witness who need be cited is S. Cyprian (250). In his day we find that the analogy of circumcision was so rigidly pressed, that it was questioned whether it was lawful to administer Baptism before the eighth day after birth. The question is considered by him, and decided in the affirmative.³ From this time onwards there can be no question as to the custom of the Church permitting Infant Baptism, although in many cases it was deliberately deferred owing to the dread of post-baptismal sin. This, however, has no real bearing on the question before us; and the passages quoted are sufficient to justify the statement made above, that from the second century onwards the Church was familiar with the idea and practice of Infant Baptism.

¹ "Pro hoc et ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinatorum quod essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam et Spiritum ablui deberent."—*Com. in Ep. ad Rom.* bk. V. c. ix.

² "Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum. Quorum peccatorum? vel quo tempore peccaverunt? aut quomodo potest ulla lavacri in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi juxta illum sensum de quo paulo ante diximus: Nullus mundus a sorde, nec si unius diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram? Et quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatæ sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur et parvuli. Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu non potuerit intrare in regnum cælorum."—*In Lucam Homilia XV.*; cf. *Hom. in Levit.* viii. § 3.

³ *Ep. lxiv.* (ed. Hartel).