Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB
10156

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/doctrineofholyba

BOOKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED

BY

HERMAN HOOKER,

S. W. Corner of Eighth and Chestnut Streets,

PHILADELPHIA.

The Sayings of the Great Forty Days between the Resurrection and Ascention of our Saviour, regarded as the outlines of the Kingdom of God, in Five Discourses, with an examination of Mr. Newman's Theory of Developments, by George Moberly, D. C. L., Head Master of Winchester College:

This is the work of one of the profoundest theologians of this age. It has already passed through three editions in England, and attained the place of a standard work on the great subject on which it treats.

The Doctrine of the Incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in its Relation to Mankind and the Church, by Archdeacon Wilberforce:

This has been styled "the Book of the Age." The "Church Review" says:—"It is adapted to the present state of religious doctrine throughout nominal Christendom. It is a thoroughly learned book."

First Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, in a Series of Discourses delivered in the Parish of Trinity Church, New York, by the Rev. M. P. Parks.

This is an earnest and faithful declaration of the Church's Doctrine of Baptism, and of the training of Children. The spirit of olden time is this work.

Bickersteth on the Thirty-nine Articles:

This is a work which deserves to be better known than it is. The Author is a sound Churchman. He sets forth the Catholic sense of the Articles with proofs from the Fathers.

A Treaties on the Church, by Thomas Jackson, D. D.

THE

DOCTRINE OF HOLY BAPTISM:

WITH REMARKS ON THE REV. W. GOODE'S

"EFFECTS OF INFANT BAPTISM."

BY ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, A. M.,

ARCHDEACON OF THE EAST RIDING.

"In causa duorum hominum, quorum per unum venumdati sumus sub peccato, per alterum redimimur a peccatis, proprie fides Christiana consistit."—S. AUGUSTINUS.

"Originem quam sumpsit in utero Virginis posuit in fonte baptismatis: dedit aquæ, quod dedit matri."—S. LEO.

PHILADELPHIA:
PUBLISHED BY HERMAN HOOKER,
S. W. CORNER EIGHTH AND CHESTNUT STS.
1850.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

NEW GROUND TAKEN BY THE OPPONENTS OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION—ITS INCOMPATIBILITY WITH CALVINISM.

Inconvenience of this mode of arguing.
- 1st, As creating a prejudice against the Reformers.
- 2dly, As creating disaffection against the Church.
- 3dly, As involving a forgetfulness of the Primitive character of her Formularies.

Tenets of the Church of England proved by experience not to be identical with those of Continental Protestantism.

Three points proposed.
- 1st, To state the Church's doctrine on Holy Baptism.
- 2dly, To show that it is not inconsistent with the Primitive Doctrine of Decrees, or even with the adoption of Calvinistic phraseology.
- 3dly, To show that our Formularies were not compiled by Calvinists. - - - 15–23

CHAPTER I.

WHAT REGENERATION IS.

It implies two parties, God the Giver of grace, man its receiver. God gives grace through the Mediator—by whom the old intercourse of nature superseded.

The Gospel History of the gift of grace. Doxologies.
Man receives grace through the New Head of our race.
Man's common nature reconstructed—and that in all its parts.
Opposition to this change through surviving concupiscence—and from the individual principle of responsibility.
Regeneration is Christ's taking up his dwelling in man. 24–40

CHAPTER II.

THE TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE AS TO THE TIME AND MANNER IN WHICH REGENERATION IS BESTOWED.

Gift of Regeneration asserted to be bestowed in Holy Baptism. Preliminary cautions. Hooker's statement. Three previous objections to be removed.
1st, The inconsonance of the means to the end.
2dly, Supposed interference with God's sovereignty.
3dly, The want of practical effect.
Reply to the third objection—that Baptism the gift of means, not of results.
Need of improved Church discipline and Church instruction.
Reply to the two first objections—the Mediation of the God-man implies that God has decreed to bestow grace through Sacraments, and thus renders this mode of conveying it probable.

Direct evidence from Scripture for Regeneration in Baptism. Objections—
1st, That grace is not tied to Baptism,
2d, That to identify Baptism with Regeneration derogates from Conversion and Faith.
Answer to 1st, Baptism our means of union with the Humanity of Christ—not only the removal of guilt, but the re-creation of nature.
Answer to 2d, Conversion and Faith needful on the part of men—Baptism the means of a gift on the part of God. Conversion the submission of the individual responsibility to God's will.—Regeneration the renewal of the common nature. - - 40–61

CHAPTER III.

THE EFFICACY OF HOLY BAPTISM ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORIZED FORMULARIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The Church of England proposes a definite view respecting Holy Baptism, in her Offices and Catechism.
This view must be accepted by those who employ her Offices.
Mr. Goode admits that our Service favours a belief in Baptismal Grace.
Its different parts shown to harmonize with this belief. 61–71

Mr. Goode objects that since qualifications are required in adult, they may be required also in Infant, Baptism.
He adduces three qualifying conditions:—
1. Sentence of Election. 2. Provision of Faith and Repentance. 3. Present Faith.
But these conditions not suggested, as they should be, by the Church's words, but by consideration of the parties, *i. e.*, of the Giver or receiver of Grace.
The Church's unqualified words could not be defended, because her words *might have been* qualified.
3d Condition.—Luther did not attribute actual faith to children, but supposed the seed of faith to be infused by the Holy Ghost.
1st Condition.—Sentence of election involves the harsh doctrine of the Reprobation of Children.
2d Condition.—Rejected on account of its Pelagian tendency. - - - - - 71–82

These conditions put forward as justifying the theory of a charitable sense.
Charitable sense not applicable either to adult or infant Baptism, because should be applied *before* Baptism as well as *after* it: whereas the Church declares *meet* Catechumens unregenerate, and does not assert the salvation except of *baptized* infants.
The Church's confidence respecting the salvation of

baptized infants, limited by Mr. Goode to the children of devout persons.
This limitation contravenes the Church's laws. And the intention of her Offices. - - - 87–104
Answer in the concluding part of the Catechism not designed to represent the efficacy of Baptism to be conditional.
Such an interpretation would be Pelagian.
No Sponsors undertake to express the individual volitions, but only the legal responsibilities, of the infants whom they represent.
Avowed intention of Bishop Overall, and of the Savoy Commissioners.
Ironical meaning assigned by Mr. Goode, to the expressions of the Catechism.
Singular agreement of uninterested parties respecting the meaning of our Church's Offices. - - 104–116

CHAPTER IV.

[THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION OF PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE.

Unfortunate *ignoratio elenchi*, which has led some advocates for Baptism to depreciate Regeneration; some who were zealous for Regeneration to undervalue Baptism.
Belief in Baptismal Regeneration essential to a due appreciation of Christian responsibilities.
Its connexion with a belief in Our Lord's Mediation—as affording a criterion how far men really believe in God's influence in sacraments; irrespective of the co-operation of the human recipient.
The Sacramental system the means whereby the Mediator acts upon men.
So that its denial leads to Pelagianism, and represents men as their own Saviours. Baxter's testimony.
A difference of men's phraseology may be remedied by explanation: differences in belief between those who reject and those who accept the doctrine of Mediation will be only increased by it. - - 116–142

CHAPTER V.

HOW FAR BELIEF IN BAPTISMAL REGENERATION IS CONSISTENT WITH ADHERENCE TO CALVINISM.

Necessity of considering the new ground, on which Mr. Goode rests his opposition to Baptismal regeneration.
His three propositions.

The doctrines of Predestination, Election, and Perseverance, rest first on God's Prescience; secondly, on His Pre-appointment.
God's first Decree respecting man referred to his state before the Fall.
This Decree having been frustrated through the Fall, God's second Decree referred to that New Head of man's race, by whom the Fall was to be remedied.
Its object the elect Head and His members.
It does not supersede the individual responsibility of men, but refers to the recreation of that common nature, which is communicated from the Head to His members.
It insures protection against the kingdom of darkness.
So that the Church's doctrine of Decrees was a shadow cast beforehand by the facts of Mediation. - 142–157

God's decreed dealings with man through Mediation spoken of by the ancient writers as regards, 1st, the *gift of grace*, 2dly, its *employment* :—
And their *cause* supposed to vary, as does their *nature*; regarded as a *gift* they depend upon God's *free* mercy; regarded in their *employment* man's *responsibility* is included.
St. Austin's dispute with the Pelagians respected the manner of the Divine *gift* of grace; whether bestowed according to the law of Mediation, or the law of nature. Therefore it left human *responsibility* untouched.
Greater difficulty of the controversy with the Semi-Pelagians; respecting Preventing grace.
St. Austin's early notions respecting faith inconsistent with the freeness of God's *gift* of grace:—At a later

period he refers Preventing grace to the Divine *gift* through the Mediator, so as not to be independent of the Sacramental system, or to supersede the responsibility of man. - - - 157–169

Calvin's system the transference of God's Decrees from the *gift* of grace to its *employment*.
Its effect to destroy man's responsibility.
His object to dispense with the Sacramental system of the Church.
The influence and purpose of the doctrine of Mediation proportionably interfered with; and thus a door opened for Pelagianism.
St. Austin did not admit the characteristic parts of Calvin's theory, since he supposed that the Mediator acted through the Sacramental system; and therefore, that God's Decrees referred to the *gift* of grace through man's renewal in Christ.
Belief in Baptismal grace the criterion whether men adopt that part of Calvin's system, which interferes with the doctrine of Mediation, or only employ his phraseology. - - - - 169–179

CHAPTER VI.

THE FORMULARIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WERE NOT DRAWN UP BY CALVINISTS.

Reasons for not entering upon the subject of the Articles.
The Service-Book sufficient to decide the question.
Three especial eras in its history.

I. What was the intention of those who compiled it, A. D. 1548–9.
Necessity of following Mr. Goode in his inquiry into the sentiments of Peter Lombard.
The efficacy of Baptism universally believed by Lombard's predecessors. St. Bernard.
Lombard's opinion that sanctification arose from indwelling of the Holy Ghost; he asserts fully that grace was given in Baptism.

This truth universally admitted in the Mediæval Church. Council of Vienne.
Mr. Goode has mistaken the doubt entertained respecting *infused habits* in Baptism, for a doubt respecting Baptismal grace.
Hence the argument, which he founds on Cranmer's language, turns against himself.
For the only expressions which can be supposed to connect Cranmer with the Calvinistic system were used before he deviated in any way from the received opinions of the Mediæval Church—therefore such expressions are consistent with belief in Baptismal grace.
The expressions in the "Institution of a Christian Man," shown not to be really Calvinistic. - - 179–215

Cranmer's Catechism asserts a belief in Baptismal regeneration.
Its statements explained by Mr. Goode on the principle (erroneously) attributed to Luther, that infants possess *actual* faith.
But Cranmer had been stated by Mr. Goode *not* to entertain this opinion.
Cranmer's language in this Catechism, and in the Homilies, decidedly Anti-Calvinistic.
Ungrounded attack upon Archbishop Laurence. Martin Bucer, and Peter Martyr. - - - 215–229

II. Second era in the compilation of the Service-Book, A. D. 1604.
Bishop Overall no Calvinist.

III. Third era. The Savoy Conference.
The service for Adult Baptism confessedly drawn up by Anti-Calvinists.
The Consecration of the Water inserted in opposition to the sentiments of Bucer. - - - 230–239

CHAPTER VII.

THE ENGLISH DIVINES ALWAYS MAINTAINED THEIR BELIEF IN THE EFFICACY OF BAPTISMAL GRACE.

Mr. Goode's Third Proposition:—That the prevalence which the Calvinistic Doctrine of Absolute

Decrees at one time attained in the English Church, is incompatible with the idea that her formularies teach Baptismal Regeneration.
Mr. Goode cites passages of two sorts, 1st, expressing low views of Sacraments. 2dly, implying a belief in Calvinistic Decrees.
I. Authorities of the first kind mistaken. Jewell—Davenant. Former perversions no excuse for present.
II. Calvinistic Decrees held *nominally* by Divines of the English Church, who had not tested their opinions.
General Course of Events. Calvinism either outgrown through the progress of thought, or objected to in consequence of the offensiveness of the dogma of Reprobation. Bishop Sanderson. - - 240–252

Where Calvinistic Decrees were really held, the doctrine of Baptismal grace was not necessarily denied. Calvinism kept in check by the language of the Church. Assertion by two of the delegates at Dort, Davenant and Ward, that Calvinistic Decrees no hindrance to belief in Baptismal grance. Archbishop Usher's concurrence.
Three principles, which influenced men:—1st, Harshness of the Doctrine of Reprobation as applied to Infants. 2d. The Church's language. 3d. The language of Antiquity.
Distinct statements of the universality of grace by Davenant and Ward.
Mr. Goode explains away these expressions, as meaning nothing more than his theory of *infantine regeneration*.
The dispute turns upon the point whether *all* infants are subjects for Baptism.
Mr. Goode denies them to be fit subjects for Baptism, without a qualification.
The qualification not in the Giver of grace, because this would imply the Reprobation of infants, which Mr. Goode does not assert: nor in the *condition* of receiver: therefore it must be in the receiver's *circumstances*, *i. e.*, in his Parents.
Therefore children supposed by Mr. Goode to be accepted through the faith of their Parents.

Effect of this system to represent the Parents as Mediators for their children with God; and thus to interfere with the prerogative of Christ.
It follows that none but the children of consistent Christians should be baptized.
But Ward and Davenant were opposed to such a restriction, consequently they could not hold Mr. Goode's notion of the "infantine regeneration" of qualified parties, but the real doctrine of Baptismal grace.
The same inference is to be drawn from the Canons and usages of the Church, by which the need of a peculiar qualification for Baptism is excluded. Hooker's judgment adverse to Mr. Goode.
Therefore the efficacy of Baptismal grace was fully admitted, even by those who were supposed to receive the Calvinistic doctrine of Absolute Decrees.
God's promises must not be explained away by reference to His secret counsels. - - 253—

CONCLUSION.

Two main propositions affirmed by the Church.
1. That God bestows grace of regeneration through Baptism.
2. That he bestows it on *all* infants.
Two counter-theories.
1. Rationalistic—that gift never bestowed through Baptism.
2. That not bestowed on *all* infants.
The second theory grounded on the need of qualifications.
To suppose the qualification to be an absolute Decree of the *Giver* of Grace involves the tenet of Reprobation.
To refer it to the foreseen excellence of the *receiver* or to the excellence of his parents, is Pelagian.
The only qualification allowed by the Church is the *common* one of helplessness. - - - 281–291

THE DOCTRINE

OF

HOLY BAPTISM.

INTRODUCTION.

The controversy respecting Baptismal Regeneration has of late assumed a new form, and shifted the ground on which it was formerly contested. Any one who will refer to the writings of Archbishop Laurence, one of its main advocates in the last generation, will find that to identify the denial of this doctrine with an adoption of that which he represented as the harsh and repulsive system of Calvinism, was among his constant objects. While on the other hand his opponent, Mr. Scott, asserts distinctly and repeatedly, that the denial of Baptismal Regeneration has no sort of connexion with the obnoxious tenets of Calvin. He heads his pages with the title—"The Question not Calvinistic." "Dr. Laurence's representing the whole question as a Calvinistic one," he notices as a great "instance of unfairness;"

and he sums up his objections by saying, "what pretext can there be for asserting, that the question whether spiritual regeneration is, or is not, inseparable from baptism, has any necessary connexion with the doctrines of absolute predestination, and indefectible grace? The assertion has no foundation in the nature of things, and it is directly contradicted by fact."[1]

Now, that a certain general consonance inclines those who hold strongly with Calvin to take low views of sacramental efficacy, can hardly be doubted; but Mr. Scott is an unanswerable witness, when he asserts that the theory of Calvin and the doctrine of Baptismal Grace are not so practically irreconcilable, that those who adhere to the one must forego the other. And yet this is the position on which Mr. Goode's recent work on the effects of Infant Baptism is based. The object of this work is to show that the Church of England does not affirm that *all* children, duly brought to baptism, are recipients of grace. This consequence follows at once, according to Mr. Goode's opinion, if it can be demonstrated that those who compiled our Formularies were Calvinists. "If," he says, "it shall appear (and I believe it to be undeniable) that their doctrine was in the most important points what is now called 'Calvinistic,' there is, or ought to be, an *end* to the controversy as to the interpretation they intended to be given to our Formularies, both as it respects Baptism, and several other points."[2]

[1] "Reply to Laurence," by the Rev. John Scott, p. 3 and 8.

[2] "The Effects of Baptism in the case of Infants," by the Rev. W. Goode.

Thus does he take for granted, as the very basis of his position, that which Mr. Scott had so emphatically denied.

This new footing, upon which Mr. Goode desires to place the Baptismal question, is open to some great objections. First—Its effect upon the credit of our Reformers will be very different from any thing which he can desire. For the Formularies, which they have left to the Church, are a plain record of their public declarations. Now, if these are not to be taken in their obvious and apparent sense, because the Reformers selected ambiguous expressions, which concealed from an "only half-protestantized people"[3] (as some have worded it) the full theory which was lurking in their own minds, what will result but the conviction that they taught one thing and believed another? Yet Mr. Goode is compelled to admit, as the issue of his laborious investigation into the language of our Baptismal Services, that "the expressions evidently favour the notion of their referring to the full baptismal blessing." So that his authority may be cited by those opponents of the English Reformation, who attribute time-serving and dishonourable motives to its supporters. And the benefit which he will do to his own friends by bringing the Reformers over to their party, will be far less than the injury which he will do to the Reformers themselves.

Secondly—It has hitherto been supposed, that to look with reverence and humility at the Divine

[3] Gorham's "Examination for admission to a Benefice."—*Introduction*, p. 28.

Decrees, and even to employ language respecting them which was borrowed from the school of Calvin, was not incompatible with an entire admission of all which the Church of England declared respecting Baptismal grace. Man's reason may be too weak, or his knowledge not sufficiently comprehensive, to enable him to bring these two systems together with logical exactness. But this is no reason why either should be abandoned. The Doctrine of Decrees has been as widely held in the Church of Rome as in the Church of England. And it is to be regretted that Mr. Goode should attempt to revive a difficulty, which was in great measure forgotten; and should tell those of our brethren who employ the language of Calvin, that they cannot receive the Baptismal services, in that sense, which (according to his own words) its "expressions evidently favour."

Thirdly—Mr. Goode seems to forget that the professed purpose of our English Divines, was to reform an old Church, not to construct a new one. Hence he supposes that those theoretical notions respecting the Divine Decrees, which he alleges that our Reformers borrowed from foreign sources, were not only a part of their system of Divinity, but the whole of it. Any opinion which does not range with the system of Calvin, he lops off without question. Now, this is to make Calvinism not only a part of our Theology, but its basis. Nor would it be unjust in speaking of new institutions, like those introduced at Geneva; since the whole code of laws was drawn in this case from one original mind, and they present, there-

fore, the perfect impress of his systematizing reason. But, however Calvin may be pretended to have influenced our theology, it cannot be alleged that he created it. Are the laws, usages, liturgy, and creeds, which had been handed down from early times, to go for nothing? Here, again, we may refer to Mr. Scott's authority. "Whence," he asks, "did the Church of England derive all the peculiar language, which she employs concerning newly baptized infants? She did not invent it. She borrowed it from primitive times."[4] If our Church, therefore, had designed to admit the theory of Calvin respecting God's decrees, it does not at once follow that she must abandon the doctrines of the ancient Fathers respecting God's promises. Her position is wholly different from that of a society, which had agreed to take its laws, ritual and faith, from the dictation of an individual, who made light of the ancient succession of the ministry, and declared the venerable Creed of Nice to be a *frigida cantilena*. All this, however, Mr. Goode forgets, when he assumes that the theory of Calvinism is the basis on which he may reconstruct the religious system of the Church of England. He assumes, in the face of all evidence, not only that Calvinists modified our services, but created them. Give him his standing-ground, and no doubt he may shake the whole world of our Theology, and bring down upon our heads the whole fabric, which God's Providence has raised upon such noble pillars.

[4] Scott's "Reply to Laurence," p. 48.

The conclusion, then, that the Church of England cannot have designed to retain the Baptismal doctrines and offices of the ancient Church, because she harmonized with the Swiss Reformers (which is the sum of Mr. Goode's reasoning), may be exchanged for the following conclusion—the Church of England cannot have harmonized perfectly with the Swiss Reformers, because she retained the Baptismal doctrines, and in part even the baptismal offices of the ancient Church. And this is a position which the course of events renders it more easy, as well as more important, to defend. It was not unnatural that an affection for the country of their temporary adoption, should have induced the Marian exiles to suppose that the system of their own Church was identical with that, under which they had enjoyed protection. This they expressed in language, to which Mr. Goode refers as of great moment. But how is it possible to maintain this opinion, now that its falsehood has been proved by the result? Whatever notion may have been entertained even in the last generation, yet now that the French revolution has unloosed that system of coercion, by which Europe was held together, the tendency of Continental Protestantism cannot be mistaken. The hot fit of enthusiasm has passed away, and the true enemy of the Cross of Christ, the chilling apathetic torpor of an Infidel Apostacy, is becoming every day more imminent. Already are the deadly forms of unbelief apparent around us. And from what quarter do they arise? They refer for their authority to the very maxims, which were introduced with other

ends by the Continental Reformers; and their favourite haunts are the very places which Piety and Faith were supposed to have chosen for their perpetual homes. This is surely an inauspicious moment for abandoning those ancient doctrines, which have descended to us from Primitive times; and for reconstructing our theological system upon the basis of that Calvinistic element which is said to have been intruded into it. For why is it, save through God's blessing on these very doctrines, that the Inspiration of Scripture is not disbelieved in England, as among the Protestants of the Continent; or that our Universities still teach that mystery of the Trinity, which has been banished from the pulpits of Geneva? We are secured, therefore, against the system of Calvin, by observing its effects; we shrink from admitting propositions to be theoretically true, which have been shown to be false by their consequences.

By this feeling only is the present writer induced to interfere in this controversy. Those great men who advocated the Church's doctrines in other generations seem to have entertained different apprehensions. Baptismal Regeneration was regarded by many of them as a safeguard against that excessive ethusiasm, which they supposed to be the prevalent danger. But were this the main reason for asserting the reality of Sacramental gifts, it would be superfluous to vindicate them. For whatever dangers may be apprehended on the side of enthusiasm, it is so little consonant to the spirit of the times, that it were better to address ourselves to the cure of more pressing evils. The question at issue in the present day

is the reality of Our Lord's mediation; the truth of that system of spiritual influences, which was bestowed by the re-creation of man's race in the Person of the Son of God; and that whole doctrine of Grace, which is characteristic of the Gospel. If it should be true, as was always believed in ancient times, and as will be stated in these pages, that "sacraments are the extension of the Incarnation;" that through their agency the Son of God effects that great work, which He took our nature to discharge, it will not seem surprising that where the sacramental system has been undervalued, those great truths to which it bears such near relation, should also be forgotten. Hence is a true belief in Baptismal grace as intimately allied in theory to the doctrines of Atonement and of Mediation, as history shows that they have been practically connected. To this point it is then that I would especially call attention in the present work. I propose

First—to set forth that doctrine of Holy Baptism, which the Church of England has received from ancient times. Whatever may be supposed to be her estimate of Calvinism; the existence of a distinct theory of Holy Baptism is an independent fact which cannot be disputed.

Secondly—I shall point out, that the doctrine of Divine Decrees is not really inconsistent with the primitive doctrine of Baptism; and that there is a certain point, up to which even the language of Calvin may be employed, without entrenching upon it. So that there exists no reason why theories respecting the secret counsels of God

should indispose men to believe His general promises.

But then I shall show thirdly—that, as a matter of fact, the Calvinistic system was not adopted by those persons, by whom our Formularies were constructed.

CHAPTER I.

WHAT REGENERATION IS.

The order which I propose to adopt in the following remarks, is first, to consider what regeneration is; and then, what is taught by Holy Scripture, and by the Church, respecting the manner of its communication. This will lead to the inquiry how far Baptismal Regeneration is of practical importance; and whether its admission is compatible with the principles of Calvinism.

At present, then, I ask what is meant by Regeneration? It has always been understood to refer to some gift of grace bestowed by God, the result whereof, is the renewal of man's nature. So that it has reference plainly to two parties; God, who bestows grace, and man, who receives it. And, therefore, its full explanation must involve the consideration of both. In what way does God bestow grace? In what way is man its receiver? Let these two points be determined, and a definition of Regeneration will be attained.

In what way, then, does God bestow those gifts of grace, which avail for the renewal of man's nature? They are expressly stated to be bestowed through the mediation of Our Lord's Humanity. "There is one God, and one Mediator between

God and men, the *Man* Christ Jesus."[1] This is the manner in which divine gifts flow forth into the world. "As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world."[2] For "this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son."[3] Not only is the intervention of the Son of Man the only channel through which the prayers of man can ascend to God, (because pardon and access have been purchased through the sufferings of the only perfect possessor of Adam's being,) but through this road is it specifically declared that the gifts of God find their way to the creature. "If through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."[4]

And this system of mediation is declared to be a new way, by which the old way of nature is superseded. For an old mode of intercourse there was, whereby, according to the constitution of nature, man was designed to receive gifts from God. In what this old mode of intercourse originally consisted is not revealed, but something we may learn of it from those traces which it has left in man's nature. For this first intercourse with God was plainly connected with that creation of man in God's image, which was the primary law of his being. And there are two ways in which this original composition of man has left its effect upon his present nature. The first is the existence of conscience; the possession, that is, on the part of man, of a certain inherent judgment respecting

[1] 1 Tim. ii. 5.
[2] John ix. 5.
[3] 1 John v. 11.
[4] Rom. v. 15.

right and wrong. Such a rule of judgment could have no authority, unless it rested on that main law of man's nature, which has his origin in God's image reflected in the creature's mind. St. Paul speaks of it as "the work of the law written in" men's "hearts."[5] And St. John tells us that it was not a law, the perpetual maintenance whereof had been trusted only to human powers: it was preserved by the abiding influence of that all-pervading Word, who never totally forsook the beings which He had created. This was that Word or creative wisdom, of which we read that "My delights were with the sons of men." And its influence is declared to have been the illuminating principle in the world of nature. "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men."

Now the result of this partial perpetuation in man of his Maker's Image, was the preservation likewise of a measure of that intercourse with God, which in the first instance had doubtless been full and unrestricted. That we are able to hold intercourse with our brethren, results from that identity of nature between us and them, whereby we and they are capable of interchanging our ideas, and the thoughts of one man are capable of being estimated by another. Even so was the power of holding intercourse with God a consequence of that formation of man in God's image, which transferred into him an intellectual mind and a moral nature. And if the intellect be found to survive even in bad men, yet it cannot reach its proper perfection without the develop-

[5] Rom. ii. 15.

ment of that moral principle, with which it has a common origin. But that the two together—the mind at large—regarded both in this moral and intellectual capacities, has some peculiar mode of holding intercourse with its Maker, is directly witnessed by its own consciousness, and is confirmed by the Holy Scriptures. For what was secret prayer, as a rite of heathen religion, but the intuitional reaching forth of the mind after its invisible Creator? It showed a conviction that the thoughts of our minds are present as a perpetual object to the Supreme Intelligence. And the same feeling is often evidenced at the present day, in those who undervalue Christian ordinances. "I need no public worship" a man says, "for I can walk forth into the open field, or lonely valley, and there my soul rises up to my Maker, and I apprehend His present influence on my mind." This cannot be denied to be a natural feeling, and if we could be saved by nature, nothing more could be desired. It is to recognize the fact that the mind is the appointed channel, through which man was designed to hold immediate intercourse with God. And this principle is confirmed by those passages of scripture, which speak of the spirit of man as though capable of direct communication with other spiritual intelligences, whether good or evil. "Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart?" And so we read that "the Lord stirred up the heart of Cyrus king of Persia." And the same conclusion follows from the activity of the mental powers, while the bodily organs are dormant. "A thing was secretly brought to me, and mine ear received a little thereof. In thoughts from the

visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men.....Then a spirit passed before my face."[6]

All this is the admission of a great truth, that the mind is an open door, whereby we communicate with the Invisible. And this intercourse is built upon that all-pervading action of the Eternal Word, which was the original light of our being. And since "all good gifts and all perfect gifts are from above," we may be assured that from His influence, whether through the seeds which He has inspired, or through the power whereby He fosters them, comes all the good which the system of nature can display. This then is the old road of nature; this the channel, through which light was originally transmitted from God to man. Now the law of mediation is the substitution of a new channel of intercourse instead of this old one. The law of grace is given in place of the law of nature. The old door of access had been shut or obstructed by sin; therefore in the Manhood of Christ was a new door opened to mankind. This is that "new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say His flesh." The Gospel, therefore, is the discovery of that new mean of approach to God, whereby the old method of approach was superseded. Its publication is the history of that great change, by which this new law of communion with God was substituted for that which had been bestowed upon Adam at his creation. It is the history of the gift of grace. For of grace, wherby is meant *God's love in action*, we hear but little comparatively in the Old Testament, and that little is connected generally with

[6] Job iv. 15.

those typical rites, whereby the minds of men were carried onward to the coming Saviour. With the Gospels begins the further dispensation of grace. Yet in the Gospels we read of no general gift of grace to mankind: its season was not yet arrived: the womb of time was still pregnant with the gift which was to ennoble the whole human family. What then do the Gospels say of grace? They speak of its communication to that heir of man's race, to that representative of humanity, in whom those spiritual blessings were still gathered together, which were soon to be diffused throughout His brethren. Every mention of grace in the Gospels refers to its communication to the *Man* Christ Jesus, the One Mediator, in whom were concentrated those gifts, which He afterwards imparted to mankind. "The child grew—and the grace of God was upon Him!" "And we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." The Gospels then speak of grace, not as bestowed on humanity at large, but on the Humanity of Christ. For it was the appointment of Infinite Wisdom that this gift was not bestowed from Him to others, till humanity had first been perfected in Himself. "It became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." Though the Humanity of the Second Adam had by nature been pure from spot, yet was suffering the appointed course through which it was perfected for the work of mediation. "For their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also might be sanctified through the Truth."

Thus did that Manhood, which was taken in the Virgin's womb, become a meet instrument for leavening the whole mass of corrupted nature. And this work being perfected, we see the new Adam, who like His earthly predecessor "had been made a little lower than the angels, crowned through the suffering of death with glory and honour." And then did "He ascend up on high, and having led captivity captive, gave gifts unto men." That which He had received because He was human, He had power to give because He was Divine. Thus did He bestow upon all His members that gift of grace, which had hitherto centred in Himself. Therefore do we read for the first time respecting our Lord's disciples, "great grace was upon them all." In this manner was the gift of the Holy Ghost, which had hitherto had its dwelling in the New Head of humanity, bestowed upon His Body of the Church. The love of God had flowed forth into the Manhood of the Incarnate Son, that thence it might diffuse itself through His brethren.

This law of mediation is recognized in all those Doxologies which the Apostles communicated to the Church. They taught men to speak of the grace of Christ, not of the grace of the Spirit, because it was the Second, not the Third Person of the Ever-blessed Trinity, who became the Incarnate Mediator from whom Divine gifts were transmitted to His earthly brethren. Such statements do not derogate from the work of the Blessed Spirit, nor detract from His Personality: they only reveal that law whereby it has been His good pleasure to regulate His dealings with mankind in the economy of grace. For the office

which God the Holy Ghost was pleased to discharge in this work of mercy, was to be the agent whereby men might be joined to that Manhood of the Son, which was the appointed channel of graces. As this work, therefore, had its beginning in the Father's love, so was the consecration of the Son's Humanity its second stage, and the communication of His hallowed manhood by the power of the Holy Ghost was its consummation. "The grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." Such is the course whereby God is pleased to bestow those gifts which regenerate mankind. This is the new channel of intercourse which had been opened to us in Christ. When the old road of nature had been dammed up by sin, this was provided in its stead. Through the manhood of Christ is this blessing extended to mankind. Thus do divine gifts enter into humanity. Their beginning was "God in Christ reconciling unto Himself the world;" their end is "Christ in" us, "the hope of glory."

But to turn to the other question: how does man receive the gifts of grace? Now, when scripture tells us in what manner God bestows His gifts, it tells us also in what manner man receives them. The channel through which God bestows them, must of necessity be the same through which they are received of mankind. Since in the manhood of Christ are centred all the blessings of Mediation, from the manhood of Christ must they emanate. To admit this is but to recognize that great truth, which is every where set

forth in Holy Scripture, that the Gospel was not the mere publishing of a new Law, but the bestowing of a new Creation. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature, old things are passed away, behold all things are become new." For herein did the true heir of man's race differ from all other teachers either of a true or false Theology. Their object has been either truly or professedly to reveal God's will, and to quicken those capacities whereby men obey it. But He who was himself the way, the truth, and the life, in whom dwelt all the Godhead bodily, did not come merely to stimulate men's powers or to augment their knowledge, but to reconstruct the very foundations of humanity in Himself. Thus are His brethren "complete in Him, which is the Head of all principality and power."[7]

If we look, then, at "the Man Christ Jesus," as that "one Mediator" through whom gifts are received by men, we find Him revealed to be the New Head of Man's race, "the beginning of the Creation of God," "the first-born of every creature." This character pertains to Him, not in order of time but in order of relation. For in order of time He had been preceded by the creature, whom himself had fashioned; but when "the fulness of time was come," He who had made all things as *The Word*, took our flesh that He might re-make it as Mediator. He who by nature was "before all things, and by whom all things consist," vouchsafed to be "the Head of the Body, the Church; that in all things He might

[7] Col. ii. 10.

have the pre-eminence." Thus did He, who filled all things by nature, vouchsafe in respect of His earthly being to receive *that* as a gift which pertained to Him by inheritance. "It *pleased the Father* that in Him should all fulness dwell."[8] Thus did He become the Second Adam, in whom the deep foundations of humanity were again constructed. So that through Him and in Him do men receive that gift, which by him God bestowed upon his creatures. "For if, by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ."[9]

Now, that we may understand more completely what it is which men receive in Christ, we must bear in mind, what is that mysterious nature of which they are the inheritors. We find, then, in every child of Adam certain appetites, affections, and intellectual powers. What they are it is not to our purpose to inquire, but they are plainly numerous and dissimilar. And they are bound together, not merely by their alliance to that material structure, which is called the Body, but by some unknown principle of Personality, by reason whereof this complicated mass can in each case be dealt with as an individual being. But though thus inherent in individuals, these appetites, affections, and powers, are not a mere accidental adjunct to the man who exhibits them. For they make up his nature—the possession of them is the link which, more than ought else, binds him

[8] Col. i. 17—19. [9] Rom. v. 17.

to his species; they re-appear in every type of the class, and their relation to the common race gives them an especial claim to attention. This may be seen by the appeal which is continually made to the judgment of the race, as giving authority to some individual conviction. When it is said that ingratitude is universally felt to be a crime, what is this but to refer to the judgment of mankind at large respecting a certain class of actions? And on this principle depend the whole of what may be called our intuitive powers. Their validity rests upon their relation to that common nature of our race, which refers them to God's voice speaking through that constitution which He bestowed upon our first parent; and not to the mere caprice of individual inconsistency.

Now, when man's race is said to have been re-constructed; the change spoken of is not one which at the time affected every individual, except so far as it affected that *common nature*, which was borne by the Head as well as by the members, and which admitted therefore of reconstruction in Him. How this change was to be extended to others; by what means, and under what law, childern are born to the Second Adam, shall be stated in the next Chapter: the question now before us is the change itself; that re-creation of our common nature which was effected in Christ, whereby man became the recipient of those gifts of grace which God bestowed through his mediation. And here the thing to observe is, that the alteration must have been one which affected all the parts of man's common nature; whereby their constitution was changed, and their objects altered.

Take first the affections and intellectual powers. On these depends the exercise of love and faith. Both love and faith are principles inherent in man's nature, and were exercised in reference to those realities which have always been around him. But the love and faith of Christians have not only been re-fashioned through the agency of those gifts of grace which were bestowed on humanity in the Mediator, the objects also with which they are conversant are other than were offered to them before. They *were* God's gift to the natural man; they *are* God's gift through the Mediator. Their object *was* the Parent Spirit of the Universe; their object *is* God in Christ, reconciling to himself the world through the Incarnate Son. To believe in the Gospel is not merely to appreciate the wisdom of its laws, and the excellence of its examples—it is not merely to reverence Christ, because He first taught the lessons of universal philanthropy, and exhibited in His Person a purity which was never equalled—all this is to believe in Christianity, not in Christ; it is to recognize the excellence of the Gospel, not to have a saving faith in the Mediation of the Son of God. Faith in Christ is that exercise of the faculty of belief which is not only a Divine gift transmitted through the Mediator to His brethren, but which apprehends Him as the God-man, whose sacrifice is the only satisfaction, His grace the only remedy for human ills. It is to believe that truth, goodness, and grace have flowed forth through this channel from above, and that only through the New Head of our race are they to be received by mortals. And so is it likewise re-

specting the love of God, which under the system of nature might have expended itself on the abstract excellencies of the first Great Cause, but which must now find its object in that manifestation of God in the flesh, through whom only it can travel upwards to the Eternal Father.

So much respecting the intellect and affections of mankind. But are these the only parts of man's nature which require to be reconstructed? Must he not be wholly reformed? For was he not wholly fallen? As wide surely as Adam's sin, must be Christ's mediation. Is not the degeneracy inherited from our first parent more expansive in its influence than the affections and understanding of man? Does it not reach to his appetites also? Are they not perverted, clamorous, excessive? Is not this to be seen in cases in which the understanding is not developed? Did not "death reign from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression?" Infancy would otherwise surely be free from those pangs, to which at present it is so peculiarly obnoxious. There must certainly be something in man which is capable of reconstruction, independently of those powers of reasoning and those affections of the heart, which are employed in our riper years on the realities of religion. For not only do infants show by their sufferings that they are "by nature children of wrath," but the Apostle declares them capable of being translated into a different state. "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." It is plain, therefore, that the whole of man not only needs reconstruction in Christ, but is susceptible of it. The

new creation extends to it all. All the parts of that common nature which is borne by every child of Adam, were re-fashioned in the Head and model of the Christian family, that the renewal of our nature in Christ might extend likewise to them all.

And has their object been attained? Is man thus perfectly restored in Christ? Such will doubtless be the case with that Church of the elect, in which hereafter will be developed the full privileges of the Gospel. Into that state shall enter nothing which offends, nor any that do iniquity. But in the present condition of things, until the resurrection of the just and the unjust, such a consummation is prevented by two circumstances. For, first, though a new nature has been bestowed on man in Christ, yet the old one has not been extinguished. The "corruption of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerate." We read, indeed, that "they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts." Yet is crucifixion but a lingering death, by which our members which are upon the earth are only gradually mortified. And, secondly, it is to be considered that in man there is something besides this common nature which has been reconstructed in Christ. For man does not consist only of those appetites, affections, and powers, which are the common heritage of his race. He does not consist only of a certain quantity of these materials, dug out of the mine of human nature, and shaped into that form which is proper to his kind. There is in each man some simple, single, indivisible principle, which invests him with that individuality, whereby he is distinguished from his fellows. There could not otherwise be that re-

sponsibility, which God has stamped upon every child of Adam. For it is this individual being which renders each man an accountable agent, and which thus brings home to himself the awful responsibility of rejecting or accepting the Gospel. Wherein this principle consists it does not belong to the present subject to inquire ; what are its relations to the will and the consciousness, are curious but irrelevant topics; the point under consideration is that this principle of Personality is something distinct from that common nature, which is re-constructed in Christ Our Lord ; that let men's opportunities be small as under the law of natural religion, or great as under the Gospel, there is in each case an ultimate principle of responsibility in themselves. Now, unless this responsibility of their own yields to the suasion of the renewed nature, the blessings of the Gospel-gift do but increase their condemnation. "If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth." And therefore is it, that belief and love are needed on our part, for the acceptance of that gift of a renewed being, which is bestowed upon us through the mediation of Christ. These graces, indeed, being good, are God's gift ; but they are a gift which does not exclude human responsibility ; and to which, therefore, the accountable principle must assent. For where the will of the individual opposes itself by unbelief and impenitence against God's blessing, His streams of mercy lose their saving effect. "The earth, which drinketh in the rain, that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing

from God. But that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." On this account it is that Repentance and Faith are spoken of as necessary on our part, if we would profit by those blessings which the Gospel bestows. Not that these things are possessed in themselves of a meritorious efficacy, which can give to sacraments a virtue which they do not already contain, or which can supply the place of those actual gifts of grace, which through the One Mediator are bestowed upon mankind. Repentance and Faith have no power of *condignity*, as some men's language would seem to imply, to impart to Baptism an efficacy, which by Christ's institution it did not before possess. But the necessity of these qualities is, that their absence from the adult mind is equivalent to that state of repugnancy against the Gospel, which renders its blessings unavailing. And therefore it is that in this state of probation, the blessings of a re-created nature are not only possessed imperfectly by the best, through the opposition of a conflicting concupiscence; but by many are altogather rejected through the hardness of an impenitent and unbelieving will.

The considerations which have been adduced will supply an answer to the question—What is regeneration? It is the effect of that gift of grace, which the Father of all mercies was pleased to embody in the Manhood of the Incarnate Son, that thereby Humanity at large might be re-constructed; and which, in Him and by Him, is received by those happy members of the family of man to whom the Gospel comes, and by whom it is not

rejected through unbelief or impenitence. It is not, therefore, the general influence of the Divine Power, but the gift bestowed through the Mediator: neither is it the mere promulgation by Christ of a better law, but His re-creating presence. Nor yet is it attained by all men, nor even by all to whom it is offered; but by those to whom it is given of God, and who do not reject it. It is *Christ taking up His dwelling in man.* "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing nor uncircumcision, but *the new creation;* and as many as walk according to this rule, grace be on them and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.

CHAPTER II.

THE TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE AS TO THE TIME AND MANNER IN WHICH REGENERATION IS BESTOWED.

THE question which I now proceed to ask, is, What is told us in Holy Scripture respecting the time and manner of Regeneration? Now it will be here maintained, that it is the revealed law of God's kingdom, that this act is brought about in Holy Baptism. But it may disengage the subject from difficulties, if certain consequences are first disavowed, which are sometimes supposed to be associated with this assertion.

First, no limit is assigned to the sovereignty of Almighty God, whereby He works among the armies of heaven, and the inhabitants of the earth, according to the good pleasure of His will. The present

inquiry has reference only to the kingdom of grace, and to the laws and system which it has been His pleasure to reveal to us.

Again, in speaking of Sacraments as means of grace, it is not implied either that they possess any efficacy in themselves, or that they convey benefit except to meet receivers. For their influence is regarded as altogether subordinate to the fact stated in the last Chapter, that the motive cause of Regeneration is God Himself, reconciling to Himself the world through the Incarnate Son. So that their outward elements are allowed not to have the slightest tendency to produce those results, which are wrought through them by the immediate power of God.

Again, as the cause of this efficacy lies wholly in God, so it is fully allowed that they produce no beneficial effect, if they are opposed by the unbelief or impenitence of the responsible beings by whom they are partaken.

These questions, then, are not raised—that which is raised is simply this—whether it is God's will so to associate the exercise of His spiritual power with certain external symbols, that where these last are duly partaken, men *always* participate in those gifts which were bestowed upon humanity at large, through the mediation of Christ. The opinion which will here be maintained is exactly that which is expressed by Hooker: "Christ and His Holy Spirit with all their blessed effects, though entering into the soul of man, we are not able to apprehend or express how, do, notwithstanding, give notice of the times when they use to make their access, because it pleaseth Almighty God to communicate

by sensible means, those blessings which are incomprehensible."[1] The truth of this statement respecting the Holy Sacraments must be learnt from Scripture; but before proceeding to exhibit the evidence in respect to the Sacrament of Baptism, it will be best to notice those antecedent difficulties, by which men's acceptance of the statements of Scripture is really prevented. These difficulties appear to be mainly three: First, the want of consonance between the outward media, and those heavenly and spiritual gifts which they are asserted to convey. Man's imagination revolts at the idea that divine powers are so bound to certain apparently trivial, external ordinances, that we can have no claim to the first, except through observance of the second. The notion of cause and effect, indeed, is a primary law of our own minds, but its application is so completely founded upon experience, that men feel an irresistible disinclination to suppose that physical antecedents can be followed by spiritual consequents.

Secondly—To many persons it seems a sort of sacrilege that any physical agencies should intrude between God and the souls of His creatures. Since external ordinances must in the nature of the case be administered by human instruments, they think that to speak of them as endowed with any real efficacy, is to subordinate "the Lord and Giver of life" to the control of men. Hence it is said, that this notion "banishes the Scriptural truth, that that life-breathing Agent infuses His vital influences into the soul, *when*, *where*, and *as* He

[1] Eccles. Pol. v. 57, 3.

listeth; and it limits His new creating power to the moment of application of the Sacramental symbol lawfully administered."[2] And thus "the Spirit would of necessity effect His operation in every infant at the moment when man thinks fit to direct He *shall* effect it."[3]

Thirdly—Men object that Sacraments do not produce the effect which, if they were really efficacious, could not fail to attend them. Children who are baptized, it is said, are not different from others, and little result seems to be consequent upon the baptism of adults.

Now this last, which is the most formidable objection to the reality of sacramental grace, must be met by considering what is meant by the work of man's Regeneration. In its original form this work assuredly was general, complete, and immediate; but its object was only that Head of our race, in whom manhood was purified perfectly and at once, by the taking it into God. The regeneration of collective manhood was wrought in the instant of Our Lord's Incarnation. And therefore of the two places in which the term regeneration occurs in Scripture, one refers to the consummation of that kingdom of Christ, of which His Incarnation was the commencement. But when this work is wrought in individual men, what is effected is not the complete and instant change of their whole nature, but only the infusion of that Divine seed of a higher humanity, by which their spiritual progress is commenced. Such a gift does not exclude the action

[2] Gorham's "Examination before Admission to a Benefice."—*Introduction*, p. xxvii.

[3] Id. p. 109. Answer, 58.

of man's own responsibility. It is but to place men in a higher state of trial, by the infusion of a principle above nature. The new seed must have time to overcome the old principle of corruption; its existence must be recognized, its growth encouraged. Those who deny Regeneration in Baptism are ready in common to admit that the children of Christian parents are placed by birth in a state of higher Christian privilege than others. Mr. Goode, who denies that Baptism assures us of the salvation of all infants ("dying before they commit actual sin") supposes that respecting the children of really devout Christians, it gives us this assurance. But have we any proof that such children would in their riper years be better than others, if no pains were taken to foster the blessing intrusted to them? Does not experience show that principles lie dormant in the mind, which it requires fitting occasions to call forth? Does not this happen perpetually in respect to the natural endowments, the capacity for art, the faculties of judgment? Do not these often appear, where men have for years shown no signs of possessing powers, which are yet only a development of the inherent principles of their being? And why, then, may not the same thing be expected in the case of that higher nature, which is supernaturally engrafted on the ancient stock of their kind?

It is plain, then, that on this subject experience will warrant no positive conclusions, till the Church's discipline is more consistent and her course of instruction more complete. While her spiritual ordinances are shared alike by the profane and the holy, it cannot be expected that the people at large will appreciate the sacredness of

that deposit, with which they have been intrusted. Till education is grounded professedly on the maxim, that the young should "stir up the gift" which is in them, how can we be surprised if we see it produce little general result? It is unreasonable in those who deny the efficacy of Baptism, to complain of that unfruitfulness which results from their own neglect. What effect do the truths of the Gospel produce upon those who disbelieve them? And how then can men expect that any general effect will attend baptismal blessings, until there prevails a general belief in their reality?

The other two objections rest in part upon the erroneous notion, that matter is less under the control of Almighty God than mind. Now this is to return to the ancient Gnostic error; to forget that evil had its origin in the region of spiritual, not of material substances, and that the one class is just as much God's work as the other. To suppose that spiritual agents have any power independently of the will of Him Who employs them, would be to exempt them from the control of Omnipotence: to suppose that His power could not be exerted through material influences, would be to limit Omnipotence itself. Why may not words and elements be made the supernatural medium of giving effect to His will, seeing that even the natural efficacy of material substances is derived altogether from His power in whom "we live, and move and have our being?"

But these objections have their ground in a still more fatal error—a forgetfulness of that great law of Mediation, whereby these two modes of existence have been indissolubly joined together

For when the Eternal Son took manhood into God, He introduced a new mode of relation between the one and the other. Man's original connexion with God had been built, no doubt, on a consideration of the Spiritual nature of the Ultimate Cause, and of that peculiar relation, which it had pleased Him to establish with the souls which were formed after his likeness. But with the incarnation came a new state of things; the law of grace was substituted for the law of nature. Our ancient intercourse with God has been given back, only through that new founder of man's race, through whom alone we can approach the Father. And "this conjunction," says Usher,[4] "is immediately made with his human nature." And this is a conjunction which requires, it would seem, some specific media; that so the one may be really, and not only in name, united to the other. Had it pleased God, indeed, He might have moulded every individual by a separate act of his forming Hand. But it was His will that we should bear some common relation to that first father, whose type re-appears in all his children. And when Christ, Our Lord, took the name of the Second Adam, He implied that we were to partake not less truly of that higher Humanity, which was re-created in Him. So that in maintaining the efficacy of Sacraments, we are not trusting to any saving virtue which is inherent in words or elements, but to the work wrought once for all, in the Garden, and on the Cross.

To object, then, to the system of sacraments,

[4] Works, vol. iv. p. 608.

as though it limited the spontaneous action of God the Holy Ghost, is to object to a revealed law of the Divine Economy—namely, that it is the good pleasure of God the Holy Ghost, to carry into effect, and not to supersede, the mediation of Christ. It is to forget that "the streams of grace must run to us, through the golden pipe of our Saviour's Humanity."[5] And therefore it is to go back from the law of grace, to the law of nature. This is not understood, of course, by those Christian writers who make the objection. But it is openly avowed, when the objection passes into the hands of Socinians, by whom only it can be consistently advanced. For it rests entirely upon that primary law of our being, according to which "the Soul is the specific sense, in which we come into contact with God."[6] Such was confessedly the law of man's creation. But to suppose that the Supreme Being must needs act at present upon this system, is to judge of Him according to that estimate which we had by nature, and not by that which has been revealed to us by Christ. So that to make this principle a ground for rejecting that new channel of intercourse, which has been provided through the taking of manhood into God, would be to rest our hopes upon the right of man's original inheritance, and to renounce that new birthright which has been bestowed upon humanity through mediation and grace.

Now, if men would discharge from their minds

[5] Usher's Works, iv. 617.
[6] "The Soul," by F. W. Newman, p. 93.

those previous improbabilities under which the sacramental system seems to labour, and would follow the guidance of faith in the interpretation of Scripture, they could not fail to be struck by the manner in which Our Lord and His Apostles uniformly associate the apparently trivial act of Baptism with the gift of spiritual blessings. What can be more unaccountable, supposing that Baptism had been only an outward ceremony, than that Our Lord should have put the washing of water prominently forward, as a necessary condition of His future kingdom, when he prophetically unfolded its mysteries to the Jewish Rabbi? Why should St. John have been guided by the Holy Ghost about fifty years later, to give this statement without explanation to the Church? Were not men sure to explain it by that Sacrament of Baptism which had already been assumed to convey the new Birth of man's nature? For was not the passage, as Hooker says, universally understood in this sense, till Zuinglius stated, fifteen centuries later, that he had discovered things which he affirms to have been hidden from all preceding times? Again, is it not a most striking circumstance, that in the only place in which the regeneration of individuals is spoken of, it should be distinctly asserted that it is connected with the washing of water? "He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." It is useless to dwell on such passages, since they are of course familiar to those who take a different view of things. Yet it is impossible not to press upon their attention, that no doctrinal statement respecting Baptism occurs in Holy Scripture, which

does not represent it as the medium of grace; and, still more, that it is repeatedly stated to be the means of union with that Humanity of Christ, which is the principle of vitality to the new nature. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ,"[7] says Saint Paul. Twice does he speak of men as "buried with Him in baptism."[8] "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death."[9] And Baptism is declared to be a work, in which God the Holy Ghost, by whom all Christ's members are cemented into one Body in Him, has an especial share. "By One Spirit are we all baptized into one Body."[10] When St. Paul, therefore, met with disciples who professed themselves to know nothing of the Spirit's work, his first question was, "Unto what, then, were ye baptized?"[11] If, as has been sometimes thought, there was really no great difference between the Baptism of repentance, and that which was ministered by Our Lord's Apostles, why should it have been repeated in the case of these disciples? Further, let it be observed how completely the appointment of Christian Baptism is made to depend upon the spiritual completeness of the mediatorial kingdom. It was when Our Lord's Humanity had received the prerogative by gift, which belonged to His Godhead by nature, that He sent His Apostles to baptize in His Name: "All power is *given* unto Me in heaven and earth. Go ye, therefore, and

[7] Gal. iii. 27. [8] Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12.
[9] Rom. vi. 3. [10] 1 Cor. xii. 13. [11] Acts xix. 3.

make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And in like manner St. Peter tells us that "Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by *the resurrection of Jesus Christ*, who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God."[12]

Two objections will probably be made to the statements which have been advanced. It will be said, first, that no one denies Baptism to be a means of grace; all that is denied is, that grace is in any peculiar manner tied to it. Prayer, it is said, preaching, advice, are all means of grace; and sacraments take a high place among them, as being significent actions, addressing themselves with peculiar force to the minds of men. And, secondly, it will be thought that to lay so much stress on Baptism, to represent it as in any wise identical with Regeneration, is to derogate from the necessity of conversion, and the prerogatives of faith.

I. The real question at issue, when it is disputed whether Baptism is in any peculiar sense a means of grace, is whether it is the appointed means of bringing men into connexion with the Humanity of Christ. For if it be, then since the gifts of grace are bestowed in God's new kingdom through the mediation of the Incarnate Son, Baptism must be, as Hooker expresses it, "a step to our sanctification here, which hath not any before it." Now, the only scriptural arguments which are ad-

[12] 1 Pet. iii. 21–2.

duced against this position are—first, that Scripture implies grace to be a preliminary to Baptism; and again, that though Baptism is repeatedly associated with the New Birth, yet that the New Birth is sometimes spoken of independently of Baptism. Let us begin with this last assertion: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." Here, it is said, a new test of spiritual birth comes in, and, therefore, though nothing hinders that the new birth may take place in Baptism, yet there are other ways which are just as fitting for its communication. The passage which has been cited, affords no real countenance to such an opinion, because the force of the Greek Perfect, which is there employed, is to imply the continuance of the action to which it makes allusion. Its full force would rather be, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, continues in that birth, wherein he has been born into God.[13] But there are, doubtless, various passages of Scripture in which the divine birth is alluded to, but in which no direct reference occurs to the Sacrament of Baptism. Such is the statement, "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God."[14] Or again, "as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His Name."[15] But though these passages contain no direct reference to Baptism, yet neither do they contain the slightest intimation that the peculiar gift which is associated in Scripture with Baptism, had not been first obtained. Regeneration, as was shown in the last Chapter, is a re-creation of man's nature; which, beginning with

[13] 1 John v. 1. [14] Id. iv. 15. [15] John i. 12.

the Son of Man, in whom it was at once perfectly displayed, is afterwards extended in their manner, and according to their degree, to his earthly brethren. When Baptism is said to be the appointed means by which this supernatural change is effected, it is because it is the revealed instrument whereby men are stated to be born into Christ, as by natural birth they are numbered among the offspring of Adam. But though this birth into Christ takes place in that act by which He first gives Himself to man, yet its result must be shown in those various stages whereby men gradually ascend to a perfect conformity with the image of their Lord. This work is not perfected, save by the extinction of that concupiscence by which it is obstructed. Although, therefore, Baptism be "to our sanctification here, a step which hath not any before it,"[16] yet it has been said that, "setting aside that accident of its being the first, the reason of man shall never be able to pronounce wherein it differs from any subsequent gift conducing to the furtherance of the same state."[17] And hence have some writers[18] spoken of Regeneration as a work which is only commenced in Baptism, and which is not completed till the con-

[16] Hooker, v. 60, 3.

[17] Davison on Baptismal Regeneration.—*Quarterly Review*, No. 15, p. 504.

[18] Many of our divines, who maintain the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, in its most unadulterated sense, often use the word *regenerate*, in compliance with popular usage, to signify a man living habitually under the influence of the spirit of grace; *unregenerate* to signify a man not living habitually under that influence. Still it is to be wished that they had avoided this ambiguity of language, and had kept close to the more ancient and more correct usage of the word.—*Bishop Bethell on Regeneration*, cap. i. p. 9.

cupiscence of our old nature becomes finally extinct. Such a mode of speaking is not accordant with the usage of Scripture (for "the only place in Scripture that looks at all favourable to the notion of a second regeneration,"[19] *Gal.* iv. 19, does not really bear it out;) yet it is rather an inaccuracy of expression than an erroneousness of thought, so long as it be remembered, that the process whereby men are conformed to Christ's image, must have its root in that appointed means whereby He joins us to Himself.

And this view of Holy Baptism, as the commencement of man's spiritual history, may show the inadequacy of the notion which is sometimes adopted, that Baptism is the extinction of guilt, but not the re-creation of nature. For how can one of those ends be truly accomplished, save by the same act which accomplishes the other? That which leads God to look on our race with displeasure, is not only our share in Adam's guilt, but the "fault and corruption" which we inherit from him. It was not sufficient, therefore, that Christ Our Lord should accumulate such an amount of merit by His death upon the cross, as outweighed all men's offences; it was needful that He should vouchsafe such actual incorporation into Himself, as would give His members a real participation in the value of His sa-

[19] *Waterland*, vol. vi. p. 364.—"Cum ergo sint duæ nativitates—una est de terra, alia de cœlo; una est de carne, alia de spiritu; una est de mortalitate, alia de æternitate; una est de masculo et fœmina, alia de Deo et Ecclesia. Sed ipsæ duæ *singulæ* sunt; nec illa potest *repeti* nec illa—Jam natus sum de Adam, non me potest *iterum* generare Adam: jam natus sum de Christo, non me potest *iterum* generare Christus. Quomodo uterus non potest repeti, sic nec Baptismus."—*S. Aug. in Joan. Trac.* xi. *quoted by Waterland, Works*, vi. p. 347.

crifice. "You being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of the flesh, *hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses.*"[20] Restoration to God's favour is the natural effect of that spiritual birth, whereby the children of Adam are transformed into the members of Christ.

But here comes in the other and more formidable part of the objection, which suggests that Scripture asserts, or at least implies, that the gift spoken of is dispensed before baptism, just as much as in it. It follows, which seems to be the view aimed at by those who derogate from the importance, and yet continue the practice of Baptism, that it is only a "sign of profession and mark of difference," instead of being "an instrument," whereby men are grafted into Christ's Body. The passage on which this is supposed to be directly founded, is that wherein St. Peter asks, "can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Yet how can a miraculous interposition of this sort supersede God's revelation respecting His ordinary dealings with mankind? It is said, however, that we may infer as much from what is taught us respecting the pre-requisites for Baptism. How can faith and repentance, the qualities required as a preparation for Baptism, be obtained, save by God's grace? And if God's grace be obtained, is not the end accomplished which is sought after? That Faith and Repentance being good gifts, come in some way from the Father of lights, cannot be disputed. But if this argument be pushed to its result, it

[20] Col. ii. 13.

would identify the system of the Gospel with the system of nature. For so far as any good is found in the state of nature it is God's gift; it results from His influence who was "the light of men." But how wide was the difference when "the true light,"—which before had shone "as a light that shineth in a dark place,"—came personally into the world. The preparatory strivings whereby He predisposes the hearts of men, are surely different from that full adoption whereby men become "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not." This was the state of nature; even in those who were conscious of the previous leadings of Him, who never finally forsook the beings whom He had created. And how different this from the full blessing promised to those "which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."[21] We may conclude, that in Holy Writ an especial blessing is associated with Holy Baptism; that peculiar blessing, namely, which results from the engrafting of mankind into the Humanity of the Son of God. To those who object to this truth in consequence of their conviction, that before Baptism grace is given, it is enough to reply, that the possibility of gifts before Baptism cannot derogate from the reality and importance of that especial gift, which Baptism is appointed to convey. Their private expectation of a blessing which is

[21] John i. 13.

not revealed, is no ground for rejecting one, of which God's revelation assures them.

II. To come, now, to the second ground of objection, the opinion, namely, that the prerogative claimed for Baptism detracts from the importance attributed in Scripture to Conversion and Faith. This is the main reason of the suspicion with which many good men regard what is called a high view of sacramental grace. Say what you will they think it impossible to reconcile such a system with the great prominence which Scripture plainly gives to the need of an individual conversion of heart; and to the efficacy of a saving faith in Christ Our Lord. Yet the answer to this difficulty lies in a single word. The absolute necessity of fitness on the part of the receiver, does not in the slightest degree invalidate the assertion, that on the part of the Giver there must be a real communication of heavenly blessings. Conversion and Faith are essential to the efficacy of Baptism *on the part of man;* but there must be an actual gift of grace *on the part of God.* This gift has been stated to be that re-creation of man's being, whereby in place of the corrupt nature which we inherit from Adam, we participate in the hallowed nature of Christ Our Lord. But besides those common qualities which were reformed in Christ Our Lord, each man is possessed of an individual principle of responsibility, which has its spring of action within itself. This ultimate principle of responsibility—the self-originating principle on which man's accountableness depends—may yield to the good influences which act upon it, or it may refuse to yield to them.

And its compliance with them is what is called conversion. Conversion is the act by which the accountable principle in man obeys the suasion of those motives, which incline it towards its Maker's service. That from his influence must come whatever of goodness there is in its choice, does not do away with the fact that in itself rests the power either of assent or of resistance. And if it finally rejects God's grace, His blessed influences are unprofitable. So that in an adult, conversion is essential to the efficacy, or perhaps it might almost be said to the completeness of Baptism. Hence St. Cyprian supposed that no real baptism could exist among schismatics, and that upon their conversion to the faith, its outward form ought to be repeated. But the Church finally ruled the matter, as it is expressed by St. Augustin,[22] that Baptism is valid where those things which are required on the part of God, are truly administered, but that its benefit does not come out till fitness on the part of the receiver co-operates with the validity of the rite. And this rule he transferred from the case of those who were baptized in schism, to that of unworthy receivers in the Church of God.

It may be asked, however, whether conversion is to be required of infants? For if conversion is an essential pre-requisite to baptism, it is plain that infants can be no fit candidates for that holy rite; yet so soon as their principle of responsibility gains strength, it is plainly bound to yield to the suasion of those motives which incline it towards holiness. And though the name of con-

[22] De Bapt. contra Donat. i. 18.

version is more exactly applicable when persons have gone away from God's commands, and afterwards return to them, yet it may in some sort be applied even to those, who yield from the first to the suasions of that better nature which is given them. And in this manner does St. Augustin[23] observe that conversion may be said to follow in infants, while in adults it must accompany regeneration.

The absolute necessity of conversion, therefore, in no wise interferes with the reality of that gift of regeneration, which is conferred in Baptism. All that is necessary is to discriminate between that gift of a renewed nature, which God bestows in Christ upon those who are engrafted into His Son, and that principle of individual responsibility which must yield to the Divine influence. And this is still more manifest in the case of faith. For what is religious faith but assent to the declarations of God, and appreciation of His nature? And what is Christian faith but the application of the same principle to that Incarnate Mediator, through whom alone fallen man can approach the Father? It is a belief, not in Christianity, but in Christ; it is not mere admiration of the excellence of the Christian system, but the casting ourselves upon that Personal restorer, through whom Divine gifts flow forth into humanity. Now why should the reality of the gift bestowed, diminish our estimate of the necessity of those qualifications

[23] "In baptizatis infantibus præcedit regenerationis sacramentum, et si Christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur in corde conversio, cujus mysterium præcessit in corpore."—*S. Aug. de Bap.* v. 24. Quoted by Waterland. vol. vi. p. 358.

through which it is accepted? The sacramental system is that scheme, whereby the heavenly blessings of the Second Adam truly enter the family of the first. Its reality, therefore, is not only compatible with a true belief, but essential to it. For faith cannot make its own objects; they must exist beforehand in order to be believed. Upon this subject we may cite the testimony of those by whom the importance of faith has not been supposed to be underrated. "Faith," says Luther,[24] "implies in its very nature the existence of something upon which to believe." The reality of Baptism therefore does not derogate from its importance, but only supplies an occasion for the exercise of its powers. This connection between a true faith and a real Baptism is set forth in the Catechism, where one qualification of those who receive it is stated to be "Faith, whereby they steadfastly believe *the promises of God made to them in that Sacrament.*"

But again, we must pass from the case of adults to that of infants. Now if faith, it is said, is essential to participation in the blessings of Baptism, how can infants receive them? And no doubt there cannot be the completeness both on the side of the Giver and on the side of the receiver, which is to be found in adult baptism. But is no benefit derived? For if a condition be absolutely wanting, without which no benefit can attend the ordinance, is it not, as in the case of impenitent adults, a sort of mockery? It is not so consi-

[24] Fallow's "Baptismal Service Illustrated." Pref. p. x. A very useful collection of authorities.

dered, however, even by those who have most insisted on the necessity of faith. "When the words and the element are combined," says Luther, "it must be supposed to be a valid Baptism, even though there be no faith. For my faith does not make Baptism, but realizes and lays hold of it."[25] And to reconcile this truth with his own general statement of the necessity of faith, he suggests that the seed of faith, its initial principle, is bestowed by God on infants in the act of Baptism, so that they may in some sense be said already to possess those things, which advancing years should bring to maturity. Such new motives and new inclinations to God, infused in holy Baptism, are stated by Melancthon[26] to be in the place of that full measure of faith and penitence, which is required of adult candidates. Now how is it to be decided whether such a gift is truly bestowed upon infants in their Baptism? It is admitted that their powers of recipiency are yet imperfect; it is asked whether those blessings, which are bestowed by the Giver are truly theirs. The question is surely to be decided by the fact, whether infants are meet candidates for Baptism. For if it does not please God to bestow those gifts of which their nature is susceptible, because they are prevented by the deficiency of their being, from exercising such graces as belong to riper years, why should they be baptized at all? The objection, therefore, is really directed against Infant Baptism itself. That some changes *might* befall them even in their present state—that a dif-

[25] Luther's "Catechismus Major." [26] Fallow, Pref. p. xxiii.

ference obtains between "unclean" and "holy" children—that it is possible for them to participate in that renewal which Christ wrought in all the powers of man's nature, has already been shown. And if this blessing is not conferred upon them, why are they baptized at all? Surely it were better to wait till their conversion could be complete, and their faith mature. Since infants, then, are admitted to be proper candidates for Baptism, their involuntary weakness cannot destroy the efficacy of God's grace. His treasure-house must have its blessings for the young, though appropriate gifts are reserved for his elder servants.

CHAPTER III.

THE EFFICACY OF HOLY BAPTISM ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORIZED FORMULARIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The meaning of Regeneration has now been considered, and the statements of Holy Writ respecting the time and manner in which it is communicated. The Scriptures, it has been seen, are distinct and unequivocal in declaring that this gift is bestowed in Holy Baptism. Is the same language taught by the English Church?

Now, of the two views on this subject—the one exalting, the other depreciating baptismal grace; those who have advocated the latter have been accustomed to say that the Articles do not *compel* them to mean more than they are able to accept

Those, on the other hand, who take a higher view of baptismal grace, while it is plain that their system is not excluded by the Articles, have been accustomed to refer to the Service-Book, as a proof that their interpretation of the Articles is the only one which was designed to be admitted. For it is the only one by which the different Formularies of the Church can be made to cohere. But however this may be, the Service-Book is, in itself, a sufficient guarantee of the Church's intentions. It is so to the Clergy, for all those who are beneficed have solemnly declared their assent and consent to all its words. It is so to the laity, for its translation into English has made it a means of general instruction; and the use of the baptismal Service "when the most number of people come together," implies a plain desire to render men familiar with its statements.

And it cannot be pretended that in her assertions respecting man's regeneration and renewal in Christ, the Church of England is merely excluding certain erroneous principles, without enforcing any definite system of her own. For she is not content merely, as in the case of Purgatory, to object to certain opinions entertained by others: she dwells upon the subject in the Catechism, which she requires every child to learn before Confirmation, and which by the fifty-ninth Canon, every Clergyman is required to teach diligently, under pain of suspension. Even the laity, therefore, may be expected to pay some attention to a rule, which the collective wisdom of the Church takes such pains to press upon them. The withdrawal of those penal statutes, which naturally arrayed the minds of independent

men against Church-authority, places it upon a footing more likely to conciliate regard. For if any accordance is to be expected in the interpretation of Scripture, any agreement among men, it must plainly be built upon deference to some common authority. Now what can be so well entitled to attention, as that exposition of doctrine, which has professedly descended from the times of the Apostles, and which has been sanctioned by the affection and belief of the wisest and best men in the intervening period? Is not this better than the dictum of any individual, under whose influence circumstances place us? And this feeling ought to be greatly strengthened by the spectacle of that blank infidelity, which has spread its noxious influence over those countries where the opposite system prevails.

And as this feeling may be looked for among the laity, so still more among the Clergy; who cannot with a safe conscience teach what they disbelieve, nor safely leave untaught what they have promised to inculcate. It could be no relief to them if the Ecclesiastical Courts, as some have desired, were inhibited from taking account of the statements of the Prayer-Book. Were it enjoined by Act of Parliament that no minister of the Church should be liable to punishment for propounding doctrines not condemned by the Articles, how would such a charge relieve the consciences of those, to whom the words of the Prayer-Book seem objectionable? Could they, as honest men, continue to use expressions which they disbelieved? Could they promise to teach a system which they intended to contradict? To what purpose should they be excused from punishment for rejecting statements, to which

in the most solemn moments of their lives, they were required to consent? Or how would they be advantaged by exemption from the control of an earthly court, so long as they were amenable to the more searching tribunal of conscience?

It is plain, then, that our Church designs to teach something in her Offices respecting Regeneration; and that so long as her offices continue unchanged, both Clergy and Laity may be expected to believe them. And what is it which she teaches? Now we have the confession of a determined opponent that they appear to teach Baptismal Regeneration. By all indifferent persons—by all, that is, who are not members of the English Church, and therefore can look at her from without as uninterested spectators—it has always been assumed as a matter of course that the Church of England teaches this doctrine in a uniform, unequivocal, categorical manner; but even Mr. Goode admits, respecting the Church's Service, that "the expressions evidently favour the notion of their referring to the full baptismal blessing." Let us first look at the thing, then, in this light, and see how far its words tally with the view, which even in the judgment of opponents is their apparent signification. That view has been stated in the preceding Chapters. After man had lost that perfection in which he was originally created, his nature received a new beginning in that Second Head, in whom all its principles were reconstructed. The Regeneration of humanity, which began when the Eternal Word took our nature in the Virgin's womb, was subsequently extended, through the power of the Holy Ghost, to all who by grace were made children of

the New Adam. Thus was the whole constitution of our being to be renewed. Now, for the accomplishment of an object which was alien in this way from the course of nature, it was requisite that some means, which nature did not supply, should be adopted. For this reason was the system of Sacraments ordained, as being the means, whereby the Humanity of the Word should extend itself to others; so that men might hereby have the same relation to the Second Adam, which the course of nature gave them to the first. On this account is the gift of Regeneration first bestowed in Holy Baptism. For then do we become "members of" Christ's "Body, of His flesh, and of His bones."

Now, if it be asked in what manner this gift affects us, it must be remembered that it has been shown to imply two parties, a Giver and a receiver. And an inefficacy, which cannot arise from any deficiency in the perfect Giver, may yet be brought about through the defects of the imperfect receiver. But the defect by which the purpose of infinite Goodness may thus be defeated, cannot be only the general fault and defect of our nature, which we each of us inherit from Adam, independently and anterior to the exercise of our individual will. For this defect and corruption of our nature is the very thing which our new nature is designed to correct; and the mere existence, therefore, of the defect, cannot be supposed to neutralize at once the remedy, which is adequate to correct it. So that the evil by which the Divine gift is neutralized, must be referred to each man's individual wilfulness; so that personal action of his own voluntary powers, which is inse-

parable from his responsibility. Where this individual wilfulness prevails, it must be met by some especial action of God's preventing grace, overcoming that impediment, which would otherwise destroy the efficacy of His ordinances. Such preventing grace has a peculiar connection of course with the sacramental ordinance, for which it prepares man: it is a gift anticipatory to Baptism, and relevant to it; whereby the individual powers of the adult catechumen may be brought into that state of Faith and Repentance, which may render him a meet recipient for the gift of Baptism. And since this action of prevenient grace does not supersede human responsibility, it can only persuade, it cannot coerce. So that whether he shall profit by the gift of Baptism must still depend, in adult years, upon the state of the responsible receiver. For his individual action may oppose itself to the efficacy of the Baptismal blessing. But, on the other hand, when the individual responsibility is not developed—when it has no power to act one way or another—when nothing has yet come into operation but that general nature, which we receive in a state of pollution, and which needs to be transformed into a state of grace—there exists no power to oppose the Divine blessing, or to interfere between God's goodness and man's wants. For what should interfere between them? Not man's general corruption; for this is the very evil which God's mercy undertakes to abate. Not man's individual action; for this has not yet received such development as to be the parent of any result.

Now, in exact accordance with this state of

things, we find two forms provided, under which Baptism is to be administered. The first and in ordinary cases the common mode, is that which is to be employed before the will and understanding have woke up to individual action. In this case, which is that of infants, there is no room for any thing but the renewal of the general nature. The Church, therefore, describes those qualifications which fit infants for Baptism. The first is that degeneracy of nature which renders this medium needful for their recovery: "Inasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin." The second is that freedom from actual sin, which renders it impossible that the purpose of God's gifts should be defeated by their individual disbelief and wilfulness. "Ye hear in this Gospel the words of Our Saviour Christ that He commanded the children to be brought unto Him; how He blamed those that would have kept them from Him; how He exhorteth all men to follow their *innocency*."[1] It is only by reference to this necessary exemption from actual sin, that we can understand how the term "innocents" can be bestowed upon those, who are tainted by hereditary curruption. Such, however, are they called; and therefore it is that whatever pertains to them is so capable of renewal, through the reforming energy of the Second Adam, because that individual responsi-

[1] In "the case of infants, their innocence and incapacity are to them instead of repentance, which they do not need, and of actual faith, which they cannot have."—*Waterland*, vol. vi. p. 356.

So St. Austin calls children, "innocentes imagines Dei."—*In Julianum*, vi. 4.

bility, which might oppose itself to such a gift, has not yet awoke to assert its powers. But because it is essential, that when this responsibility awakens, it should be moulded according to the laws of that new nature, which unconscious childhood had previously received, therefore does the Church take legal security of the infant's guardians, that its awaking consciousness may be instructed in the nature of that gift, of which it has already been put into possession.

Now, to this Service for the Baptism of Infants, was added, in a later time, a service for the Baptism of Adults. Here the same general framework was retained; but a marked diversity in the expressions was suggested by the difference of the case. Inasmuch as the individual powers of the receiver had now awoke into consciousness, the blessing of Baptism is stated to be contingent on their due exertion. "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe that He will favourably receive these present persons, *truly repenting, and coming unto Him by faith.*" Respecting this condition nothing had been said in the Baptism of Infants: while on the other hand, all mention of "innocency" in respect of actual transgression is omitted; and it is stated not only that men are "born in sin," but likewise that "they that are in the flesh cannot please God, but live in sin, committing many actual transgresssions." And then follow those direct and explicit declarations of the regeneration of the baptized parties, which "evidently favour" the idea, as Mr. Goode allows, that "the full baptismal blessing" is conferred. For respecting every baptized infant

unconditionally, and respecting every adult with the condition which has been already mentioned, the minister is required to affirm that "this child" or "person *is* regenerate." Now that which is true of every child must be true of all; for what can be more general than an assertion to which there is no exception?

Thus do both these services accord exactly with the notion, that a real gift is bestowed in Baptism. This idea is not only favoured by the expressions used, but it harmonizes with them exactly in every particular; and the very condition which it was essential to introduce in the one case, shows the unqualified truth of that which had been asserted in the other. And the same idea may be traced in all the Church's Services. The Catechism teaches all children to affirm, that in Baptism, they are elected to be members of Christ. In Confirmation the Bishop reminds them that God has "vouchsafed to regenerate" them "by water and the Holy Ghost." In sickness the Priest recalls to their thought "the profession made unto God in" their "Baptism." Those who live in open sin the Church requires her chief pastors to separate from her communion by public sentence, but when the last sad offices are to be discharged, she bids her ministers to speak of all who have been baptized, and are not excommunicated, as members of her brotherhood. Thus are the positive statements which she makes respecting infants, confirmed by her mode of dealing with her adult children.

It might seem that these expressions of the Church left no room to doubt what was her inten-

tion. For here is an affirmation made respecting *every* infant, and the gift bestowed in Baptism is referred to as important in after-life. All this, however, is held by some persons to be erroneous, because, as Mr. Goode expresses the matter, it involves a "complete preterition of the necessity of qualifiations in infants." His argument is as follows: "In the case of adults we must suppose that these statements were intended only to apply to those adults who have faith and repentance. Why, then, I ask, are we not to suppose a similar and analogous limitation implied in the case of infants?" Now it may readily be conceded that these, like all other general statements, admit of limiting conditions, but then the statements themselves must be shown to be of a kind which not only admit, but require limitation. The strongest arguments which have been adduced against the sacramental system (the little effect which follows Baptism, to which we adverted in the last Chapter; or the Calvinistic Doctrine of Decrees, which will be considered in conclusion) would here be out of place; for the present question is, not whether Baptismal Regeneration is true, but whether it is taught in the Prayer-Book. Such general objections to the truth of the doctrine, might be a reason for altering the Prayer-Book's words, but they cannot alter its interpretation. What Mr. Goode must do, is to show that the statements themselves are of such a kind, that their very expressions imply the limitation for which he is contending. For example, when the Church is speaking of the state of man in the coming world, here the very language suggests that measure of uncertainty,

which is bound up with our notion of futurition. So that it may be observed in passing, that general statements respecting any thing past or present, are different in kind from general statements respecting what may be hereafter. Thus, when we say "to-morrow *will* be a fine day," our acknowledged ignorance of the future leads us to receive the statement in a very different sense from that which we would assign to the assertion, "yesterday *was* a fine day." If a man, possessing the ordinary means of knowledge, deceived us in the one case, we should say he wanted skill; if he deceived us in the other, we should say he wanted veracity. Now some such qualification, drawn from the nature of the case, must be found in the present instance. For the ordinary laws of language would not allow us to affirm any thing as a general truth, which we have no reason to believe to be so. The condition, though not positively expressed, must in some manner be applied. To assert those things respecting every man unconditionally, which they believe not to be unconditionally true, would be to commit a breach of veracity in Church, which men would not hazard in the market-place.

Mr. Goode so far feels the force of this reasoning, that he is not contented to say, as some have done, "we make this assertion of every body, because, though usually false, it sometimes turns out to be true:" he does not mean that occasional truth is an excuse for ordinary falsehood; but he maintains that he is able to bring forward certain qualifying conditions, by which the general statements of the Prayer-Book are actually limited.

And, by way of stating the views of various parties, he brings forward three qualifications, the two first of which he himself apparently favours, the third he attributes exclusively to others, These qualifications are, first, "That the efficaciousness of baptism in infants depends upon previous election by God to salvation." Secondly, "The efficaciousness of Baptism depends upon the prevision by God, of further faith and repentance in the child at a subsequent period of life." Thirdly, "As faith and repentance are required in the adult, so they are requisite, in proportion, to the infant, for the reception in Baptism of the full blessing of that ordinance."

Now, the first consideration which these qualifications suggest, is, that they involve this important truth, that the benefit of baptism is not merely a change in men's ecclesiastical position, but a real alteration in their nature. Whether the Church designs to affirm that all baptized infants experience this change, is a further question; but Mr. Goode may be expected to accord with that doctrine, which her words so obviously imply, that those who partake the inward gift of Baptism are participants of a real and spiritual blessing.[2] And

[2] "For ourselves, as we have often stated, we never could clearly see the scriptural warrant for this distinction between spiritual and what is called baptismal regeneration. . . . . We cannot but think that the phrase, "baptismal regeneration," was invented to reconcile the strong terms in which the effects of baptism are spoken of in Christian antiquity, and by our own Church, with the undeniable fact that all baptized persons do not give evidence of having been spiritually born again. We concur with Dr. Pusey, and other writers of the same school, that this notion does not satisfy the strong language of

this accordingly he fully admits to be the meaning of our service. "It appears to me," he says, "that regeneration in the full scriptural sense of the word, as implying incorporation into the true Church and Body of Christ, is prayed for, and that the thanksgiving is for the presumed bestowal of the blessing asked." And in whatever case the words of the Church are truly applicable, it seems inconceivable that less can be implied in them.

But when from this consideration we come to the qualifications themselves, we are met by this difficulty, that they are not based, as they ought to be, upon the statements themselves, but only upon a consideration of the parties. For it is at once evident, though Mr. Goode has not adverted to it, that these qualifications are brought out by considering that the blessing of Baptism implies a Giver and a receiver, and that we may consider under what condition the one gives, and what conditions render the other a suitable recipient. God's previous election is a condition deduced from the law according to which the Giver bestows His blessings. "Future faith and repentance" is a condition drawn from what the receiver *will be:* present "faith and repentance" from what he *is.* So that we are led back to that which had been previously excluded — the external reasons for

our offices: that regeneration is not an ecclesiastical relation (though baptism includes such a relation,) but a new nature; and that *whether we can reconcile the expressions in our offices with this opinion or not,* we must not make a new kind of regeneration to meet the supposed difficulty." —*Christian Observer,* No. 27, 1840, pp. 166, 167.

thinking the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration false; and these have been shown to be no just grounds for assigning to the words of the Prayer-Book any other meaning than that which they naturally convey. These external arguments are no excuse for the Church if she affirms any thing unconditionally, which is only conditionally true. It is needful that her statements themselves should *imply* at all events that, which they do not express. Mr. Goode seems to suppose that because the Church *might* have limited her words, therefore he is at liberty to conclude that she *has* done so. "Because such general statements refer to the case of adults, as well as infants; and in the former case it is admitted that faith and repentance are necessary to a salutary reception of the Sacrament; therefore some similar qualification *may* have been held necessary in the latter case." Here is a plain forgetfulness of the old logical rule, *Exceptio probat regulam.* This rule does not mean, as often understood, that every statement admits of exceptions, but that to admit a particular instance to be an exception, is to allow the truth of the general rule from which it is a deviation. Those who drew up the form for baptizing children, affirmed unconditionally that all baptized infants were regenerate. When a form for baptizing adults was subsequently added, the new condition of faith and repentance which their age introduced, made it necessary to annex a specific limitation. But this limitation does not, as Mr. Goode supposes, destroy the general rule, but establishes it. For the necessity of an-

nexing this condition, shows that when it is not annexed, the rule is unconditional.

The conditions which have been produced would be no justification, therefore, for the Church's language, but would rather tend to impeach her truth. But let us consider them in themselves. The third condition, drawn from a consideration of the state in which the recipient *is*, that, namely, of the Infant's *faith*, is not advocated, but only noticed by Mr. Goode. But it requires to be considered, because it acts a very important part in his system. Were this, indeed, a mere question between Mr. Goode and Luther, to whom he attributes the opinion, it were needless to enter upon it, since we are not concerned with the views of those who are not regarded as authorities by our Church.[3] But by attributing

[3] It may be well to state explicitly on what ground the sentiments of Luther respecting Baptism are of importance to members of the English Church. In the year 1523, Luther published what he called "The Book of Baptism, translated into German," "Das Taufbüchlin verdeudscht." This book he did not profess altogether to approve, though he found in it nothing positively censurable; but he states in his preface, "in order to spare weak consciences, I have let it remain much as it was, that they might not complain I wished to introduce a new Baptism." It may be found in German in his works, vol. ii. p. 227, Jena, 1572. This book (either from choice, or by command) formed the basis of the form which Bucer afterwards compiled for Herman of Cologne, A. D. 1543, and the two forms were plainly in the hands of those who compiled our own Liturgy. Now Mr. Goode argues, since Luther employed the same general statements which were afterwards adopted in our Services, our Reformers need not have believed them any more than he did. It is of moment, then, to show, as Luther's words most abundantly establish, that he fully believed in the truth of those general statements, which he copied from the ancient Services. And

this notion to Luther, Mr. Goode gets rid of the otherwise unequivocal language in which Luther had spoken of baptism, and which passed from Lutheran sources both into the Liturgy of Herman, and into the first Book of King Edward. For since such faith is assumed to require predisposing grace,[4] as that of adults confessedly does, therefore Baptism will only be efficacious when it has made use of a prevenient gift of grace already bestowed upon the recipient. But this supposition involves the strange hypothesis, which Mr. Goode allows "may seem to many in

this circumstance would prepare us to expect that Cranmer, who published a Catechism drawn from German sources, entertained the same opinion. On this subject, then, and as the translator of a Form which our own in part imitated, the sentiments of Luther are of importance even to those who do not refer to him in other particulars, and on this ground, and this only, is he quoted as an authority in the present work.

[4] Such is Mr. Goode's account of the effect of the view he assigns to Luther, and the same it would seem must be Mr. Gorham's opinion upon the subject. For he states that the "Article does not except infants from the necessity of that due qualification" of faith; and that it "therefore teaches that there must have been a prevenient act of grace to render such infants worthy"—(*Gorham's Examination*, Answer, 71:) and again, "as infants are by nature unworthy recipients . . . they cannot receive any benefit from Baptism, except there shall have been a prevenient act of grace to make them worthy." Ans. 15. This seems to imply the exercise of some responsible powers, which prevenient grace is given to influence, for otherwise why should Baptism, which is only the gift of grace, need a preliminary act, any more than prevenient grace itself does? The only ground on which the necessity of prevenient grace can be rested, is the analogy of adult Baptism; and it is needed by the adult, because his responsible powers require to be prepared. So that the requirement is without meaning, unless there is to be an exercise of responsibility in the infant also.

the present day singular," that new-born infants possess powers of consciousness of which they give no indication, and are really responsible agents capable of exercising actual faith. For unless Luther's words are to be taken for as much as this, they fail of effecting Mr. Goode's object, which is to show that grace is not in all cases bestowed upon infants in Baptism. To do this, it is necessary to place infant faith upon the same footing with the faith of adults; and since Luther did not hold the high Calvinistic notion, but supposed that the unfruitfulness of Baptism in unbelieving adults results not from an Absolute Decree, but from neglect of that preventing grace whereby God is willing to call all men to repentance, therefore the unfruitfulness of infant Baptism must be charged to the infant's own responsibility. Such is Mr. Goode's view of Luther's words, "we bring a child to a minister of the Church to be baptized, in this hope and persuasion that it certainly believes, and we pray that God may give it faith."

Now, in thus charging Luther with attributing *acts* of faith to infants, Mr. Goode certainly does not stand alone; for one of the usual arguments employed against him by members of the Church of Rome was, that his words must needs have this signification; while the Anabaptists alleged the same statements as an argument against baptizing infants at all. And perhaps Luther's early statements were sufficiently unguarded to allow an opponent to draw such inferences. But it must be remembered, both that Luther altogether denied that he used these words in the sense which his

opponents assigned to them, and also that his language may in some degree be accounted for by the peculiar terminology which had been prevalent. For it had been held ever since the Council of Vienne, that a gift of grace not only was bestowed on infants at Baptism, which had been believed from the first origin of Christianity, but that they received the infused habits of faith, hope, and charity. If it were asked how this consisted with the unconsciousness of the infant mind, the answer was found in a distinction between acts and habits. Of the first, children were allowed to be wholly incapable, but not of the second. Aquinas accordingly lays down "that faith and charity depend on the will of men, yet so that the habit of these and other virtues requires the potentiality of will, which infants possess; but to put these virtues into act requires an act of will, of which infants are incapable."[5] When Luther, then, in his work on the Babylonish Captivity, was asserting the universality of the principle of faith, he was met by the question of Infant Baptism, and he solved it by saying that the circumstance whereby infants were rendered acceptable to God, was the faith which was infused into them, and not the virtues. But when it was alleged that in this case he must mean to attribute to them actual faith, and thus that he fell into the absurd notion of supposing them to be conscious agents, he altogether denied the charge, and explained his doctrine by the very illustration of the character possessed in sleep, which had been employed by Aquinas. "What scriptural grounds

[5] Summa Theol. iii. Q. lxix. 5.

there are for saying, as some do, that when children are baptized they understand the words of the Gospel, and have an *actual belief* in them, and so are saved, I could never discern." Such was Bucer's objection in the conference at Wittenberg. To which Luther replied, "that this was not his opinion or that of his friends; but just as we are numbered among the faithful even in our sleep, and are really faithful, though we have no actual thought of God, so that in infants there is an *initial* principle of faith, which yet in God's work, acting upon them according to the law of their capacity (a law of which we know nothing,) and that this he called faith. That he had rather no discussion was raised on this subject, nor that any one attempted to investigate in what way God effects this His work in them."[6]

It is plain, then, that Luther did not design to attribute *actual*[7] faith to children, but bestowed the

[6] Buceri Script. Ang. p. 656.

[7] As this is a point of considerable moment, I will quote the account which is given of it by an author of high reputation: "The Treatiser chargeth me, that whereas Luther defendeth that infants in Baptism actually believe, I endeavour to wrest his words to habitual faith; which sense, he saith, Luther's discourses will not admit; and for proof hereof referreth the reader to certain places in Luther, and to the positions of his followers. . . . The reader cannot but find by Luther's discourses, and the doctrine of his scholars, that I have rightly delivered his opinion to be, that infants are filled with habitual faith when they are regenerate, and not that they have any such acts of faith or knowledge of God, as men of years have. Let us, therefore, hear what Luther himself will say: 'Some men,' saith he, 'will object against that which I have said, touching the necessity of faith in such as are to receive the Sacraments with profit, that infants have no faith, nor apprehension of God's mercies, and that therefore either faith is not so necessarily required to the due

name of faith on that spiritual gift which God infuses into them in Baptism. Accordingly, in the agreement which he concluded with Bucer at Wittenberg, it was expressly stated that children receive the Holy Ghost in Baptism; that it is not to be supposed that they understand, but that motions and inclinations tending towards faith and love are bestowed upon them, and that in this sense it may

receiving of the Sacrament, or that infants are baptized in vain. Here, I say, that which all say, that other men's faith, even the faith of such as present them to Baptism, steadeth little children. For as the word of God is mighty when the sound thereof is heard, even to the changing the heart of a wicked man, which is no less unapt to hear the voice of God, and to listen unto it, than any little babe: so by the prayer of the Church, which out of faith (to which all things are possible) presenteth it to baptism, the child is changed, cleansed, and renewed, by the infusion of faith, or by faith which is infused and poured into it.' Thus doth Luther express his own meaning touching this point. Now let us hear what his followers will say. 'It was agreed upon,' says Chemnitius, 'amongst the followers of Luther' (*i. e.*, at the conference at Wittenberg, A. D. 1536), 'that when we say infants believe or have faith, we must not imagine they do understand or feel the motions of faith. But their error is rejected, who suppose that infants baptized please God, and are saved *without any operation or working of the Holy Spirit in them;* whereas Christ pronounceth, that unless a man be born anew of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. So that this is all that Luther and the rest meant, that children cannot be made partakers of those benefits that God offereth to men in Baptism, nor inherit eternal life by virtue of the faith of the Church, without some change wrought in them fitting them to be joined to God, which change or alteration in them they call faith: for they constantly deny that they feel any such motions of faith; but a kind of habitual faith only, there being nothing in faith, but such an act of believing as they deny, or the seed, root, and habit, whence actual motions in due time do flow.' "—*Field's Book of the Church*, Appendix to the 5th Book second part, sec. ii. p. 837.

be said that they have faith.[8] So that instead of regarding faith as a condition of the infant's mind, by which Baptism might be rendered either useless or beneficial, Luther looked at it as only the fittest name for that seminal principle, which he asserted so strongly that Baptism in itself always conveyed. "Some persons," he says, "preach and magnify Baptism, but yet err in that they rest it not on God's command and institution, but on some human work, on our faith and dignity, as if it were not enough that God should have appointed and commanded it, but it must first be confirmed by us; and as though Baptism had no existence or no efficacy without the accession of our faith. To this I make objection, and say, whatever be my faith, firm or weak, present or absent, this neither adds any thing to Baptism nor takes any thing away.[9] A similar passage occurs in the Catechism, wherein he says, that "after all, the main force of the matter does not depend on this, whether the child who is baptized believes or no; seeing that through want of this the Baptism suffers no detraction. For its main point rests on God's appointment."[10]

This subject has been dwelt upon, because it is of moment to show that not a shadow of reason exists for doubting that Luther's repeated statements respecting the regeneration of infants in Bap-

[8] Buceri Script. Ang. p. 668.

[9] Homilia de Baptismo, vol. vii. p. 351. Wittenberg, 1558.

[10] "Deinde hoc quoque dicimus, nobis non summam vim in hoc sitam esse, num ille qui baptizetur credat necne; per hoc enim Baptismo nihil detrahitur. Verum summa rei in Verbo et præcepto Dei consistit."—*Catechismus Major*, works, v. 638.

tism, are to be taken in their simple and obvious sense. The only ground for such an opinion which Mr. Goode can allege depends, upon the strange conception which some of Luther's earlier expressions had seemed to favour, but which he himself, in later years, distinctly repudiated. Yet, on the strength of this argument Mr. Goode infers that the expressions in the Cologne Liturgy, and in those of our own Church, need not he taken in their apparent sense, because they were formed on the model of the Nuremberg Liturgy, which Luther had originally translated. The deduction would not be legitimate, even if it stood on a solid basis; but in this case, the foundation on which it rests has been shown also to be utterly illusory.

So much respecting the third of those conditions for saving Baptism, which Mr. Goode has produced. The other two were—first, a sentence of previous election to salvation on the part of God: and, secondly, the prevision by God of future faith and repentance. And respecting these two it is necessary to say a few words.

If the first or Calvinistic hypothesis be only stated in express words, its glaring repugnancy to the whole language of the Prayer-Book, cannot fail to be manifest. For take it in any individual case. See some infant lying helpless and unconscious in its nurse's arms, incapable alike of actual good or evil. Its friends pause a moment after bringing it within the portals of the sanctuary, as though conscious of the risks of life, and almost fearful of committing it to the grave responsibilities which result from dedication to God's service. There they are encouraged by the voice of the Priest, and by

Christ's merciful words in the Gospel: "Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe that He will likewise favourably receive this present Infant." Thus invited, they proceed in the service, "being persuaded of the good-will of our heavenly Father towards *this Infant*." And could we bear to speak thus, if we knew that it was at least as probable as not, that the Baptismal waters were in this case robbed of their healing efficacy, not in consequence of any thing which the child was or did, or could do, but because Almighty God, by an irresistible sentence, had decreed to withhold from him the succours of grace, and thereby to consign him to everlasting ruin? For even if men do not take the full view expressed by Calvin,[11] and suppose that the All-Merciful makes a show of bestowing help, in order to enhance the guilt and misery of those whose destruction He had previously decreed by an arbitrary sentence; yet the denial of sufficient grace must render the whole language of the service a mockery.

From the harshness of this supposition men fly, not unnaturally, to the second condition assigned by Mr. Goode, and look for the qualification of Baptism, not in the will of Him who bestows grace, but in the condition of him who is to receive it. And since the present condition of the infant is that of unconsciousness, they refer to what his condition *will be*. According to this theory "the efficaciousness of Baptism depends upon the prevision by God of future faith and repentance in the child at a subsequent period of life." Now it should be observed

[11] "Quia Dominus, ut magis convictos et inexcusabiles reddat se insinuat in eorum mentes."—*Calvin Instit.* iii. 2, 11.

that this qualification, if it means any thing, is incompatible with the other which preceded it. For if those who bring the child have a right to assume that something will be bestowed upon him, provided it is apparent to the foreknowledge of the Allwise that he will hereafter make a good use of the endowment, it follows that the responsibility of man has some part in the decision of his destiny. For otherwise this condition need not be introduced, seeing that the whole question would in reality be shut up in God's predetermining appointment. To dwell, then, on this condition; to rest on it as supplying, in itself, the reason why Baptism is, in some cases, attended by grace—in others not attended by it, is incompatible with an employment of that other condition of God's arbitrary decree, which has already been mentioned.

The passage in the Catechism on which this condition is often rested, shall be mentioned before the conclusion of this Chapter; at present it need only be said, that it is not open to any one to refer to this condition, if he commits himself to the other condition of Calvinism. To take one or the other, as the occasion serves, is wholly irrational. And this will be found, as will be shown in the instance of Cranmer, to be an error which runs through many of the interpretations which Mr. Goode gives to the words of the Liturgy and of the Reformers. There are two keys, and if one does not serve, the other may be made available. But then the keys belong to different systems, and if the one be used, the other ought to be altogether discarded. For this condition of the prevision of man's future conduct is, in truth, a part of that Pelagian system,

which is as inconsistent with the principles of the Gospel, as the system of necessity is with the instincts of natural piety. For it makes man's foreseen actions the source of that first gift of grace, with which he must start in the career of duty. It makes something, therefore, which may be discerned in man, the moving cause of God's first advances towards him. And this has been long rejected by the Church as a part of the Pelagian hypothesis: it has long been held that the first measure of power to will and to do is God's *free* gift, although it is a gift which does not exclude man's responsibility. It is strange, therefore, that this condition should have been relied upon by the parties who of late have used it, since if it means any thing, it makes man the original moving cause of his own salvation, and gets rid of the universality of baptismal grace, by limiting it to those cases in which it is purchased by human merit. It will be shown hereafter, that the words of the Catechism do not, as has sometimes been represented, involve such a condition: and this single consideration is sufficient to show that they could not do so. For otherwise the Church would be involved in that Pelagian error, against which she uniformly protests. But it is one thing to say that the succours of grace are so dispensed, as not to supersede man's accountableness; another to say that the condition which procures them is his own excellence. For his last system breaks that golden chain whereby all created beings must depend on the Ultimate Source of good as the primary spring of all virtue; and while the system of Necessity would make man a beast, this would make him a god.

There is in reality, then, only one point of contact between the two first conditions which Mr. Goode suggests; namely, that both of them introduce a qualification into the Church's general statements, and thus allow men occasionally to reject that which she asserts, without limitation, to be true. It has already been shown, that the very introduction of such conditions, unsanctioned by the expressions themselves, is a violation of the plainness of speech which, in common life, would be accounted dishonourable. And nothing can be worse than on the most sacred subjects to admit of a conventional dishonesty. But let us test somewhat further this principle of a charitable interpretation, which results either from the one or the other of the conditions which have been discussed. Let us see whether, if it could be admitted in this case, it would tally with the other parts of the baptismal service. Now what is the opinion before us? It proceeds on the supposition that "God *may* be mercifully present to the child in" Baptism, "but we have no right to assume that such will be the case." Christ works by "ministers, but only when and in what cases He pleases." Out of every hundred to whom they administer the Sacraments, there may be very few to whom they minister more than an outward rite or ceremony." This is the necessary result, of course, of the erroneous opinion[11] that to conceive sacraments effectual is to subordinate God's power to man's control. The error arises

[11] So Mr. Goode. "It would be making God's best gifts dependent upon the course of human generation, for baptism is in the power of all." And still more clearly Mr. Gorham, Sup. p. 26.

from forgetting a rule which even Luther inculcates, "to be baptized in God's name, is not to be baptized by men, but by God Himself."[13] For God is equally supreme in those things which He does by the agency of earthly, and those which He does by the agency of heavenly, instruments; He as truly feeds the nations by bread, as He did the Israelites by manna. If, therefore, Baptism be really His appointment, it does not cease to be His own act because He employs the ministry of His servants. But this mistake implies, of course, as a necessary consequence, that the only mean of ascertaining, whether any one has partaken of the regenerating gift of grace, is by observing whether he is a devout Christian; and not, as Cranmer says in his Catechism, because "I know for a surety that I am baptized;" "and the Holy Ghost doth witness, that he which is baptized hath put upon him Christ." And hence results the opinion that grace and regeneration are identical: the last not being any particular gift, or attainable in any particular manner. And since the gifts of grace may of course be bestowed by their Giver when and how He pleases, therefore Regeneration may be looked for before or after Baptism, just as well as in that ordinance. And so says Mr. Goode; "in *all* cases baptism is connected with regeneration, only as the formal signing and sealing of the deed is connected with the completion of a purchase." "In adults the internal work of regeneration must be at least commenced before parties can properly receive Bap-

[13] Siquidem baptizari in nomine Dei, non est ab hominibus, sed ab ipso Deo baptizari.—*Catec. Maj.*

tism ; and in infants, it must either be commenced or foreseen by God certainly to follow."

The theory, then, of a charitable sense, is that grace of any sort is identical with the grace of regeneration ; that since God bestows His gifts before, in, or after baptism, no means exists for determining whether it is bestowed except the effect ; and that consequently in the case of any child who is brought to baptism, it is charitable to affirm that, which it is impossible to deny. The reader must be reminded in a few words what was that other system, which was before explained, and which assumes that all baptized infants have been regenerated. For the cause of this it refers to the grace of God, which originally took up its dwelling in the Humanity of the Word, and is since distributed through sacraments. Its office is the reconstruction of that common nature, which was corrupted in Adam ; a work which is declared in Holy Scripture to have its commencement in Baptism. In this case the gift is not to be estimated merely by the result, but by God's promise. For it is not identical with grace at large, but is that peculiar and separate grace, which results from union with Christ's Body. In adults this process is liable to be obstructed through the opposition of their individual wilfulness: in infants there can be no such repugnancy. In the first, therefore, regeneration is only affirmed to take place, when their will has yielded to the suasion of preventing grace ; in the second, regeneration is declared to be coincident with valid Baptism. Such are the two system ; it has been shown that the last alone accords with the Church's general

assertions respecting baptismal grace; let us see whether any other passages in the Service-Book enable us to test their applicability.

Now such a test may be found by considering what is the Church's mode of speaking respecting those who are *not* baptized. For since God may plainly bestow His grace before as well as after Baptism, therefore the judgment of charity does not allow us to *deny* its presence in one case, any more than in the other. Before, as well as in Baptism, it is equally charitable to affirm that, which it is impossible to deny. But what is the Church's mode of proceeding? In the case of adults she not only supposes that they *may* have grace, but before she admits them to Baptism, she takes the utmost pains to ascertain that they actually possess it. No securities of course can altogether guard against the deceitfulness of the human heart, but where "timely notice" is given to the Bishop, "that so due care may be taken for the examination" of the parties, where they are "exhorted to prepare themselves with prayer and fasting," and finally are "found fit," it cannot be doubted that they must be supposed to come as meet receivers to Baptism. And of course to exhort them to "prayer and fasting," is to imply that they have partaken of some measure of that grace, without which such exercises must be useless. Now if the Church supposes that regeneration is attained wherever God bestows grace, if she judges of it merely by the general conduct, and does not suppose it to be associated with any peculiar ordinance; if she thinks that Baptism is only a sign of that gift which God has before bestowed on every

meet receiver, how can she possibly affirm that such persons are not regenerate till they approach the baptismal font? I waive the fact that after they are baptized she pronounces them regenerate, for this men will attribute to the judgment of charity; but how comes she to be so wanting in charity as previously to deny them this gift? She has taken the utmost pains to ascertain that they are fit recipients—she has satisfied herself that so far as human testimony goes, they possess those qualifications which are supposed to imply that the blessing of regeneration has already been vouchsafed, and then proceeds to ask it for them as a future benefit. "We call upon Thee for these persons, that they, coming to Thy Holy Baptism, may receive remission of their sins by spiritual regeneration."

It is plain, then, that in this case the "charitable hypothesis" is altogether inapplicable. For the Church does not carry it far enough. If this were all which she intended to say respecting the baptized, she could not refuse to employ the same language respecting meet Catechumens.

And it is not unimportant to observe, that though exhorting the candidates for Baptism to previous prayer, the Church does not include them among those whose supplications she invokes for the validity of this healing ordinance. She calls on the congregation to pray that "these Thy servants may be received into the ark of Christ's Church;" but she does not associate the prayers of the candidates with those of Christians; to the former she says, "ye have heard how the congregation hath prayed, that our Lord Jesus

Christ would vouchsafe to receive you." A moment before Baptism she prays, "regard, we beseech Thee, the supplications of this congregation; sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin; and grant that the persons now to be baptized therein may receive the fulness of Thy grace." A moment after Baptism she says, "seeing now, dearly beloved Brethren, that these persons are regenerate." Now what a mockery is this whole transaction, if the Church has previously ascertained to its own satisfaction, that regeneration had in reality been before dispensed! For in truth, on what is called the "charitable hypothesis," regeneration can never be supposed to be conferred on adults in Baptism. Not on meet receivers, for they are regenetated already: not on unmeet, for since by the hypothesis they must come hypocritically, they cannot expect a blessing which they do not seek. Thus would the Church be supposed to affirm that every meet receiver was unregenerate before baptism, and regenerated in the act of baptism itself; while in reality both statements would be false--the blessing would never be bestowed at the time asserted, never absent when its presence was denied.

If we turn from the Service for adults to that for infants, we find in it, likewise, that the theory of a charitable construction is equally untenable. The ground of its inapplicability in the former case was, that by Regeneration is meant that renewal of our common nature, which began in Christ, and in Sacraments is extended to His brethren. Since in adults this work may be obstructed by the waywardness of the individual

will, the influence of preventing grace is needed as a preparation for it. But because Regeneration is not identical with grace at large, therefore it is not spoken of as effected, when preventing grace is supposed to be possessed : the judgment of charity does not lead to any such assumption ; but the term is reserved to express that particular work, of which Baptism is the appointed means. Now in exact conformity with this system, we find that the regeneration of baptized infants is asserted because their nature admits of reconstruction, though there is no room in them for the operation of preventing grace ; and we find assertions made, and laws passed, which, but for this supposition, ought in common charity to be extended to unbaptized infants also. For it is plain, that the unconsciousness of their age excludes infants from the action of preventing grace upon their individual will. The influences of which alone they can be susceptible, must be those which address themselves to that general nature, from which our separate responsibility has been distinguished. And such a change is plainly recognized, when it is said that "it is certain by God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." With which must be associated the fact, that to baptized children only is allowed participation in the Funeral Offices of the Church. This is not a mere accident, but is a positive rule, founded on those ancient Canons, which declared that those, with whom was no communion when living, cannot be admitted to communion after death. Now what can more strongly mark the

Church's opinion, that in Baptism the nature ot the old Adam is exchanged for that which was re-fashioned in Christ; than her declaration that the salvation of baptized Infants, dying before they commit actual sin, is affirmed in Scripture? Here is a direct assertion that baptized infants are partakers of that renewal of man's nature, which commenced through the regeneration of humanity in Christ. For what does Holy Scripture tell us of the salvation of mankind, except as dependent on this great event? It every where sets forth this "new and living way," as the only revealed channel of Divine grace. So that when we are told that baptized infants, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly possessors of the Scripture promise of salvation, here is a distinct affirmation that they have undergone that change for which we supplicate, when we say, "Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he may be born again, and made an heir of everlasting salvation."

And here, therefore, we have an opportunity of seeing when the Church uses the judgment of Charity, and when she does not. For we have no proof that God, whose mercies are infinite, may not bestow His grace upon unbaptized children also. And therefore our Church, while affirming the salvation of those who have been made members of Christ, exercises a charitable judgment respecting others. But she does not speak of them in the same terms, which she uses respecting the baptized. On the contrary, she does not allow her ministers to use her Burial Service over their remains, and she studiously abstains from pronouncing respecting their state

She leaves ground for hope, where she possesses no certainty. Now this is exactly the position, in which those who deny Baptismal grace would place her in respect to baptized infants. Her words, therefore, respecting the unbaptized, ought on this theory to be the same which she employs respecting those who have received Baptism. Else she is wanting in that Charity towards the one, which she exercises towards the other.

It is plain, then, that the Church's different treatment of baptized and unbaptized infants is wholly fatal to the idea, that she is expressing nothing but a charitable judgment respecting the former. The hope for which she leaves room respecting the one, renders emphatic the certainty which she reserves for the other. And if any question remained on this subject, it would be cleared up by the obvious difficulty in which Mr. Goode involves himself, when he attempts to reconcile this rubric with a denial of the regeneration of all baptized infants. For he is driven to the avowal of principles, on which the Church's laws make it impossible for him to act. Here is certainly to all appearance a general statement, from which no baptized infants are excluded. And the rule respecting the admission of the baptized, and of the baptized only, to the rights of burial, gives it a practical interpretation which cannot be mistaken. And yet it is indispensable to Mr. Goode's position to find some condition by which it may be limited, otherwise the Church must express more than a charitable hope; she must be speaking of *deed*, not an hypothesis. The qualification which he adduces is worth attention;

but still more the grounds which lead to its attention. "Our Church administering Baptism to infants as the children of true believers,[14] this rubric must be understood accordingly; *otherwise our system of theology is thrown into utter confusion.*" Again he says, "no man has any right to stretch the rubric as to the undoubted salvation of all baptized infants dying in their infancy, so as to include any others than the infants of professing Christians. . . . . And further, it is clearly open to us to maintain, that such a profession must be a reality, to obtain any blessing from God."

Baptism, that is, is not the right of all infants, but only of those whose parents are Christians. And since Christianity is a life and not a profession, therefore none can really challenge its benefits whose parents are not truly devout Christians. When the Church, therefore, asserts that "children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved," she makes a general assertion, because it is uncertain who are its legitimate objects; but none except the children of religious parents possess that qualification, without which her words are inapplicable.

Such is Mr. Goode's mode of avoiding the inference, that the Church intends to make a gene-

[14] The twenty-ninth Canon, which forbids Fathers to be Sponsors for their children, is well known to have been designed to counteract the notion expressed by Mr. Goode, that "the faith of the parent" is "imputable to the infant"; and to show that "it is not the virtue of our Fathers," as Hooker says, "that can give us the true holiness which we have by virtue of our new birth."—*Vide an Article in the British Magazine, for Feb.* 1840, p. 164.

ral statement respecting all baptized infants. He can find no means of escaping the difficulty, but to introduce a qualification for Baptism, which may limit the right of partaking it—that qualification being the consistent Christianity of the parents. Now it is needless to refer to the opinions of our best divines,[15] who are notoriously

[15] Hooker states the arguments against Mr. Goode's opinion. *Eccl. Pol.* v. 64-5. "To restrain favours, is an odious thing; to enlarge them, acceptable both to God and Man." "The ancients," says Wall, "did not in the baptizing of children, go by that rule, which some presbyterians would establish, viz., that none are to be baptized but the children of parents actually godly and religious." "Bishop Stillingfleet has fully shown the absurdity and inconsistency of such presbyterians; and how they can never, in many cases that may be put, come to a resolution or agreement what children may be baptized, and what not; and has cleared the grounds of Baptism from such scruples."—*History of Infant Baptism*, part ii. c. 6. As the limitation of Baptism to the children of Christians is so essential a link in Mr. Goode's system, it may be well to observe the testimony which was borne against it, even when Calvinism was in the ascendant, by our own leading divines of the Calvinistic party. At the Synod of Dort, a question arose "concerning the baptizing of the children of ethnic parents. The English first exhibited their minds in writing to this effect: That infants, if they were justly taken, as if they were given, or bought, or the like (for it might not be lawful fraudulently or violently to take them from their parents,) ought to be baptized, &c." "On the contrary, the Helvetians and South Hollanders, concluded that the infants of ethnic parents ought not to be baptized till they came to be of years to declare their faith. Their chief reason was, because Baptism was a sign of the covenant: but the infants of ethnic parents are not born within the covenant, and therefore they cannot be partakers of this sign."—*Hale's Letters from the Synod of Dort*, p. 31. The English Divines were Carlton, Hall, Ward, and Davenant; so that Mr. Goode must have misunderstood the sentiments of the last, when he says that "his writings clearly show that he held the infants of believers only to be proper subjects for Baptism." Of the opinion entertained by the

opposed to this hypothesis. No doubt those who wrote against the Anabaptists, employed what against them was a telling argument, that if the children of Christians were worthy of heaven, they must be worthy of Baptism. Mr. Goode has referred to various instances of this *argumentum ad hominem;* forgetting that our Church employs Infant Baptism, professedly because it is "most agreeable with the institution of Christ." Her intention, therefore, is not to be gathered from what may have been adduced as conclusive against a particular error, but from the laws which regulate her general conduct. And in this case we may appeal to Mr. Goode's own practice. His opinion respecting this subject accords exactly with that of Baxter: but whereas he maintains that such a view is allowed by the Church, Baxter[16] refused to subscribe, on the professed

Dutch Calvinists (as well as by Mr. Goode,) John Hales observes (*Letters*, p. 43:) "a strange decision, and such as, if my memory or reading fail me not, no Church, either ancient or modern, ever gave. When it was objected, What if they were in danger of death? Their answer was, that the want of baptism would not prejudice them with God, except we would determine as the Papists do, that Baptism is necessary to salvation. Which is as much to undervalue the necessity of Baptism, as the Church of Rome does overvalue it." This is a wholly different case, of course, from the Baptism of children against the will of their parents, which was always discountenanced, if not positively forbidden. The motive in this case, was a fear of the profanation of the gift.—*Vide Maskell on Holy Baptism*, cap. xii. p. 343.

[16] "For the new clause of the salvation of baptized infants, as certain by the Word of God, the scruple were the less, if it were confined to the Infants of true believers. But our Church admitteth of all Infants, even of Infidels and Heathens, without distinction, if they have but Godfathers and Godmothers; and the Canon enforceth ministers to baptize them all without ex-

ground that the Church did not allow it. Now which of the two is right as to the question of fact? Is this qualification compatible with the Church's laws? Is Mr. Goode able to act upon it in his own Parish? He has been admitted to his benefice after promising canonical obedience. Suppose an infant brought to his Church, whose parents are either professed infidels or live in open sin—will he refuse to baptize it? If not, what becomes of the statement that the consistent Christianity of the Parents is a necessary qualification for the blessing of Baptism? If he does, where is the obedience which he has promised to render to the sixty-eighth Canon[17] of the Church of England—a Canon which the ecclesiastical courts would not fail to enforce against him, as they have done lately against others?

But, it may be said, this would be the harsh appeal to a law, which when lately enforced in a much harder case (that of denying to recognize schismatical lay-baptism,) excited considerable murmurs. Is an appeal made, then, from the law,

ception. And when in our public debate with the Bishops, I instanced in one of my Parishioners that was a professed Infidel, and yet said he would come and make the common profession for his child for custom sake; even Dr. Sanderson, the Bishop of Lincoln, answered me (and none of the Bishops contradicted him, but some seconded him,) that if there were Godfathers, it had a sufficient title, which Bishop Moreley and others confirmed."—*Baxter's Life*, part ii. p. 428.

[17] "No minister shall refuse or delay to christen any child according to the form of the Book of Common Prayer, that is brought to the Church to him upon Sundays or Holidays to be christened. . . . . And if he shall refuse to christen . . . . he shall be suspended by the Bishop of the Diocess from his ministry by the space of three months."—*Canon*, lxviii.

as enforced by Jurists, to the intention of those by whom our formularies were constructed? In the case before us, however, we have full information with what meaning this Rubric was constructed; and it can be shown to have been framed with the view of excluding the very interpretation which is put upon it. The Rubric before us is one of those which owes its form to the Commissioners who conducted the Savoy Conference. Mr. Goode is very desirous to deny all authority to these Commissioners, and observes that the formal recognition of the Prayer-Book depended upon Convocation and Parliament. But no reason exists for supposing that the Commissioners did not represent, as was designed and supposed, the predominant opinion of the Church; and the record of their intentions is not invalidated, because Baxter says, that the published Report did not do justice to the arguments of their antagonists. In the present case at all events the words introduced into the Rubric are manifestly theirs. For they occur in the concessions recommended by the Commissioners.[18] If the meaning, therefore of this Rubric is to be gathered from the intention with which it was devised, we must plainly refer to their arguments; and such was obviously the feeling of Baxter, a most competent witness respecting the history of this statement. When it was maintained that men might subscribe to the Service-Book, without believing that *all* baptized infants were brought into a state of salvation, he replied; "Your consciences must tell

[18] Cardwell. Hist. of Conf. p. 363.

you, that if you limit it to some only, you cross the sense of the compilers of the Liturgy. I am sure Dr. Gunning, who brought it in, hath publicly expressed his sense for the salvation of *all* such Infants."[19]

What then, according to their own explanation, was the intention of those who are stated to have inserted the words, "dying before they commit actual sin?" The words had previously stood, "it is certain by God's Word, that children being baptized have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved." To this the Presbyterians objected, that "although we charitably suppose the meaning of these words was only to exclude the necessity of any other sacraments to baptized infants; yet these words are dangerous as to the misleading of the vulgar, and therefore we desire that they may be expunged."[20] To which the Bishops replied as follows: "It is evident that the meaning of these words is, that children baptized and dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved, though they be not confirmed: wherein we see not what danger there can be of misleading the vulgar by teaching them truth. But there may be danger in this desire of having these words expunged, as if they were false; for St. Austin says he is an infidel that denies them to be true."[21] And that they could not intend to exclude any baptized infants from the benefit of their statement is still further shown by the remark which immediately follows on one of the Prayers at

[19] Baxter's Life by Sylvester, P. ii. p. 428.
[20] Cardwell, p. 327.
[21] Ep. 23. ad Bonifac.—*Cardwell*, p. 358.

Confirmation: "It supposeth, and that truly, that all infants were at their baptism regenerate by water and the Holy Ghost, and had given unto them the forgiveness of all their sins."

But perhaps Mr. Goode may observe that though this Rubric owes its form to the Commissioners at the Savoy Conference, yet that it was only a modification of an earlier statement, which occurred in King Edward's first Prayer-Book. Now, have we any clue to the intention, with which it was originally inserted? King Edward's Prayer-Book is not so detailed in its statements on this subject as to supply a complete answer. We must go a little higher, therefore, and ask what the usage was, which it tacitly adopted. This we may learn even from the form compiled by Bucer and Melancthon for Herman of Cologne. For this Service-Book contains an express provision respecting the baptism of children whose "parents" are "defiled with manifest crimes and abominations." "If the parents be found in such crimes, they shall desire their kinsfolk or other friends, which be as yet the true and lively members of the Church, that in their stead they will ask baptism for their infants."[22] Now, although the first English Prayer-Book does not so expressly contradict Mr. Goode's hypothesis, yet the want of any provision which sanctions it, is in reality equivalent to its denial. That children were rendered incapable of the benefits of Baptism through the misconduct of their parents, seems never to have entered into men's minds. And, therefore, when the Presbyterians requested, at the Savoy Conference, that the

[22] Fallow's "Baptismal Offices Illustrated," p. 30.

Church's words might receive such alterations as might render them susceptible of the interpretation which Mr. Goode at present assigns to them, the Bishops rejected the proposition altogether, as being not only inconsistent with their own convictions but also with the immemorial usage of the English Church. "There being divers learned, pious, and peaceable ministers," said the Presbyterian remonstrance, "who not only judge it unlawful to baptize children whose parents, both of them, are atheists, infidels, heretics, or unbaptized, but also such whose parents are excommunicated persons, fornicators, or otherwise notorious and scandalous sinners; we desire they may not be enforced to baptize the children of such, until they have made due profession of their repentance."[23] In this wish Mr. Goode must plainly coincide; since he asserts that none are entitled to Baptism but the children of Christians, none partakers of its benefits but those whose parents are consistent Christians. But what was the reply of those, by whom the words of the Church's Rubric were suggested? "We think this desire to be very hard and uncharitable, punishing the poor infants for the parents' sakes, and giving also too great and arbitrary a power to judge which of his parishioners he pleaseth, atheists, infidels, heretics, &c.—and then in that name to reject their children from being baptized. Our Church concludes more charitably, that Christ will favourably accept every infant to Baptism, that is presented by the Church according to our present order. And this she concludes out of the Holy Scriptures (as you may see in the office

[23] Cardwell, p. 323

of Baptism,) according to the practice and docrine of the Catholic Church."[24]

If the words of the Rubric, then, were not sufficient in themselves, the argument by which Mr. Goode would avoid its application would be decisive against him. He has no means of avoiding the conclusion that the Church considers all baptized children regenerate, except by seeking for a discriminating qualification in the character of the parents. And this involves the necessity of his not only contradicting the Church's present laws, but of his opposing the avowed intention of those who enacted them.

It has been shown, then, not only that there is no authority for the introduction of any conditions, limiting the general statements used in the Baptism of Infants, but also that the conditions which have been suggested are in themselves utterly untenable. To introduce conditions, to which there is no allusion in the Service, would in itself be to pervert the meaning of words; and the sense which they introduce is incompatible with the Church's statement that adult Catechumens are not regenerate, and with her different mode of dealing with baptized and unbaptized infants. Insomuch, that the objections to this doctrine are not founded upon the words of the Service, which are allowed even by opponents to "favour" it, but upon external difficulties. There is one passage, however in the Catechism, to which the opponents of baptismal regeneration have often

[24] "Cpr. Ep. 59. Aug. Ep. xxviii. et de verb. Apost. Serm. xiv. Cardwell," p. 355.

referred, as contenancing their hypothesis. "This passage," says Mr. Goode, "directly opposes the notion, that the full baptismal blessing is necessarily conferred upon all infants. For not only is it said that 'repentance and faith' are necessary in an adult coming to Baptism, in order that he may profit by it, but in answer to the question, 'why, then are infants baptized, when, by reason of their tender age, they cannot perform them,' the reply is, 'because they promise them both by their sureties, which promise when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform.' Here, then, at once is a limitation to the 'wholesome effect' of Baptism in infants." This passage, then, is supposed to recognize, as an necessary condition for efficacious Baptism, "the prevision by God of future faith and repentance." And Mr. Scott considers it so important, that he speaks of it "as the true key to the meaning of the Church in the language which she uses concerning infants.[25] Now even if this passage had been intended to produce such an effect, it could not neutralize those earlier statements of the Church, to which it was added after the Hampton Conference. For the interpretation which would represent it as a key to the Church's meaning, would make our Church's words wholly Pelagian in their tendency, since it would rest God's first act of favour upon something which He sees in men, and not on His own free mercy. It would represent Him as bestowing His gifts where He sees men to be such, that they will respond to His favours. Whereas, as the Council

[25] Scott's Inquiry, p. 146.

of Orange[26] expresses it, God's favour towards us is founded on what we *become* after we have received His gifts, not on what we *are* before we have received them. His previous love must not be referred at all to our deserts, but wholly to His free favour. Now, to suppose that a gift is offered to all infants, but that it is only bestowed on those who are seen to be about to use it, is to rest the discriminating condition upon the recipient's excellence. And this is a notion which is not only opposed to the whole teaching of the Church, but has been condemned in the strongest terms by Bishop Overall, to whom the conclusion of the Catechism is attributed. "The two views, either of an absolute decree on the part of God, or of a prevision of man's co-operation . . . are wholly to be rejected."[27] To found any such inference, then, on these words, would be utterly inadmissible; and yet, since they are the only words in the Prayer-Book which have been adduced with any show of plausibility, it is needful to examine them.

The practice of requiring sponsors at Baptism is of ancient date. What purpose was it intended to answer? The relations in which men may stand towards one another are plainly of two kinds, some depending on the will of the parties, others on their duties. Friendship is a relation of the first kind; allegiance, of the second. Men are not

[26] "Tales nos amat Deus quales futuri sumus ipsius dono, non quales sumus nostro merito."—*Harduin*, ii. 1099.

[27] "Præstantium Epistolæ Theologicæ." Amsterdam, 1704, No. 210, p. 353. This subject is considered at large in the 5th chapter.

friends longer than they desire to be so: allegiance is a coercive yoke, of which the laws will not allow them to divest themselves. Now, when a man is proxy for his neighbour, it is plain that he cannot undertake those relations which result from will, unless he acts by his neighbour's consent; but in respect of those relations which are imposed upon his neighbour by law, the same law may authorize him to act on his neighbour's behalf. This is seen in the guardianship of children. No guardian can undertake to prognosticate what will hereafter be the inclination of his infant ward; but so far as the law gives him power over his ward's property, he can act with confidence on his behalf. Now, the same principle which is applicable to things earthly, may be employed in estimating our relations to God. For we came into the world owing an allegiance to our Heavenly Sovereign, which the eternal laws of duty forbid us to neglect. The discharge of this allegiance in riper years implies the active exercise of faith and penitence. But during the season of infancy, while the voluntary powers are in abeyance, this allegiance can be nothing more than a duty, which has been contracted by the accident of our birth. For it is fast bound to that general nature, of which every child of Adam is an individual type.

When a man is proxy, therefore, for an infant towards God, it is not "as if the soul of the child were considered as transferred to his sponsors"[28] (as Mr. Scott at one time viewed the matter.)

[28] Scott's Inquiry, p. 140.

Such a transfer of souls is impossible in the nature of the case: "for no man may deliver his brother, nor make agreement unto God for him." The only relations which the proxy can undertake are those which some law assigns him: not the voluntary ones, inseparable from the accountableness of the individual, but those responsibilities which he has incurred as an heir of nature. Now this exercise of the proxy's duty the Catechism explains. Laying down faith and repentance as the general requirements on the part of man, it proceeds to show how far children can discharge them. Its office, as a manual of practical instruction for the young, is not, as Mr. Goode seems to imagine, to *defend* infant baptism, but to show its relation to the general scheme of Scripture doctrine. And therefore it states in what manner these conditions of faith and repentance can be complied with by infants. As respects their voluntary fulfilment, they cannot as yet be performed in any wise, but they do not the less exist as an obligation, inseparable from man's nature. And therefore the same law, which imposes them upon children, gives their guardians authority to make public acknowledgment of them. So that in the only sense in which infants can at all act by proxy—the contracting, that is, of obligations, the performance whereof some external law will hereafter enforce upon them—they can and do perform the requirements which are necessary for Baptism. And this it is which the words of the Catechism declared, as they were originally penned by Bishop Overall. "Why, then, are infants baptized,

when, by reason of their tender age, they cannot perform them? Yes, they do perform them by their sureties, who promise and vow them both in their names; which, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform." Had the words remained, therefore, as at first written, they would have afforded no opening for the idea that baptismal grace was contingent on men's future conduct. For the words spoke of something which was then and there performed by the infant, through his sponsors' intervention: and that which a proxy can effect for an infant is not the prognostication of his uncertain will, but the confession of his unquestionable duty.

But, it may be said, Bishop Overall's original intention was abandoned at the Savoy Conference. Happily, however, we have direct testimony why his words were altered, and what was the intention of those who altered them. And since the present words of our Catechism were actually suggested by the Bishops who conducted the Conference, their interpretation of their own meaning is decisive. The words of Bishop Overall were suggested by the Presbyterians to be open to such misconception, as Mr. Goode has been shown to entertain respecting those of Luther. It might be supposed, they said, that an act of repentance and faith really took place in the minds of infants; and not merely that they were admitted in consequence of Christ's appointment, and thereby incurred an obligation to the exercise of that faith and repentance, without which the full advantages of this sacred rite could not be enjoyed. That this was the objection made by the Presbyterian

party, and that the Bishops did not design by their concession to admit a mere hypothetical view of regeneration, is apparent from their own words. The former party said, by way of objection to the Catechism as it previously existed, "We desire that the entering infants into God's covenant may be more warily expressed; and that the words may not seem to found their baptism upon *a really actual faith and repentance of their own;* and we desire that a promise may not be taken for a performance of such faith and repentance; and especially that it be not asserted, that they perform these by the promise of their sureties, it being to the seed of believers that the covenant of God is made; and not, that we can find, to all that have such believing sureties, who are neither parents nor pro-parents of the child."[29] To this the Bishops replied: "The effect of children's baptism depends neither upon their own present actual faith and repentance (which the Catechism says expressly they cannot perform,) nor upon the faith and repentance of their natural parents or pro-parents, or of their godfathers or godmothers; but upon the ordinance and institution of Christ. But it is requisite that when they come to age they should perform these conditions of faith and repentance, for which, also, their godfathers and godmothers charitably undertook on their behalf."[30]

It is plain, therefore, that those who re-moulded the language of the Catechism at the Savoy Conference, had no intention of relinquishing the prin-

[29] Cardwell's "History of Conferences," p. 327.
[30] Cardwell, p. 357.

ciple which Bishop Overall had originally expressed. For here were two theories—first, that the spiritual effect of Baptism in the case of infants depended entirely on Christ's institution, and not on any qualifications of which they were possessed; secondly, that certain qualifications were needed on their part, either the qualification of a present active faith and repentance, which is the theory which has been erroneously attributed to Luther, or else the qualification of excellence on the part of their parents and sponsors. Now the Bishops plainly affirm the first of these two theories, and deny the second. "The effect of children's Baptism," they say, "depends neither upon their own present actual faith, nor upon the faith of their parents or godfathers." The second of these qualifications indeed, the faith of their God-parents, was sufficiently excluded by Bishop Overall's words; but the other qualification, the actual faith of the children, might seem to be recognized: the intention, therefore, of the Bishops, was to turn the force of the answer against the last qualification, not to let in the former. They had no intention of abandoning the truth, that the Baptism of infants rested entirely upon the institution of Christ, but they were willing to guard more effectually against giving countenance to the Anabaptist notion, that an actual present faith was always required. And that such was their feeling, is manifest from the words which they had used just before: "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: and the denial of it tends to Anabaptism, and the contempt of this Holy Sacrament, as nothing worthy, nor material whether it be administered to children or no."[31]

And here perhaps it may be objected that the intention of the Church's rulers in the year 1661, cannot be doubted, but that they may have been overruled by God's Providence or by fear of others, and may have adopted language, which themselves did not believe. The supposition is wholly visionary, since their own party was so plainly in the ascendant, that such a course was as unnecessary as it would have been dishonest. Such, indeed, is the conclusion, which those who follow Mr. Goode must adopt respecting the original compilers of our Service-Book, and upon it rests the opinion that its general promises are to be limited by some secret condition, which was present to their minds. But even if the Caroline Bishops could have designed in this way to admit sentiments, which they did not shrink from publicly denying, yet would this admission be wholly ineffectual, so long as it was undone by those acts of the Church, in which they made no alteration. For let it be admitted that the efficacy of Baptism in the case of infants depends not, as the Bishops asserted, on the institution of Christ, but on some qualification derived from the piety of their sponsors, or on their own fulfilment of baptismal vows. In this case the act of the sponsors becomes essential to the

[31] Cardwell, p. 356.

validity of the ordinance. If that which is stated respecting them is the key to all the Church's language, that which they do, becomes the critical circumstance on which rests the weight of the Sacrament. But how does this consist with the fact, that sponsorship, though a fitting and useful adjunct, is not essential to Baptism at all? Private Baptism is administered without it. The Puritans would fain have put a stop to this. "We desire," they say, "that Baptism may not be administered in a private place." "And so do we," the Bishops replied, "where it may be brought into the public congregation. But since Our Lord hath said, 'unless one be born of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,' we think if fit that they should be baptized in private, rather than not at all."[32] Here, then, is an *act* on the Church's part which decides beyond contradiction the meaning of her expressions. A promise is made, and most properly, at Baptism, to express the obligations which the child contracts at that Holy Ordinance. Unless this promise be remembered and appreciated, the full prospective benefits of Baptism cannot be appreciated. But there is also an immediate effect attendant on Baptism, irrespective of its future relation to the responsible understanding of the child: and this effect depends on Christ's institution, and not on the piety of parents and sponsors. And that it does so, is made abundantly manifest by the Church, because she requires that infants should be baptized

[32] Cardwell, p. 356.

even when parents are not pious, and where sponsors cannot be obtained.

But the expression which has been cited is by no means the only one in the Catechism which treats of Baptism. The Catechism contains various statements which are designed to teach children the nature of those obligations which they have contracted. And considering the singleness of heart, and the ready credence which marks that age, the expressions which are designed for it are likely to be distinguished for their simplicity and plainness. The divines at the Savoy state that the Catechism "being short, is fitted for children and common people;" and the original design of its concluding portion, as suggested at the Hampton Conference, was to adopt "the fewest and plainest affirmative terms that may be." It might be expected, therefore, that no question could be raised what it was, which a child was designed to learn when it was taught to say, that "in Baptism" I was "made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven:" or again, when it was instructed to declare that it had been "called to this state of salvation;" that "the Holy Ghost sanctifieth me and all the elect people of God;" and, finally, that "we are hereby made the children of grace." Mr. Goode, accordingly, does not scruple to express his disapprobation of the whole system of instruction, which is conveyed on this subject in the Catechism; though his vow of canonical obedience obliges him to employ it in the instruction of the young. But how can he bring himself to use it at all? After referring to other Cate-

chisms, which he parallels wth our own, he states the principle on which he conceives that formularies of this sort were designed to be understood by their authors. "No doubt they hoped that such language might lead the sinner to reflection and repentance, when he felt its *unsuitability* to his state."[33] I cannot refrain from expressing the unmixed regret with which I have read this part of Mr. Goode's volume. What a portent it is, that one who has been put in trust with the care of souls—who has bound himself by vow to teach that simple form of truth which is said to be "fitted for children and common people"—should suppose the Spouse of Christ to be such a "captious sophister," that she can put deceptive words into the mouths of these tender and confiding learners, and that she expects them to find out that when she says one thing she means another. "What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish will he give him a serpent?" And can it be believed that the Church would put ironical words into the mouths of Christ's little ones? Is this her mode of treating those "new-born babes, who desire the sincere milk of the Word? And what result but unbelief can be expected in riper years, if the simplicity of childhood is thus to be bewildered by a text which holds one doctrine, and a commentator who holds the contrary —by a catechism which affirms that they are regenerate and a catechiser who affirms that they are not?

[33] "My own view," he says, "would be adverse to the use of such language." &c.

And now one word in conclusion. I have no wish to attribute dishonesty to those, who do not read the formularies of the English Church with the same eyes as myself. The understanding of man is so defective an instrument for ascertaining truth, our wishes so greatly influence our conclusions, that such charges are unreasonable as well as unchristian. Yet I would wish those who think that the Church of England does not hold the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, to consider one circumstance. Of those who are called Christians, the larger part profess, while at the same time not a few deny, this doctrine. But while every variety of opinion prevails respecting the doctrine itself, there is one point on which all parties but ourselves are unanimous. Roman Catholics, Dissenters, Infidels, answer with one voice, that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is plainly affirmed in the formularies of the Church of England. On this head alone, are those who reject the doctrine and those who accept it, accordant. The only intelligent beings who profess to think otherwise, are those, who combine the rejection of this doctrine with the acceptance of those formularies, in which all uninterested parties suppose it to be expressed. Surely this universal consent should lead earnest minds to a serious and dispassionate consideration of so singular a phenomenon. For that to force the judgment into an opinion which it resists, has occasionally been found to be the only means of maintaining the singular position which has been described, we know from the candid avowal of one who has abandoned it. "I once laboured

hard," says Mr. Baptist Noel, "to convince myself that our Reformers did not, and could not mean that infants are regenerated by baptism; but no reasoning avails. This language is too plain." "The Prayer-Book assumes clearly, that both adults and infants come to the font unregenerate, and leave it regenerated; that worthy recipients of Baptism are not regenerate before Baptism, but come to be regenerated; that they are unpardoned up to the moment of Baptism, that they are pardoned the moment after."[34]

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION OF PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE.

In the first Chapter of this work Regeneration was stated to be that act, whereby Christ takes up His dwelling in mankind; the putting on, that is, of the New Man. It was next affirmed, on the authority of God's revealed Word, that in the case of those whose unbelief does not deprive them of such blessedness, this divine work is effected in Holy Baptism. That such is the teaching of our Church, it has been shown out of its authorized formularies. I now come to a subject of no little moment, by which the English mind is sure to be greatly affected—the practical importance of the doctrine. Is the question of

[34] "Essay on Church and State," p. 419.

Baptismal Regeneration of any great practical moment? It has sometimes been maintained, that though this doctrine ought to be admitted, because it is revealed in Scripture and taught by the Church, yet that it exercises no serious influence, and that those who reject it are rather inaccurate in their expressions than heretical in their thoughts. It can have no place, it is said, in the practical teaching of earnest men: those who are careless need to be awakened, and those who are devout need to advance; what use is it, then, to think about the stages which have been already traversed either by the one or the other? Yet if this were so, why should so many volumes have been expended upon the subject, and how unmeaning have been all the deadly disputes to which it has given occasion? It could hardly have been the great battle-field, in which opposite opinions have uniformly come into collision, unless it exercised some real and important influence upon the progress of religious thought.

To do justice, then, to this subject, it will be well to inquire, first, why Baptismal Regeneration has been so vehemently opposed by its antagonists; and why its supporters have looked upon it as the keystone of their position.

The opposition to Baptismal Regeneration on the part of earnest men, seems to have arisen mainly from a fear lest it should do away with the necessity, or detract from the importance of conversion. I will not enter into controversy, says Mr. Scott, with persons who believe that those who have neglected their baptismal vows, "do still need that great and radical change, on

which the Scriptures insist."[1] And even Mr Goode allows that "when the distinction is preserved between this infantine regeneration and that regeneration of heart, which is necessary for the salvation of an adult, then (whether or not we agree in the view taken) it seems very unnecessary to raise a further controversy." Now, had these and other writers always kept this truth before them, a large part of the distrust and hostility which the subject has excited, might probably have been avoided. Their feeling plainly was, that the importance of a change of character had not been duly remembered, that Regeneration had too often been spoken of as a mere technical, official process; and thus has man's salvation been rested only on his external profession, and not on any real alteration of the heart. Against such an error it was impossible to protest too strongly. But unfortunately, in their earnestness to resist falsehood, men have sometimes sacrificed truth; they have supposed it impossible to exalt regeneration, unless at the same time they disparaged Baptism. Thus does Mr. Scott refer, as though it were an admitted truth, to the opinion that if Our Lord's statement respecting the New Birth, in the third chapter of St. John, "relate to Baptism or what necessarily or inseparably accompanies Baptism, then it means nothing to us who have received Baptism."[2] Yet no words can possibly be more opposed to the opinions of those who believe in the efficacy of baptismal grace. This misdirection in the efforts of those who de-

[1] "Reply to Laurence," p 147. [2] Inquiry, p. 33.

sired to vindicate the importance of regeneration, has involved a corresponding re-action on the part of some who were jealous for the honour of Holy Baptism. Insomuch that it was supposed at one time, that a man could not have a due appreciation of the one, if he was disposed to do hearty justice to the other. No one can pretend to say how far his own feelings on the subject may result from that early association, which has happily taught him to believe in the reality of spiritual gifts, and yet to reverence God's appointed ordinances; but the present writer cannot refrain from saying that he has met with no statements from any of our approved writers, either of the reality of regeneration, or of the efficacy of Baptism, with which he does not heartily concur. It is stated on the one side that regeneration is a change of heart, not of circumstances—that its influence extends to the whole life—that it is a divine work wrought in man by the sovereign power of the Holy Ghost—all this, and whatever else of a similar kind can be thought of, he not only admits, but most strongly maintains. For what truth can be of graver importance? But, on the other hand, that Baptism is a real participation of Christ's nature, that all baptized infants are translated from death to life, and are made members by grace of the New, as by birth they were portions of the old Adam—this, likewise is revealed in Holy Scripture. Let the two parties, then, keep to the positive enunciation of their own principles, and they cannot go too far in their assertions. It is only when they pass into one another's ground; when the one party disparages Baptism, and the other

explains away Regeneration, that the desire of opposing error leads them away from truth.

Now this seems to have given rise to the prevalent opinion, that belief in Baptismal Regeneration is inconsistent with a due appreciation of the doctrine of conversion. Yet if the nature of the two processes be considered, this fancied opposition will vanish at once. Regeneration is that work, whereby God renews man's nature. Its immediate process is the substitution of that new nature, which has been re-constructed in Christ, for that old nature which was corrupted in Adam. That the process thus mercifully provided for our recovery reaches to the whole man—that no part of him is untouched by that renewing power of grace, which has its source in God's love, and its channel in the Manhood of the Mediator—is not inconsistent with the truth, that in man resides a power of will, which must yield to the suasion of these better principles. The process whereby the will makes this surrender is conversion. Look at the motive principle by which the will is swayed to good, and it is God's grace; look to the action itself, and it is man's faith and repentance. Whether this process takes place early or late, with the first dawnings of reason or in the last hour of its possession, it is plain that the corrupt will which opposes and prevents it, is incompatible with the state of grace. But what reason is there why a jealous regard for this truth should blind men to the reality of those gifts, with which the Mediator has enriched His saving ordinances?

There is no reason, then, for denying Baptismal Regeneration, on the ground that it is incompatible

with the doctrine of conversion. But is its assertion of any practical importance? For if it be a technical dogma, and is needed only to complete a theological system, without exercising influence over men's lives, it were useless to trouble ourselves with its defence? Nor would there be much interest in the task, were it the main object of this doctrine, as seems to have been thought in the last century, to repress that irregular enthusiasm which might otherwise overflow the established limits of orthodoxy. But it is a very different consideration, and of far higher interest, that upon it depends so large a part of the responsibility of mankind. For what single circumstance is more fraught with practical consequences, than that it has pleased God to bestow grace, for which men are responsible? What has more contributed to the neglect of Gospel blessings, than that parents have forgotten to warn their children, that they must answer for the gifts which they have already received? For in truth, Christian education is based entirely upon a belief in Baptismal grace. It does not appear how Christian education can be generally given on any other hypothesis, without implying the error of Pelagianism. For is it not its essence that education is to precede improvement? Does it not begin by assuming principles, which are not yet exhibited? Does it not accustom the infant tongue to the accents of prayer and praise, before it can be ascertained how far the mind receives them? And is not this to sssume that all Christian children have received a measure of grace? Yet we have no ground for supposing such a gift to have been bestowed upon our little ones, unless we have brought them to

Christ.[3] Zuinglius, therefore, and those who agreed with him, were driven to deny that the children of Christians were in reality born in original sin ;[4] and Mr. Goode on the other hand disapproves of the mode in which the Catechism addresses children as already possessed of a Divine gift. "My own view," he says, "would, *even in theory*, apart from the experience of the results, be adverse to the use of such language." But not only is this system of education enjoined by the Church's laws, and recommended by her practice, but it has the sanction of the best writers even of the school which Mr. Goode professes to respect. Even Bucer founds the duty of parents upon the gift of Baptism, and speaks of the importance of not stifling the seed of God's word, which he describes as already received previously to the very first dawning of reason."[5] "For though we cannot understand the action of God on the infant mind, yet it is certain," he says, "that new and sacred impulses are wrought in it."[6]

[3] The early Church gave careful training to Catechumens. But this training was not irrespective of Baptism, but was based upon that gift of grace, which in the case of adults, whose individual responsibility is developed, is its indispensable preparative.

[4] Vide Pusey on Baptism, p. 102, 121. (first Ed.)

[5] "Se suorum liberorum, postquam baptismate eos Domino consecraverint, pædagogos magis quam patres agnoscant. Quos enim ipsi genuerant carne in mortem, norunt Christum regenuisse baptismate in vitam æternam."—*Script. Ang.* p. 7.

Then follows an allusion to the "Semon verbi Dei," which must be explained by the words to which he subscribed in his concord with Luther, "constat infantibus contingere per baptismum . . . . donationem Spiritus Sancti, qui in eis efficax est pro ipsorum modo."—*Script Anglic.* p. 668.

[6] Script. Anglic. p. 668.

It is a matter of wonder that the consideration which has been mentioned has so little weight with earnest-minded men. How is it that they do not perceive, that their own principles involve the necessity of some means of union between the infant and God? A real belief in original sin, implies, of necessity, a belief in baptismal purification. The unwillingness to admit it in words, while at the same time their own practice constantly recognizes it, illustrates that which Bishop Butler so admirably enforces, the impossibility of reducing the scheme of Necessity to practice. It would seem, indeed, that a great part of men's repugnance to this view of things, is to be traced to an opinion, that if a measure of grace has been already bestowed, the process of subsequent conversion will be crippled. The ground of this erroneous impression is, that they do not discriminate between man's common nature, and his individual responsibility. The gift of grace, indeed, produces so wide an effect, as to influence the whole of man's being. Yet the principle of responsibility still remains. As it co-existed with the law of nature, so does it co-exist with the law of grace. Its positions and obligations are altered; but the Will is still man's Will, and accountable for its acts.

But there remains another very important consideration, on which the practical moment of Baptismal Regeneration may be based; its connexion with a belief in Our Lord's Mediation. The doctrine of the sacraments is so essentially allied to this central truth of the Gospel, that they may be shown to be as closely associated in theory, as the experience of three centuries has proved them to be

in fact. And this is the main reason why the Church has always held so firmly to the truth of Baptismal Regeneration: not only is it a question of practical importance to all her children, but it involves her belief in the main point of Theology, the "Articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ" the Mediation, namely, of the God-man, Jesus Christ Our Lord. To this subject we now direct attention.

The blessings of Regeneration have been shown to depend upon that gift of grace, which is bestowed by God upon man. Such a process has been shown to involve the consideration of two parties—God who bestows gifts—man who receives them. God's method of bestowing grace in the Gospel covenant has been stated to be the Mediation of the Man Christ Jesus. Those gifts which were needed for the recovery of the fallen children of Adam, were embodied in the consecrated Manhood of the Word, that from this fountain they might flow forth into the whole generation of his brethren. This was the new system by which the original law of nature was superseded. The Son of Mary was the Second Adam, from whom flowed forth a stream of life, to correct that hereditary taint, which had been transmitted to all the naturally-descended children of Eve. Now it has been already shown by the testimony of Holy Scriptures, that the means whereby the Second Adam propagates that spiritual life which we derive from Him, is the system of Sacraments. Nothing shall here be said of the Holy Eucharist, because not falling within the range of the present inquiry. Nor can it be needful to quote the words

of the Church's ancient Authors, because their opinions have been sufficiently exhibited by Bishop Bethell and Dr. Pusey. I will cite an author of a later age, and a different school of Theology, whose words may show how novel is that system, which would lead men to expect the gifts of grace, independently of the agency of the Second Adam. "Baptism," says Luther, "cannot fail to effect that for which it was appointed, namely, regeneration and spiritual renewal, as St. Paul teaches in the third Chapter to Titus. For as we were born into this life from Adam and Eve, so our true man which was before born in sins to death must be regenerated to righteousness and eternal life, by the power of the Holy Ghost. To this regeneration and renewal there lacks the application of no other external means than Water, and Words; of the one whereof our eyes take note, our ears of the other. Yet they have such virtue and energy that the man who was conceived and born in sin is regenerated in the view of God; and that he who was before condemned to death, is now made truly God's son. This glory and virtue of Holy Baptism, who can attain, and perceive by sense, thought, and human intellect? You should not regard, therefore, the hand or mouth of the minister who baptizes—who pours over the body a little water, which he has taken in the hollow of his hand, and pronounces some few words (a thing, slight and easy in itself, addressing itself only to the eyes and ears; and our blinded reason sees no more to be accomplished by the minister;) but in all this you must behold and consider the word and work of God, by

whose authority and command Baptism is ministered, who is its founder and author, yea, who is Himself the Baptist. And hence has Baptism such virtue and energy (as the Holy Ghost witnesses by St. Paul,) that it is the Laver of regeneration, and of the renewal of the Holy Ghost; by which laver the impure and sentenced nature, which we draw from Adam, is altered and amended. For we are all born in sin, and reek with pollution and defilement; so foul a leprosy of sin pervades us, that our heart and reason oppose God's law and will, and from this plague we have no power to purify ourselves. But the Laver of regeneration purifies and takes away our hereditary disease, and renders us innocent, so that being exempted from sin and death, we may rise in the last day, more clean and glorious than the sun—pure in mind and body." Therefore Luther goes on to add, "the minister's agency is required; his hand and mouth must be used in pouring out water, and pronouncing words: but I ought to look not at the visible, but the invisible Baptist, the author and founder of Baptism."[7]

This is but a single passage out of many, which might be quoted from Luther's Homilies on Baptism. Neither is it adduced for the purpose of showing his uniform judgment on this subject, which has been amply effected by Dr. Laurence; nor because his judgment is an authority with members of the Church of England; but because it sets forth so ably the truth which I de-

[7] "Homiliæ de Baptismo." Lutheri Oper. Wittenberg, 1558. vol. vii. p. 377.

sire to establish, that Baptism is the appointed means wherein the Second Adam communicates His renewed nature to His brethren. That which Luther's words especially exhibit, is that when we look to the Divine Giver of grace, when we abstract our thoughts from any thing, which men contribute towards the work of renewal, we find this rite of Baptism appointed as the specific mean, through which God is pleased to bestow His blessings. Hence Luther begins his Homilies on the subject by saying, "If Baptism is to be any thing, and deserves the name of a Sacrament, there must of necessity be some external sign and tangible creature, through which God deals visibly with us, that we may be sure of His action. *For it is not His will to deal with us without external media, through unembodied secret inspirations and influences or by any private and secret revelations.*"[8] The denial of such individual influence on the part of God cannot be meant, of course, to put a bar upon the general law of spiritual influences; the thing intended is, to set forth Baptism as being in its own line the revealed medium through which such influences descend from God to man, inasmuch as it is the declared instrument through which the gifts of Mediation are extended to the

[8] Hom. vol. vii. p. 347. The original German of another passage, elsewhere quoted in Latin is very forcible. "Wiltu mich leren was Geist ist, und wo ich in finde, So mustu mich nicht ins Schlauraffenland weisen. . . . Sondern hie mustu ihn suchen, dahin Er in selbs gesteck that, durch das Wort, das er die Taufle einsetzt in seinem eigen Namen."—*Predigten, D. M. L.* von unser heiligen Taufle, Anno xxxv. *Luther's Works*, Jena, 1558. vol. iv. p. 302.

children of the Second Adam. Now when we proceed to consider the effect of these spiritual gifts as they manifest themselves in the human receiver, it is clear that a second element must be taken into account; we have not only the agency of God who bestows gifts, but of man who receives them. All the good actions of men are referrible to the combined agency of these two principles. They have in them something divine, or they could not be good: they have something human in them, or they would not be the acts of responsible beings. Now, where an action is in this way the result of two combining influences, there is peculiar danger lest one element or the other should be overlooked. And since our own contingent towards our acts is impressed upon us by our own consciousness, nothing is more probable than that we should overlook that Divine co-operation, of which we are assured only by faith and revelation.

And here it is that the regeneration of Infants in Baptism supplies a test of such peculiar value. If there be any instance in which it is possible to *eliminate* one of two agencies, which combine to produce a common result, such an instance enables us to appreciate the importance which is to be assigned to the other. This opportunity is afforded us in the Baptism of infants.[8] Seeing that in their case the will of the human receiver is wholly inoperative, the benefit of the ordinance must fall entirely on the side of the Divine Giver. So that

[9] The connexion of Baptism with the Sacramental System at large, is stated strikingly by Cranmer in his answer to Gardner Jenkyns's Ed. iii. 65.

we have an opportunity of knowing whether men believe that in the Gospel Covenant any thing is really *done* by God, irrespective of the instrumentality of mortals. And thus does this doctrine supply us with a most invaluable criterion, which is applicable to the whole Sacramental system. For the real weight of all those controversies which agitate the present day, rests upon a single point; whether God has been pleased really to renew humanity through the action of Christ, or whether He looks only, as a favouring co-operator, upon those whose wish is to renew themselves. The first is the Church system; it regards Christ's Incarnation as the Regeneration of Nature, and the Sacramental system as our mean of participating in this mighty alteration: the second does not altogether exclude God's action, but it looks upon it as co-operating only with the action of the human will. I do not at present enter upon the theory of Calvinism, I am dealing only with the practical effect of any system of teaching which denies the reality of Baptismal Grace. The result of such a system is to throw the whole weight on the side of the human agent, and thereby to detract from the reality of those blessings which are bestowed through the Mediation of Christ. So that besides the practical effort of Baptismal Regeneration, as suggesting the deepest reasons for self-examination and watchfulness, it supplies us with a means of estimating how far men really appreciate those gifts of grace, which are bestowed through the channel of Our Lord's Mediation. When men will not admit that any thing is really *done* in an instance, in which all that we are sure

of is, that man can contribute nothing, when they say that the Church's assurances, that something is really effected, can refer only to those cases in which infants possess peculiar qualifications, or in which their future exertions are foreseen by the Divine Foreknowledge—they must pardon us if we venture to doubt how far their professions of referring to Divine help in other cases mean any thing; if we attribute them rather to a decorous habit of self-renunciation, than to any genuine perception that the true source of action is in the Divine Giver. If they refuse to recognize the action of a divine power in the only instance in which we are able to disengage it altogether from human co-operation, is there not reason to question whether in other cases they have actual belief, as themselves suppose, in the agency of that unseen Intelligence, who is truly to be recognized as the parent of all holy action in the Church of the Redeemed?

There are many who will be startled by the line of argument which has been employed. The assertion that to deny Baptismal Regeneration is to derogate from the doctrine of Our Lord's Mediation, they will be ready to resent as an unjust imputation. Yet they should remember, that where this doctrine had been denied by any community of men (provided there has been opportunity for the free development of its tendencies,) the heresy of Socinus has in every instance been the result. And they should not be surprised if a logical coherence be pointed out between opinions, which have been shown by experience to be actually related. Yet men will say, with truth, that this is the last thing which they consciously

design, they have no intention of denying that all gifts proceed from God, through the Mediation of Christ; all which they intend to deny is the predominant place which has been assigned to Sacraments. For this they say is to attach unreasonable importance to what is external. Christ's propitiation for us, they observe, depends upon His death; and He is able to sympathize with us because He participates in our nature. But we hold intercourse with Him not merely through that Sacramental union which is commenced in Baptism, but likewise by all those affections and desires, all those prayers and ejaculations, in which the soul is drawn towards its Saviour. Sacraments they allow to be of especial efficacy, but then it is only because their *acted* nature gives greater life to the affections of those who celebrate them. And the higher view which has been taken of their effect, as the actual means, whereby the Mediator bestows heavenly blessings, would in their opinion be to substitute the Incarnation for the Atonement, and Christ's Sacramental presence for the sanctifying agency of the Holy Ghost.

A word in the first place respecting the two last objections. If the propitiation which Our Lord effected on the Cross for the sins of men was a real work, and not a mere technical representation—if it effected any actual change in the position of men—it must have been built on the truth of that oneness between Him and mankind, which was brought about through His Incarnation. "Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a *body* hast Thou prepared me." To set up, therefore, the Atonement of Christ against His Incarnation, as though

the two doctrines could be contrasted with one another, is as if it were supposed that God's creative power was denied, because His Omnipotence was asserted. Again, to set up the sanctifying influence of God the Holy Ghost against the Sacramental Presence of the Incarnate Word, is to forget what was that especial function which the Third Person to the Blessed Trinity undertook to discharge in the work of man's redemption. For His offices were not irrespective of the Incarnation of the Word; the presence of the Word was the very gift which the Spirit was to bestow upon the faithful: "He shall receive of Mine and shall show it unto you." That which consecrated the Manhood of the Son of God to be the food of souls, was that hallowing influence of the Holy Ghost which the God-man at once procured and bestowed by His Ascension. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before. It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing."

There can be no contrast, then, between the Sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost, and the God-man's Sacramental Presence; because the very object of the one is to bestow upon us the other. As the Two Blessed Persons are one in their nature, so are the two influences identical in their effect. And as to the assertion that prayer and holy affections are a means of union with Christ, this, be it remembered, is to refer to those means whereby we hold intercourse with God; whereas that which we are considering, is the mean whereby God holds intercourse with us. There can be no more contrast, therefore, between these things, than between the loyalty of a subject and the bounty of his Prince.

We hold intercourse with God through all those means whereby we ascend towards Him. He holds intercourse with us through the Mediation of Christ; and therein through those peculiar institutions whereby the sanctified Humanity of Him, who is one with the Father, is transmitted to His earthly brethren. So that we may take that one case in which this action is wholly detached from any human co-operation, namely that of Infant Baptism, as a test whether the other actions of the Mediator are really apprehended.

For even those actings of Christ Our Lord upon the spirits of men, which might seem to be most independent of the Sacramental System, have a real relation to it. The actings of the Eternal Word are as wide as the spirits which He has created. "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." And this is the secret of that gracious influence, by which those who are strangers to the Church are not wholly unvisited: this seed sprung up in the heart of many a Gentile: it is present even now in those whom invincible ignorance detains without the Church's pale, who yearn after her blessings but do not possess them. Such men "show the work of the law written in their hearts." But is not the very purpose of this gracious influence to lead men to that full incorporation with the Word made flesh, whereby they may become fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God? These Divine influences then, whereby the Word draws all hearts towards entire communion with Him, are not irrespective of His Sacramental Presence, seeing that it is the term towards which they are tending.

And still more is that hidden communion of soul, whereby He sways the hearts of those who are truly joined to Him, a result of their full oneness with Himself. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him." As that preventing influence whereby He wins men to Him, tends towards Sacramental union as its highest term, so the sympathy between Christ and His people is built upon the same union, as its fundamental principle. For both are based upon the truth that through His manhood are derived those regenerating gifts, which sanctify ours. Let it be considered, then, what is the real meaning of setting up these means of union with Christ, as something which may be opposed to that Sacramental union, from which they derive their efficacy. It is nothing else, in truth, but to put those means of union with God which we had by nature, in place of those which are given to us through the Mediation of Christ. For what leads men to contend for and prefer those opportunities of union, which are irrespective of the Sacramental system? The system of Sacraments, they say, depends too much on what is physical and external: these things can have no real tendency to confer grace. "It is not very conceivable," says one writer, "how water, literally taken, being applied to the body, should be instrumental to the regeneration of the soul." "The washing of the body," says another, "cannot affect the soul, nor infuse any gracious habits into it, which itself hath not; neither can it work morally by way of suasion and argument, because infants have not the use of reason to apprehend any such." These are arguments drawn from the unfitness of the material agents, em-

ployed in Baptism, to produce an inward result. Such a mode of reasoning implies of course that we have a certain standard in our own minds, whereby we are able to judge, respecting the consonance or inconsonance of the means employed, to bring about their effect. Now what are the channels to which men look, as fitter than Sacraments for conveying a spiritual effect? They are professedly those which are less *external;* those which arise out of the nature of the mind, which are built upon its power of communing at once with unseen intelligences—these means of intercourse with God seem more natural, and men refer to these, when they say that we do not hold intercourse with God merely by Sacraments, but by all those holy aspirations, whereby the mind travels forth towards its invisible Creator. That when men become members of Christ they are restored to that right of intercourse with God, which renders their thoughts and affections a means of communion with Him, has already been admitted. But to rest upon this mean of union in opposition to the system of Sacraments, is to abandon the law of grace for the law of nature. For the very loss which men incurred by the Fall, was the forfeiture of that natural intercourse with God, which can only be replaced through the Mediation of Christ. So that to revert to those inward channels, whereby the soul was naturally fitted to approach God, is to fancy that we can turn to God of ourselves, and thus to fall into the error of Pelagianism; and thereby to renounce that doctrine of Mediation, which is founded on the re-creation of mankind in Christ.

Now it is no answer to these complaints to say,

as men will do, that they are not Pelagians, because they trust to God's power, and not to their own efforts; and that they do not reject Christ's Mediation, because His death, intercession, and sympathy, are the basis of their hopes. For Pelagianism does not consist merely of the professed assertion that men can save themselves; it lies at the bottom of every system, which builds the great work of man's recovery on agencies which act directly through the natural faculties of each man's mind, instead of resting it on that renewal of humanity at at large, which was effected in the Incarnation of Christ. For what are our natural faculties but a gift of God?[10] What, therefore, are those movements which they severally originate, but His work? In this sense, therefore, all who believe in a Creator at all, may suppose that all good aspirations are a divine gift. But then this mode of receiving blessings has been obstructed by sin. In place of it came that communication of divine power, which had its centre in the humanity of the Second Adam. To refer, therefore, to these natural channels of communion with God, as something which may be substituted in the place of that sacramental fellowship, whereby he communicates His nature, is the very error of Pelagius, because it is to substitute the efficacy of nature for the efficacy of grace.

Nor is it to any purpose to say that these objections do not apply, because men affirm that all their hopes are founded on the sacrifice of Christ. For men cannot do full justice to the sacrifice,

[10] St. Austin, Ep. cxciv. vol. ii. p. 717.

intercession, and sympathy of Christ, unless they recognize that main law of His Mediation, that through His manhood were bestowed those gifts of grace, by which the regeneration of His brethren was to be effected. Each part of our Lord's work may no doubt be viewed by itself, and the efficacy of each implies the reality of His character; but men cannot discern the full purpose of His mission, unless the whole truth of His Mediation be accepted. To leave out of account the operation of Our Lord's manhood, as the mean through which spiritual blessings are communicated to man, has a direct tendency to lead men into that error of Sabellianism, which would merge the reality of his person in a mere appellation, under which the Eternal Father is pleased to be addressed. This is exactly the effect which the denial of the Sacramental system has been upon a recent writer, who tells us, that Christ is only "a change of name" for God; and that "the reverential imagination of the Church at Antioch sublimated the Mediator into something spiritually undistinguishable from the morally perfect and omnipresent God, and thus neutralized the doctrine; saving spirituality at the expense of logic."[11] In this manner is the reality of our Lord's being, denied by a person, who yet professes to reverence the name of Christ. For what more clearly marks out the Eternal Word as a true Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity, than that participation in our nature, which He vouchsafed to make the instrument in His work of Mediation? And al-

[11] "The Soul," &c., by F. W. Newman, p. 67.

though men may be kept from such avowed Sabellianism by their belief in the efficacy of Our Lord's sacrifice, and in the value of His intercession, yet past experience shows how liable are even these truths to be lost, when their relation to the other acts of the Mediator are forgotten. And the history of the Nonconformist congregations in our own country (all of whom gradually subsided into Socinian disbelief,) shows that it is not the mere technical affirmation of divine truths which will insure the Church's vitality, unless that practical system is duly maintained, whereby the Godman communicates Himself in Sacraments to His people. For what could be better than the theoretical statement of truth which is given by Baxter, who yet formed the first link in a series, which has ended in an entire denial of Our Lord's Mediation? "The Spirit," he says, "is not given radically or immediately to any Christian, but to Christ our head alone, and from Him to us." "These things," he remarks, are distinctly and clearly understood but by very few; and we are all very much in the dark about them. But I think (however doctrinally we may speak better) that most Christians are habituated to this perilous misapprehension (which is partly against Christianity itself,) that the Spirit floweth immediately from the Divine nature of the Father and of the Son (as to the authoritative or potestative conveyance) unto our souls. And we forget that it is first given to Christ in His glorified humanity as our Head, and radicated in Him, and that it is the office of this glorified Head to send or communicate to all His members from Himself

that Spirit, which must operate in them as they have need." Again, "the Spirit is not given radically or immediately from God to any believer, but to Christ, and so derivatively from Him to us. Not that a Divine nature in the Third Person is subject to the human nature in Christ; but that God hath made it the office of our Mediator's glorified humanity, to be the cistern that shall first receive the waters of life, and convey them by pipes of His appointed means to all the offices of His House: or to be the Head of the animal spirits, and by nerves to convey to all the members."[12]

The considerations adduced will supply an answer to the question, whether the disputes respecting Regeneration are a mere affair of words, and whether a reconciliation may be effected among the various parties in the Church, between whom it is contested. For if the dispute respect nothing but the terms employed, and no real difference exist respecting the things intended, the two parties only require to understand one another, in order to be at concord. But if men are at variance respecting the things themselves, if in their *belief* the two parties are discordant, any additional light which is thrown upon the subject will only increase their perception of the discrepancy. Now it would seem, from what has been said, that their exists both a mere verbal misunderstanding, which might easily be healed, and also a real difference in belief, which no explanation will do away with. There are some persons who are offended by the term Baptismal Regeneration, because they think it inconsistent with

[12] "The Christian Directory," part iii. Ques. 42.

a sense of the importance and reality of conversion. They admit that some spiritual gift is bestowed in Infant Baptism, but they think that the "full Baptismal blessing," to employ a phrase of Mr. Goode's, is only attained in riper years; when the understanding and will of the recipient has apprehended and done justice to the endowment, which in Baptism had really been bestowed by the Giver. They think it dangerous, therefore, to speak of Baptismal regeneration, because they suppose that men will of necessity confound the *initial* state of the Christian progress with its stages of subsequent development. Such an objection is surely ill-founded; it leads to a phraseology not sanctioned by Scripture or the Church, and opens the door for greater misapprehensions. But in this case the difference of words is greater than that of things: and therefore it may be hoped that further explanation may abate it. And in the mean time it is not too much to ask such persons to employ the Church's words, while they are allowed free scope for such explanations as may satisfy their own conscience.

But it is otherwise when the diversity in ideas is greater than that in expressions. For there are doubtless those, whose general belief in the whole Sacrametal system is only brought out by that peculiar test which is afforded by the question of Baptismal Regeneration. That which distinguishes them from the parties last mentioned, is their denial that any spiritual gift is actually bestowed in Baptism by virtue of Christ's appointment. If any spiritual benefit is bestowed on infants in Baptism, they say that it is due to some qualification by which the re-

cipients are distinguished; such as the Christian profession and piety of their parents or sponsors, or a previous gift of grace bestowed supernaturally upon themselves, or the prevision of their future conduct; otherwise, they say, that infants leave the font as they came to it: the communication of any spiritual gift to *all* infants duly baptized, they absolutely deny. Now, it is plain that such persons do not expect the renewal of man's nature from any actual engrafting in the manhood of Christ, but from a Divine power acting according to some other law. For unless there be a communication of gifts through those principles of nature which lie in the human receiver, they deny not only, which all admit, that the blessing is used, but also that any blessing is given. And thus do they abandon one main part of the Mediation of Christ, that in His Man's nature commenced that re-creation of humanity, which is actually bestowed on all His members. And though they may continue to believe the reality of Our Lord's Sacrifice, and the value of His Intercession, yet it is obvious that these doctrines also must lose much of their force and meaning, when they are forcibly rent away from the other portions of His wondrous Mediation. So that it is only a question of time and circumstances, whether such persons will not follow the various bodies of Continental Protestants, who have passed from a denial of Our Lord's Sacramental Presence to a denial of His nature. And, therefore, it is plain that an irreconcilable hostility exists between such opinions and those of the Church. It is an hostility which explanation and inquiry can only increase. Neither can the gulf between them be bridged over, unless the parties in

question are converted to a belief in the full doctrine of Our Lord's Mediation, or the English Church loses her claim to be any longer a portion of the Church Catholic, by renouncing the doctrine of the Cross. Now, may God in His mercy grant us to behold the first, and may no vain hope of an unreal conciliation expose us to the second.

CHAPTER V.

HOW FAR BELIEF IN BAPTISMAL REGENERATION IS CONSISTENT WITH ADHERENCE TO CALVINISM.

THE question which remains for inquiry, is that new ground, upon which Mr. Goode has placed his opposition to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration—its incompatibility with the tenets of Calvin. This subject naturally follows the considerations which have hitherto been adduced, because by admitting the charges of Laurence, and denying the assertion of Scott, Mr. Goode transfers his opposition from the ground on which the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is founded, to the doctrine itself. His objection is not to the premises, but to the result. You may assert, he says, that Baptismal Regeneration is taught by Scripture and held by the Church; but without inquiring into the grounds on which the assertion is rested, we can show the conclusion to be incorrect. In the previous chapters, which contained the reasons for which this doctrine is to be believed, Mr. Goode's pages were but incidentally referred to; but in what follows, it becomes necessary to meet his statements

more expressly. If premises only were disputed, they might be confirmed, or new ones suggested; but when the conclusion is declared to be impossible, its truth cannot be established except by overthrowing the opposite hypothesis.

Mr. Goode's assertions are the following: first, That those who composed the Church's offices were themselves Calvinists; secondly, that if this were not the case, yet that many distinguished persons in our Church, who were plainly designed to be included within her pale, were Calvinists; thirdly, that the Calvinistic doctrines of Election, Predestination, and Perseverance, are incompatible with the admission of Baptismal Regeneration. In asserting the first point, Mr. Goode seems occasionally to feel the weakness of his ground; while, respecting the second, he plainly speaks like a man who thinks his position impregnable: the third he appears to suppose may be taken for granted, provided Baptismal Regeneration be understood to imply that real communication of spiritual gifts, which has been all along contended for in these pages. I shall endeavour to show—first, That the composers or compilers of our Church's offices were not Calvinists; secondly, that the prevalence of partial Calvinism in the Church, at one period in her history, makes nothing for Mr. Goode's argument; and thirdly, I shall consider how far a belief in the doctrines of Election, Predestination, and Perseverance, is incompatible with a belief in Baptismal Regeneration. It will be most convenient to begin with the last of these three subjects, which shall be treated of in the present Chapter.

The doctrines of Election, Predestination, and

Perseverance, were not broached for the first time, when Calvin reared his intellectual empire at Geneva. They rest upon statements of Holy Scripture, and had received a certain form in the early Church. What was that form, and how was it modified by the Genevese teacher? That which leads the way to these doctrines, and forms the basis on which they are built, is plainly the truth of God's Prescience. Among the attributes of the Most High, universal knowledge is neither less certain nor less astonishing than unlimited power. That all things, past, present, and to come, are spread out as in a map before the Supreme Intelligence, is a part of what we design, when we speak of God's Omniscience. "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world." Insomuch that to deny this truth, is to deny the existence of God,[1] since by God we mean a Being, infinite both in power and knowledge. And therefore, as to bestow upon His creatures the property of volition is within His power, so to foresee their voluntary actions is within His knowledge. Such foreknowledge, however, does not in itself detract from the voluntary nature of the actions which are foreknown, nor therefore from the responsibility of the actors; for there is no more reason why the fore-knowledge of the Omniscient should interfere with the free-agency of the beings who are its objects, than the after-knowledge of His limited creatures.[2]

[1] "Qui non est præscius omnium futurorum, non est utique Deus."—*De Civ. Dei.* v. 9.

[2] "Nullo modo cogimur aut retenta præscientia Dei, tollere voluntatis arbitrium, aut retento voluntatis arbitrio, Deum, quod nefas est, negare præscium futurorum."—*De Civ. Dei.* v. 10.

But it is otherwise, when we pass from the region of foreknowledge to that of pre-appointment. We now come to something which, so far as it goes, is an interference with the free-agency, and, therefore, with the responsibility of men. The question is, in what manner, and to what degree are they interfered with? And this is a thing, respecting which we must refer to Holy Writ. For in Scripture we read of various decrees promulgated respecting the condition of man, either previous or subsequent to the Fall. The original decree preceded the Fall, and means were no doubt afforded to the race of man for carrying it into execution. It referred to that authority, which man should exercise in the world as God's vicegerent, and to those properties of mind and body, whereby he was qualified for so high a trust. "God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the foul of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." Here was a decree respecting man, which pointed out his place in the universe of created kings, and rested it upon that likeness to the great Creator, whereby he was enabled to hold intercourse with the Supreme Spirit, after whom he was framed. Yet this first decree did not destroy the free-agency of the being to whom it related, for through Adam's voluntary sin its operation was stopped, and its design defeated. And then came a period, the only period in the history of man, when his race might be said to be wholly in a state of na-

ture, to be left to itself, and to be without God in the world. For that which the Apostle speaks of as the state of those who have cast off God, was the state of man at large, after he had fallen from original grace, and before a new promise of grace was given. And now, then, it seemed that Satan's purpose was accomplished, and that man's fall was irretrievable. So that we hear of no attempt on his part at recovery; there was no such civil wisdom as might have sufficed for the construction of society, nor such moral perception as the Philosopher pretends. All these things were forfeited, with that intercourse with God, which man had lost. He hid himself from his Maker's presence in the shadows of the forest, like the beasts.

Under these circumstances, the only hope of man's recovery was in a fresh decree on the part of his Maker. And that such a decree would go forth, and what would be its consequences, had been known beforehand to the Supreme Intelligence, and had been part of His ordination, even when He beheld it as consequent upon that voluntary act of our first parent, whereby he was the free author of his own ruin. For that which was "manifest in these last times" was "fore-ordained before the foundation of the world." Now of what nature was this new decree, which was to be brought forth out of the treasures of eternal mercy? What were the means by which the race of man might be re-created? The decree was proclaimed in the promise of the woman's seed, by whom the serpent-enemy was to be trodden under foot. And after this promise had

been gradually unfolded to succeeding Prophets, it was more plainly set forth to two among the latest teachers of Israel. To Isaiah was revealed the divine character of the coming deliverer—"Immanuel, God with us"—and also that He would take upon Himself that burden under which humanity was groaning—for the transgression of My people was He stricken: to Daniel corresponding truths were exhibited by vision. He saw how the Humanity of Christ was dug out of the mine of man's nature without man's participation—"a stone cut out of a mountain without hands"—and again, he saw the future extension of that kingdom, which the new Heir of man's nature was predestined to establish. "I saw in the night-visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him; His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." In this way did the Most High declare His Predestination of that kingdom, which was to be set up by "My servant, whom I uphold, Mine *elect*, in whom My soul delighteth." For the title of elect is especially bestowed on the Incarnate Son, whose humanity was taken out of the mass of man's nature, that He might be the new Adam, the fresh "beginning of the creation of God." He is said to be "My servant whom I have *chosen*." For as the old decree had regarded in the first instance

our original Father, and then had contemplated the human race, as receiving in Him, and through Him, the blessings of nature, so did the new decree regard first the Head of the renewed race, and see in him those spiritual members, to whom from His Humanity were to be communicated the blessings of grace. For this is the great contrast which it pleased God to establish—the blessings of nature through the first, the blessings of grace through the Second Adam. These are the two decrees: the first whereof was frustrated by the Fall, whereas, by the second the Fall is remedied. For according to this second decree, whatever spiritual benefits were designed for man's race are embodied in the Son of Man, that He might be the new "first-born of every creature." Thus is the last first, and the first last; and the true Joseph is found to be that real "chosen one," through whom all his brethren have access to royal favour.

This is the view of the decree of Election, which prevailed from the first in the Church. It is set forth in the clearest terms by the very earliest of the Fathers. "The All-seeing God, who hath elected the Lord Jesus Christ, and us through Him to be a peculiar people."[3] And this accordingly is declared in the New Testament to be the fulfilment of that decree, which had been announced in the Old. Our Lord Jesus Christ is declared to be "the *elect*, in whom the Father is well pleased."[4] And

[3] "ὁ πανόπτης Θεὸς—ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ιησοῦν Χριστὸν, καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον."—*Clem. Rom.* ad Cor i. 58.

[4] Compare Isaiah xlii. 1, and St. Matt. xii. 18.

this election is extended from Him to others. The decree, of which the first Adam had been the subject, had contemplated his race as well as himself, since how else could the earth be replenished? albeit that to infinite Wisdom the result must from the first have been apparent: but respecting the Second Adam, it is expressly declared that in His case the decree of mercy would not be equally ineffectual. "He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days." "He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied." It was predestined that in Him should be gathered together that Gentile Church, of which the election of the Jewish nation had been a preparatory shadow. "And now, saith the Lord, that formed Me from the womb, to be His servant—it is a light thing that Thou shouldst be My servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be My salvation unto the ends of the earth." The building up of that universal Church, which consists of all living members of the Incarnate Mediator, was always understood in the earliest times to be the fulfilment of the decree of God's Predestination. "Whereas God had taken to Himself your people," says Justin Martyr to his Jewish opponent, "out of all nations, an useless, disobedient, and unbelieving race, He has now shown that those who are *elected*[5] out of every nation obey His counsel through Christ."[6] And again, "we are no contemptible people, but God has *elected* us, and become merciful to them

[5] "Electæ sunt gentium nationes, ut destrueretur perfidia Judæorum."—*S. Ambros. on Ps.* xliii.

[6] Dial. cum Tryph. sec. 130 Id. sec. 119.

which asked not for Him." This it is, then, which the Apostle sets forth, when he explains how the whole Church is included in the operation of that merciful decree, which assigned a new Head to the human race. "Blessed be the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ, according as He hath *chosen us in Him* before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love; having predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the Beloved. In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace; wherein He hath abounded to us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure, which He hath purposed in Himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one, all things in Christ."

Now respecting this predestined election of Christians to be one body in Christ, there are two points to be observed—First, That it in no wise interferes with the responsibility of man; secondly, What is the nature of that safety, which it is said to afford? It does not interfere with man's responsibility. For it has been stated to depend upon that law of Mediation, whereby all blessings which God bestows upon men are given through the intervention of the new Head of humanity. "There is one Mediator between God and men,

the Man Christ Jesus." Through our Baptism into Him is that nature reconstituted which is transmitted by birth from our first Parent. For the law of Christ's Mediation not only refers to His actions on our behalf as our Advocate with the Father, but likewise to that channel which He has provided in His own humanity, whereby He may bestow heavenly gifts upon men. This point was brought prominently forward in the Pelagian controversy. The Pelagians were ready to admit that through Christ's Mediation we obtained remission of our sins, but they did not allow the necessity of that new mean of connexion with the Father, whereby we obtain the blessing of a re-created nature, through baptismal union with the Humanity of Christ. The Council of Milevis therefore passed a censure on those who said, "that the grace of God, whereby we are justified through Jesus Christ our Lord, avails only for the remission of sins past, and not for help against their future commission."[7] And therefore it is that the efficacy of Baptism formed so large a part of the controversy between St. Augustin and his opponents. But although the Divine nature which is communicated by Baptism, extends as widely as that old nature through which we inherit corruption, yet it does not so far re-create us, as to supersede that principle of individuality which previously existed. In each child of Adam there is not only that general nature, which we have in common with our race, but likewise that principle of individual existence which enables us to speak of ourselves.

[7] Harduin, vol. i. p. 1218.

The baptized man remains the same individual, which he was before Baptism. His nature may be improved, but his identity is unaffected. The Apostle speaks to those, who had been brought into the fold of Christ, as conscious that they were bound by the tie of human personality to their former existence. "Remember that ye being in times past Gentiles in the flesh—that at that time ye were without Christ. But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ." Now it is this individual personality, whereby we are enabled to speak of ourselves, with which the principle of responsibility is indissolubly connected. We discern its existence, independently of the Word of God, through that law of consciousness which is bound up with our individual existence. However far, therefore, the new nature which is given in Christ may leaven the old —however it may augment our power of suggesting to ourselves motives—whatever influence it may exercise over the will, by corroborating it in all good resolutions—yet there remains a principle of responsibility, which cannot be detached from ourselves. This responsibility acted in one way according to the law of nature; it acts in another according to the law of grace. In both cases its decisions were contingent, in that they depended upon the choice of a responsible being; but they were not the less foreseen by the Supreme Intelligence, and were linked, therefore, into the chain of His unalterable counsels, just as much as if they had been wholly irrespective of our own will. But although its choice is foreseen, and though it acts at different times under circumstances of more

or less advantage, yet the principle of responsibility itself remains untouched, and cannot be detached from the personality of God's reasonable creatures.

When we go on to consider the nature of that safety, which is promised to us in the Christian kingdom, we must remember what are the dangers, by which we are surrounded. For these dangers do not arise merely from our own weakness, but from the assaults of external enemies. There exists around us an actual kingdom of darkness, which had no place, indeed, in the pure nature of our first parent, but which, by reason of their own sins and his, has power over all his descendants. Nothing is more plainly declared in Scripture than the existence of such a danger, and men who watch their own hearts will see reason to suppose that they can trace its operations. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world against spiritual wickedness in high places." And if this be so, we have ample ground for desiring that succour, which may guard us from such assaults. And this it is, which the Head of the Christian Body has secured for His members. When He "beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," He conquered for His members as well as for Himself. To this external aggression He makes especial reference, when speaking of the security of His servants. "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any one pluck them out of My hand. My Father, which gave them Me is greater than all, and no one is able to pluck them out of My Father's hand."

Thus is the decree of God's predestination ("My Father which gave them Me",) and the assurance of Christian perseverance, connected with preservation against an external foe. And this assertion is wholly beside the question, what use may be made of this blessing. It leaves untouched the question of human responsibility. For afterwards occurs Our Lord's own statement of the manner in which, while upon earth, He had afforded this protection. "While I was with them in the world I kept them in Thy name; those that Thou gavest Me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition." Thus does it appear that one who was within the sentence of God's predestination, so far as to be given to Christ, and who, therefore, was kept by Christ from external assaults, had notwithstanding become the son of perdition. So that we may receive the full statement of God's predestination and of the perseverance of His true servants, without in any wise trenching on that law of responsibility, which in every circumstance remains untouched. The course of the Divine dealings has been directed in conformity with the merciful decree of His will, to provide a fresh beginning of man's race in place of that old one, in whom it originally began. Through union with this new Head has He predetermined to give security against Satan's assaults to Christ's living members. This end is effected through that calling, acceptance, and exaltation, which He has bestowed upon them through the ordinances of grace, whereby they are engrafted into His Church. Thus is the predestination of the Head consummated in the Body. "For whom He did foreknow He also did predesti-

nate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" "For I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus Our Lord."

What, then, is the Church's doctrine of Predestination, Election, and Perseverance, but a representation of the fact of Mediation, as it shines reflected in the mirror of the Divine Foreknowledge? Those things which it has pleased the Almighty to effect upon this scene of time, in that grand transaction between Him and His creatures, it has been His will to reveal in Holy Writ as they were the subject of His own contemplation and decree, amidst the solemn stillness of eternity. Of this decree the first and immediate object was the new Head of humanity, and in and through Him all His believing members. For "He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world." Therefore does St. Augustin speak of "the Saviour, the Mediator between God and man," as "the especial light of predestination and grace." In our Head, therefore, let us discern the very fountain of grace, whence according to each man's measure it diffuses

itself to all His members. For that grace, whereby the whole process is accomplished, through which every faithful man becomes a Christian, is the self-same principle whereby humanity was first moulded into Christ in Him ; by the same Spirit whereby the one was born, is the other regenerate. By the same Spirit, whereby the one has forgiveness of sins, was the other always sinless. These were things which God foreknew that He would accomplish. The predestination, therefore, of the saints is that doctrine which shone in the Saint of saints with such transcendent glory ; which, who therefore, that understands rightly the oracles of truth, can deny ? For the Lord of glory Himself, so far as the Son of God was partaker of Humanity, is declared to us to have been predestinated. The Apostle of the Gentiles proclaims at the opening of his Epistles, "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God, which he had promised before by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning His Son, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was predestinated to be the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of Holiness by the resurrection from the dead." Jesus therefore was predestinated, that He, who was to be the Son of David according to the flesh, might yet be the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of holiness, because He was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary. This wondrous assumption of humanity by God the Word was brought about in some unspeakable manner, that so He might truly and with propriety be said to be at once the Son of God and the Son of man—the Son of man

by reason of the humanity which He had assumed, the Son of God by reason of that only-begotten Deity which assumed manhood—lest the truth ot the Trinity might be obscured, and we might believe that there was a fourth God. It was the decree, therefore, of God's predestination, that humanity should receive that mighty elevation, than which there could be no higher stage of advancement; and likewise that Deity should submit to that deepest of all humiliations—participation in the weakness of flesh, and the death upon the cross. As respecting Him alone, therefore there passed that decree of predestination, whereby he was appointed our Head: so respecting us, being many, is there a like decree of predestination, whereby we are appointed to be His members."[8]

There is one material distinction, however, which it is necessary to bear in mind, when we read the statements of the Church's early writers respecting the decrees of God. It has been stated that these decrees were the shadow cast beforehand by that momentous system of Mediation, which took effect through the Incarnation of Christ. Now there are two ways, in which the ancient writers speak of those things which were decreed by God in Christ: sometimes they speak of them in regard to their *gift*, and sometimes in regard to their *employment*. In the first case they simply affirm the fact of the gift; what

[8] "Ipsa est igitur prædestinatio sanctorum, quæ in Sancto sanctorum maxime claruit." "Sicut ergo prædestinatus est ille unus, ut caput nostrum esset; ita multi prædestinati sumus, ut membra ejus essemus."

St. Austin follows the Vulgate in reading Rom. i. 4. "Qui prædestinatus est Filius Dei," &c.—*De Præd. Sanc.* sec. 31.

they say in the second depends upon its improvement. Looking at the first, they speak of Saul and Judas as participators in election,[9] but when they speak of God's Decrees under their second character, they refer to those cases, in which the due use of divine gifts leads to man's final salvation. Now, in exact accordance with this twofold language respecting the *nature* of a state of Election and Predestination, there is a corresponding diversity in their statements of its *cause*. When they look only at the gift, they refer God's Decree to that mere mercy, which works according to the counsel of His own sovereign will. But when they take its employment also into account, they speak of the decree of God as influenced by a foreknowledge of man's conduct. In this case, therefore, the sentence passed in the Divine Councils is an anticipation of that law, by which the Giver of all grace has declared that He is guided in His conduct towards His creatures: "he that hath, to him shall be given." Bearing this distinction in mind, we may see why God's Decrees are sometimes spoken of as certain in their effect, and sometimes as liable to be modified in consequence of human ingratitude;[10] why the good are saved through God's predestined mercy in Christ, and through the gift of

[9] "Blandiri sibi per confessionem non potest, quasi sit electus ad gloriæ præmium — nam et Judam inter Apostolos Dominus eligit," &c.— *Cyprian de Unitate.*

"Nec statim, qui eligitur, tentari non potest nec perire: quia et Saul electus in regem, et Judas in apostolum, suo postea vitio corruerunt."—*Hieron in Ezech.* xx.

[10] "Si cum dicis, Prædestinatus non potest damnari, intelligas ita, id est, non potest esse ut prædestinatus sit et damnetur, verum dicis."—*Lib. Sententiarum*, i. 40. B.

perseverance; while the bad cannot charge their failure on the arbitrary denial of what was essential to their safety. Not only are these considerations necessary, if we would make different writers of the ancient Church consistent with one another, but even if we would make the same writer consistent with himself. Thus do St. Ignatius and Hermas[11] speak of the Church as owing its calling simply to the will of God, while Clement[12] of Alexandria, a writer of the same century, speaks of it as comprising those whom God "foreknew would be righteous." In the former instance God's Decree is viewed in relation only to the gift which He bestows upon mankind; in the latter, His Decree is thought of as extending onward into that ultimate effect, which results from it in the case of the obedient. This is still more manifest if we consider the opposition which would otherwise arise between different assertions of the same writer. Thus does Jerome censure Origen, because he "attempts to prove the justice of God, on the ground that He elects each person, not from His simple exercise of inherent foreknowledge, but from the merit of the individuals elected." Whereas, he says, "God elected us, who were not previously holy and immaculate, in order that hereafter we

[11] Τῇ προωρισμένῃ πρὸ αἰώνων,—ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τῇ ἐκκλησιᾳ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ" —*Ign. ad Eph.* sec. i.

"Deus virtute sua potenti conditit sanctum ecclesiam suam." —*Past.* i. 1, 3.

[12] "Τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους, οὓς προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς, δικαίους ἐσομένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς."—*Clem. Alex. Strom* vii. p. 900. Oxf. 1715.

might become so."[13] Yet the same Jerome says, "those of whom God foresaw that they would be conformed to the image of His Son in life, He willed also should be conformed to it in glory."[14] Here we have the Decree of God set forth in one case as being independent of men's acts, in the other as being contingent upon the use which they make of it. In every case, therefore, it is the system of Mediation which is the object of God's prevision; in the one instance extending its blessings unconditionally to mankind, in the other leading to the ultimate salvation of those who employ it.

And this is still more manifest when we turn to that period of the Church's history, when the doctrines of Grace were brought most prominently forward—the contest, namely, which was carried on by St. Augustin against the Pelagians. For that controversy did not turn on the question whether men needed divine help, which Pelagius did not deny, but whether the help which they were admitted to require, was to be expected through the channel of nature, or the channel of grace—whether it was to be referred to the principles of our creation through the first, or of our re-creation through the Second Adam. The qualities and capacities of man are so plainly God's work, his affections and intellect are so entirely dependent upon the sustaining hand of their author, that those things which are brought about by them, might be said to be brought about by a power which is bestowed by their author.

[13] Hieron. Comment. in Ephes. i.

[14] Hieron. Comment. in Rom. viii. 29. Other passages are quoted in Faber's "Primitive Doctrine of Election," p. 271.

Pelagius, indeed, appeared to go beyond this in his admissions. "If he asserted that man could be perfect without the help of God," said his friends at the Synod of Jerusalem, "this were most mischievous and censurable; but since he adds, that this cannot be attained without God's help, what do you say?—do you deny God's help?"[15] Still, however, all his concessions come back, in the end, to the same point—the help which he acknowledged was bestowed through the medium of nature, and according to the laws of the first creation; whereas, the improvement for which St. Augustin contended was built upon a new principle; upon the re-creation of man in Christ." "The Pelagians assert," say the African Bishops, "that the grace of God lies in this circumstance, that He has so constituted and created man's nature, that man can, by his own will, fulfil God's law."[16] And again, the five Bishops who addressed Pope Innocent, contrast the statement of Pelagius, "that the nature with which man was created, evinces his Creator's grace," with their own assertion, "that assisting grace was revealed and given through the Incarnation of the only-begotten Son."[17] Thus did the whole controversy turn upon the fact, whether grace was a result of the re-creation of man's nature through Christ, or whether it was to be looked for through the channel

[15] Harduin, i. 1208.

[16] Id. i. 1214. Vide also St. Augustin's Letter to Sixtus, who was afterwards Pope: "Abjiciatur a Christianorum cordibus ista fallacia: nam omnino non istam gratiam commendat Apostolus, qua creati sumus ut homines essemus, sed qua justificati, cum mali homines essemus. Ista est enim gratia per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum."—*Ep.* cxciv. sec. viii.

[17] Harduin, i. 1226–8.

of our original constitution. And therefore the Church's doctrine on this subject did not trench in any degree upon the accountableness of man. For if the Divine Decrees are bound to that system by which it has been shown that man's common nature is altered, but by which the principle of responsibility is left untouched, they do but secure that free-agency, which is only perfectly restored[18] in Christ. And when the reference to God's decrees was carried further, and they were spoken of in their application to those chosen members of the Lord's Body, who will share its ultimate advancement, it was never forgotten that such a result was contingent upon the due use of those blessings, which were dependent for their beginning upon man's free election into Christ. Thus were the springs of responsibility left untouched,[19] while the privileges of the Gospel were made to depend exclusively upon that free grace, which had been communicated to humanity in the Incarnate Saviour.

And the same principles were involved when the controversy went deeper into the mysterious ground of human responsibility. The dispute between St. Augustin and Pelagius had been—whether the assistance of God's grace was bestowed according to the system of Mediation, or the system of nature.

[18] This is stated in that collection of the opinion of the Roman Bishops, which was put out under the authority of Celestine: "Nemo nisi per Christum libero bene utatur arbitrio."—*Harduin*, i. 1255.

[19] Vide the statements referred to Celestine: "Quo utique auxilio et munere Dei non aufertur liberum arbitrium, sed liberatur." "Tanta enim erga omnes homines est bonitas Dei, ut nostra velit esse merita, quæ sunt ipsius dona," &c.—*Harduin*, i. 1257.

Though Pelagius admitted the truth of Our Lord's satisfaction for sin,[20] yet he denied that whole theory, which supposes divine grace to be communicated through the Mediator to mankind. But the Church accepted with one consent the assertions of St. Augustin, that as the gifts of nature through the first, so were the gifts of grace bestowed upon mankind through the Second Adam. All spiritual blessings were understood to be bestowed through the ordinances of the Church upon the members of Christ's Body. This was the external medium through which grace was bestowed by God upon man. But when this was admitted, there arose of necessity the further question, By what means were men induced to become members of the Lord's Body? What was the condition of persons before Baptism? Was man's dependence after Baptism to be the grace of Christ, and before Baptism the principles of nature? Was there such capacity for holiness in man natural, that he could of himself have taken the first step towards God? Yet if not, it would seem that the only reason why one man is converted, and another is not, must depend upon God's decree; and, therefore, that the responsibility of man must be proportionately endangered. For if the direct object of God's Decree be that decision which results from the actings of man's compound organization, and not that renewing influence of the Incarnate Mediator, which is bestowed upon mankind at large for the re-creation of his nature, it does not appear how individuals can

[20] "Justificatio per peccatorum veniam."—*Op. Imper.* c. *Julian.* ii. 165.

be held responsible[21] for that, over which they have no control. From this difficulty Augustin[22] had at one time been disposed to escape, by assigning a meritorious efficacy to men's faith, which he denied to their actions. This error is not uncommon among those who speak much of faith, without discerning its true ground of importance; namely, that it is correlative to that external system of Mediation, whereby a real change has been effected in the position of mankind. We are saved only by faith in Christ, not because faith is of more value in itself than the other parts of our constitution, but by reason of the worthless nature of those acts of our own, of which sense acquaints us; whereas those acts of the Man Christ Jesus, which are the objects of faith, are of countless efficacy. St. Augustin's view of faith had rested apparently upon a different principle; he had observed that faith, when looked at in itself, bears the same relation to its results, which motives bear to actions; and while he affirmed that the second need the help of grace, he supposed that power over our own motives could not be separated from the free-agency of man. This, however, was plainly to attribute men's conversion to their own merits, and it was contrary to those statements of Scripture, which refer faith to the gift of God. And St. Augustin spoke a wholly different

[21] "Si igitur non est Dei gratia, quomodo salvat mundum? Et si non est liberum arbitrium, quomodo judicat mundum."—*Aug. Ep.* 214. 2.

[22] "Quod credimus nostrum est. Quod autem bonum operamur, illius, qui credentibus in se dat Spiritum Sanctum." "Non quidam Deus, elegit opera, quæ ipse largitur, cum dat Spiritum Sanctum, ut per charitatem bona operemur; sed tamen elegit fidem."—*Explicatio Prop. de Epistola ab Rom.* written A. D. 394.

language, when the controversy with Pelagius led him into deeper views of truth. He sums up the dispute between them at the end of his treatise on grace; "If Pelagius will allow not only that the human faculties, irrespective of our will and acts, but that our will and acts themselves are divinely assisted, and so assisted, that without such assistance we can neither will well, nor act well; and that the mean whereby we are assisted is the grace of God, through Jesus Christ Our Lord, whereby He makes us righteous through *His*, and not through *our* righteousness; so that our true righteousness is that which is given us by Him; no controversy respecting the assistance by God's grace, so far as I understand, will be left between us."[23]

At this point it was, then, that the dispute broke out between St. Austin and the Semi-Pelagians. The need of God's grace in Christ, as aiding the actions of men, they readily admitted. But there must first, they said, be a surrender of himself on the part of man, in order to enable him to profit by God's grace. And this first movement must of necessity lie in his own nature. The gifts of God flowed forth, they allowed, through the channel of Christ's Manhood, like the stream to thirsty Israel; but man must stoop down to profit by the draught. This, however, were to assert an independence of the Creator, which the creature has no pretention to advance. It had been objected against the Pelagians by St. Jerome,[24] that they supposed

[23] "De Gratia," sec. xlvii.

[24] Vide Hieron. Ep. ad Ctesiphontem. "Deus cujus occulta potentia cuncta penetrans incontaminabili præsentia facit esse quicquid aliquo modo est, in quantumcunque est, quia nisi faciente illo non tale vel tale esset; sed prorsus esse non posset."—*De Civitate Dei*, xii. 25.

the world to have been framed by a Divine Artificer, and then to be left to pursue its course through the agency of those principles, which had been originally infused. Whereas in reality there exists no power, properly speaking, but the will of spiritual beings; and no power in material substance, save that will of their Author, which still supports, as it first called them into being. Now the same principle, which is true in the natural world, is applicable to the spiritual. Here likewise, the principles of Theism do not allow us to exclude the agency of God, when it is not excluded by the peculiar constitution of accountable beings. While we bear in mind, therefore, that responsibility implies the existence of a power of original action, we cannot exclude the influence of God's agency from any good actions of His rational creatures. But according to what law is this agency exerted? Here the very question comes back upon us, which we met with before in the controversy with the Pelagians. Is this pre-disposing influence of the Divine power, which has the wills of responsible agents for its immediate object, bestowed through the system of nature, or the system of Mediation? St. Austin maintained that it was bestowed through the latter. As the Second Person in the Ever-Blessed Trinity is the source of that natural light, which still dwells even in the darkened consciences of our fallen race, so still more is it from His influence, and in anticipation of that light which through full communion with Him He bestows upon the true members of His Body, that the dawning and imperfect glimpses of the coming day draw

men to His presence. The especial ground on which St. Austin rests his proof of the efficacy of preventing grace, is that it is implied by those prayers, which the Church continually offered for the conversion of unbelievers. For unless this were a thing which was brought about by God's power, and not by the unaided exertion of individual will, why should we ask God to grant it? Why should we petition Him for that, which He had put out of His own power? Now this principle is especially applied by Celestine,[25] when summing up the Church's decision against the Semi-Pelagians, to whose prayers, which the Church offers through Sacramental union with Christ; and the admission of Catechumens to her full privileges by Baptism is stated to be its result. So that although the gift of grace, which the Mediator bestows through the channel of His man's nature, exercises an attractive influence in those who are not yet members of His Body, yet it is through this medium only that the blessing is transmitted.

This it is, then, which was asserted in that famous Council of Orange, which gives us the final result of the Church's judgment on these momentous questions. It expressly refers preventing grace in those who are not Christians, to that same anticipatory influence of the Incarnate Mediator, on which were built the hopes of the gene-

[25] "Præter eas sanctiones, quibus nos piissimi patres ad Christi gratiam referre docuerunt; obsecrationum quoque sacerdotalium sacramenta respiciamus—ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi." "Ut denique catechumenis ad regenerationis sacramenta perductis, cœlistis aula misericordiæ reseretur."—*Harduin*, i. 1257.

rations which preceded His Advent. And it sums up its protest against the Semi-Pelagian doctrines in these two assertions—first, that *all* the baptized by the grace given to them in Baptism, have through Christ's help the means of salvation; secondly, that it is a detestable doctrine to suppose that any persons are predestinated to evil by Divine power.[26] Now the second of these positions is a distinct proof that the Fathers at Orange did not consider that the ultimate determinations of men were the first and immediate object of a Divine Decree, since it is unquestionable that these last determinations are often evil. And on the other hand, we may learn from the first statement what they supposed to be the object of the Divine Predestination—namely, that Body of Christ, to which through His Mediation, He transmitted in measure those gifts of grace, of which He was Himself the natural possessor. So that we are led back again to the position before attained. Election, Predestination, and Perseverance, were supposed by the Church to be conceptions, which existed from eternity in the Divine Mind, and which were acted out in that majestic economy of the Divine dealings, which had its commencement in the incarnation of the Son of God. They express that law, whereby a fresh hope was afforded to the fallen race of man

[26] "Hoc secundum fidem catholicam credimus, quod accepta per baptismum gratia, omnes baptizati, Christo auxiliante et cooperante, quæ ad salutem animæ pertinent, possint et debeant, si fideliter laborare voluerint, adimplere. Aliquos vero ad malum divina potestate prædestinatos esse, non solum non credimus, sed etiam, si sunt qui tatum malum credere velint, cum omni detestatione illis anathema dicimus."—*Harduin's Con.* ii. 1101.

through the re-creation of his nature in Christ Jesus. Regard them, therefore, in reference to the gifts bestowed, and they are spoken of as resulting exclusively from that unmerited mercy of God, which chooses things which are not, as though they were. But look at them in reference to their employment, and that principle of responsibility must not be left out of account, which, though unable of itself to do good, must yet assent to the good which is done for it. "Tolle liberum arbitrium, et non erit, quod salvetur; tolle gratiam, et non erit, unde salvetur." Leave out either, and the existence of man would be a riddle, and he would no longer have a consistent place in the Universe of God.

Now, what treatment did this systen of doctrine meet with, when it was re-cast by the powerful intellect of the Genevese Reformer? He at once assailed the existence of responsibility by asserting that the immediate object of the Divine Decrees was the ultimate decision in man, and not the reconstruction of his nature. Thus did he profess to vindicate the supremacy of the Creator, while in reality he exonerated the creature from obedience. For duty cannot exist, when responsibility is extinguished. And this is the necessary result when the employment as well as the gift of grace is supposed to be the subject of a decree which is wholly irrespective of the conduct of the creature. So that the result of transferring the decrees of God from the scheme of Mediation at large to the conduct of individuals, was in reality, to leave men as free from accountableness as the beasts. Now it is an obvious objection to this

system, that it is inconsistent with the constitution of the world which we inhabit. The doctrines of Necessity as Bishop Butler has shown conclusively, cannot be reduced to practice. They are incompatible with the conduct which men's wants compel, and their conscience witnesses. They are fatal to the existence of praise and blame, to the justice of reward and punishment. When Calvin kindled the flames which consumed Servetus he gave a proof of the reality of his belief in those principles, which his famous third book of Institutes cannot do away. But how was it, then, that a man of Calvin's great penetration should have been betrayed into those excesses, which earned for him from the milder Melancthon the title of the Zeno of modern times? It could not have been merely the boldness of his intellect, or the harshness of his temper, which induced him to found his system on the principles of Fatalism. The "horrible decretum" must have had some peculiar charm for him. And such, no doubt, it had in that singular aid which it gave to his theological scheme, whereby it enabled him to dispense with the whole theory of that Church system, which in practice he had set himself to overthrow. Let it be allowed that God's Decrees had relation solely to the decisions of His separate creatures, that these decisions were forced upon individuals by some external law, independently of their own participation, and the whole plan of ordinances, which had been provided in the Church—the means of Sacramental union with Christ, of inherence in His Sacred Body—might at once be dispensed with And now it may be seen what

Calvin gained by substituting the actions of individuals, as the object of the Divine Decrees, in place of the Mediation of Christ. His grand object, in which he led the way among the Reformers, was the destruction of the whole ecclesiastical system of the Church. Now, that which rendered the Church system so precious, which indisposed devout men to touch it, even when its luxuriance might with advantage be pruned away, was that it was the appointed means of bestowing those hallowed gifts which included men among the number of the elect, and gained for those who duly used them the predestined blessings of salvation. To get rid, therefore, of the treasure which was enshrined in the Church's ordinances was to render the ordinances themselves contemptible. And thus did Calvin take the true course for weakening men's value for the offices of the Church, when he persuaded them that the promises of Scripture did not refer to the privileges of grace, but to an arbitrary pre-appointment to glory.

But with this gain there was a corresponding loss. For since the Divine Decrees were in reality a reflexion cast beforehand by the facts of Mediation, it was impossible to destroy their true character, without obscuring men's perception of that great doctrine with which they were connected. And consequently the system of Calvin has a direct tendency to conceal from men a large part of the scheme of Mediation. For since God's Decrees were no longer looked upon as the law, by which He dealt with those who were members of His Son's Body, but were an independent, an-

tecedent Decree of the Great Creator, they plainly led men to look away from the system of grace to the system of nature. And herein does Calvinism touch on that very error of Pelagianism, to which it professes to be most opposed. As the system of Arminius, if, indeed, it supposes man's election to grace to be dependent on foreseen actions, assigns too much to the desert of men, so the system of Calvin, by resting the individual actions of men on the Decree of the Creator, irrespective of that real re-construction of their nature which is wrought in Christ, does not rest man's safety sufficiently on the work of Mediation. It is true that Calvin professes to ground God's Decrees on the merits of Christ, and on the sacrifice which was offered upon the Cross. But what is here complained of is, that though he allows what Christ does on man's behalf towards God, yet that His system blinds him to what Christ does on God's behalf towards His brethren. For he supposes man's salvation to be spoken of in Scripture, as though it were the result of a Decree which acts immmediately upon man, irrespective of that series of acts whereby the Humanity of Christ infuses itself as a supernatural seed through man's nature. So that Our Lord's sufferings for man are looked upon as a mere arbitrary act; and are not grounded upon that relation to mankind, which grows out of His character as the Second Adam. And this want of coherence and completeness in his system has opened a door to Socinianism, from which, as we know by history, even the strong intellect of Calvin has been unable to guard his disciples.

The foregoing statements afford a ready criterion, by which we may discriminate the system of Calvin from that of the Church. Not that we should find in him, much less in his followers, such rigid adherence to his intellectual theory, as absolutely to exclude all expressions drawn from the Church's ordinary teachings; but the language of his theory, looked at in itself, is precise and distinctive. It is admitted on all hands that the gifts of God are but the acting out of that system, which is revealed in the scriptural statement of His counsels. Now, if the Decrees of God are not associated, as the Church supposes, with the system of Our Lord's Mediation—if their immeate object be not the reception and employment of the gifts of grace, but the actions of individuals, it is plain, that no acceptance can be given to that Sacramental system, which supposes divine influences to be communicated through union with Our Lord's Body. God's gifts will be looked at as an immediate and independent donation conferred by the Creator on His creatures, irrespective of that medium of communication which has been provided in the Humanity of Christ. Whatever advantages may have been obtained through those acts which were performed by Our Lord in the days of His flesh, no further need will now exist for the "One Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus." The Supreme Governor may of course bestow spiritual gifts, simultaneously with the exhibition of Sacraments; but no peculiar connexion can be supposed to tie the two together. For their connexion depends wholly upon this principle—that

the channel through which heavenly blessings flow forth is the Humanity of Christ. Abstract this circumstance, which depends upon a supernatural series of relations, and the peculiar efficacy of Sacraments must be rested only upon the natural fitness of external emblems to convince the intellect and affect the heart. Here, then, is the first characteristic of the Calvinistic theory: its rejection of that Sacramental system, by which the blessings of Mediation are distributed through the Body of Christ. Its second is the denial of any gift of grace, except to those who shall finally be saved. This is the necessary consequence of the view which it takes of the doctrine of Decrees. For God's purposes cannot be defeated: the Word which cometh out of His mouth cannot return in vain. Now, if His Decrees do not refer, as the Church supposes, to the re-creation of our common nature in Christ, but are a mode of superseding the springs of individual resolution, they would be frustrated, supposing it were necessary to take any account of the principle of human responsibility. For their object is the ultimate decision of man, and not that reconstruction of his nature, which assumes that his accountableness remains undiminished. God's grace is not supposed to be given, that the members of Christ may serve Him according to that new law of liberty, which has superseded their old relation to the corrupt Adam; but in consequence of an arbitrary decree, which marks out some of the children of men for death, and others for salvation. So that a belief that any gifts of grace are bestowed where there is no certainty of salvation,

is inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the theory of Calvin.

And here it may be asked whether the author of such a system had any right to claim the sanction of that greatest mind in the ancient Church —so rich, profound, and affectionate — whose works, next to the sacred writings, have been the favourite study of all following generations. For while Calvin mentions, with evident satisfaction, that the majority of ancient writers had been wholly unacquainted with that theory, which the force of his intellect had enabled him to discover, he yet refers to St. Augustin, as one who was universally admitted to take the same view as himself of the Decrees of God. I will not claim for the Bishop of Hippo an exemption from error, to which himself made no pretensions. The season of distress and perplexity, in which he lived, when the ancient forms of social life were falling to pieces under the rude shock of the Northern Barbarians, tended especially to fix his thoughts on that order and stability which can be found only in the purposes of God. What wonder, as he heard on his dying bed of the excesses to which his own city was just about to be a victim, if his last works should show that he was meditating, like our own Hooker, on the order and harmony of the heavenly world, and that he found rest in the contemplation of those unfailing Decrees, which have been the comfort of so many good men amidst the perplexities and reverses of Christ's earthly kingdom. It was natural, perhaps, that he should attach to them a disproportionate importance, when amidst those wild out-

cries with which the Vandals had filled northern Africa, he beheld them,

> "Calm as the march of some majestic cloud,
> Which o'er wild scenes of ocean-war,
> Holds its still course in Heaven afar."

But even admitting that St. Augustin was betrayed occasionally into incautious expressions, as Jeremy Taylor and others have imagined, yet the principles which have been adduced, amply vindicate him from the charge of coinciding with Calvin. For he distinctly asserts that spiritual gifts are bestowed even upon those who are not finally penitent, and he maintains in the fullest manner that doctrine of Sacramental grace, which the theory of Calvin was intended to discard. It has already been shown that the Regeneration of infants is a decisive test, by which to ascertain men's belief in the doctrine of Our Lord's Mediation. Since in this case the human receiver can contribute nothing, its whole efficacy must of necessity be thrown upon the action of its Divine Giver. So that it enables us to ascertain whether men suppose any thing to be really effected by those spiritual gifts, which have their channel in Our Lord's Humanity. Now on this point St. Austin speaks so distinctly, that Mr. Goode himself is compelled to admit him to receive the doctrine. What can be more decisive than such passages as the following? "We say that the Holy Spirit dwells in baptized infants, although they know it not. For they are ignorant of it, although it is in them, as they are ignorant of their own mind. For it lies in them, as yet

unable to be used, like some buried spark, to be quickened by increasing years."[27] Or again, "It is matter of the utmost wonder, that to some of His sons, whom He has regenerated in Christ, to whom He has given faith, hope, and charity, God does not give perseverance."[28] We need not be surprised, therefore, at finding that he speaks of the blessing of Election[29] as conferred through the ministration of Baptism. And his example illustrates the rule, by which it may be decided whether those who profess agreement with Calvin, are really able to accord with the English Church. For it is indifferent whether the charge which has been brought against St. Augustin be well-grounded or no, seeing that his error, if it existed, was only one of philosophy, and did not affect his religious faith. For by affirming the reality of Baptismal grace, he maintained the great truth of Our Lord's Mediation. And this is a test of universal applicability.[30] Are

[27] "Dicimus ergo in baptizatis parvulis, quamvis id nesciant, habitare Spiritum Sanctum. Sic enim eum nescient, quamvis sit in eis, quamadmodum nesciunt et mentem suam; cujus in eis ratio, qua uti nondum possunt, velut quædam scintilla sopita est, excitanda ætatis accessu."—*Epist.* clxxxvii. 8.

[28] De Corrept. et Grat. sec. viii.

[29] Op. Imperf. c. Jul. i. 38, 39.

[30] "The ancient predestinarians never questioned the certainty of Regeneration in Baptism, because this doctrine was consistent with their theory. For though they maintained that only the elect or predestinate are endued with the gift of perseverance to the end, and will be finally saved, yet they believed that God bestows at His pleasure every other kind and measure of grace on those persons, from whom He withholds this special grace of perseverance. They therefore held, in common with the rest of the Church, that the forgiveness of sin, and

there any, whose minds dwell exclusively on the beauty and harmony of the Divine Decrees, whose habit is to refer every thing to God's purpose, but whose language does not do justice to the importance of human responsibility?—still if the error be only one of philosophy, if it does not lead them to detract from the reality of the Mediation of Christ, if they admit that Sacramental system through which the Incarnate Son has made His Humanity the channel of heavenly gifts, they may be bad reasoners, but sound Christians. But if their theory induces them to deny the reality of those gifts, which are bestowed through Sacraments on the members of Christ—if they will not recognize the blessings of that renewed nature, whereby the Second Adam restores what was corrupted by the first (of all which the Regeneration of Infants has been shown to be the test)—how can they hold the great truth of Our Lord's Mediation, or believe those assertions of the Prayer-Book, to which they are required to assent?

the gift of the Holy Ghost, are generally bestowed in Baptism," &c. "This was Augustin's Doctrine," &c.—*Bishop Bethell on Regeneration*, cap. ix. p. 140.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FORMULARIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WERE NOT DRAWN UP BY CALVINISTS.

It has been shown in the preceding Chapter that the Primitive Doctrine of absolute Decrees is not at variance with the truth of Baptismal Regeneration: it remains to show in the concluding Chapters, first, that those who drew up the Church's Formularies, had not adopted that peculiar theory on the subject of Decrees, which goes by the name of Calvinism; and, secondly, that such Calvinism as was once prevalent in the English Church, is no justification for those parties in the present day, by whom the obvious sense of the Church's words is rejected. Now, in handling this subject, it is not necessary to consider the Church's words at large, but only that part of her offices, in which the doctrine of Baptism is delivered. The Seventeenth Article, therefore, shall be left untouched for several reasons. First—It will be manifest to those who will compare it with the slight sketch of the Church's doctrine respecting the Divine Decrees, which hast just been given, that it asserts no more than has universally been believed on this subject. The ground on which it has been often supposed to have a contrary tendency is, that it does not guard and limit its statements respecting the Decrees of God by a co-incident assertion of

human responsibility. But then such statements occur in other portions of the Church's teaching; and it is exactly conformable to the example of Scripture to put forth God's Decrees in their simplicity, while the consistency of doctrine is maintained by other statements, in which the accountableness of man is not less explicitly vindicated.

Again—Dr. Laurence[1] has shown beyond dispute, that historical evidence plainly identifies the teaching of the Articles with the school of Melancthon, rather than with that of Calvin. Melancthon was the person principally consulted by Cranmer[2] at the time of their composition; the language itself is in great measure borrowed from Melancthon's words; and it was not till A. D. 1552[3] (a year after the original compilation of the Articles,)[4] that the peculiar theory of Calvin became a matter of public controversy. The Lutherans, indeed, had used language at an earlier period, which may be confounded with that of Calvin; but a characteristic difference had separated the two parties: the language of the Lutherans was founded mainly upon a philosophical misconception of the difficulty of reconciling foreknowledge with free-agency—while the scriptural statement of God's Decrees respecting the re-creation of mankind in Christ, was maintained by Calvin to be a sentence passed arbitrarily upon individuals. And when our Articles were composed, the Lutherans, as their own con-

[1] Bampton Lecture, viii. and note 3, p. 167 and 431.
[2] Bampt. Lect. p. 229 and 232. Notes 6 and 7 in Serm. ii.
[3] Laurence's Bampt. Lect. Note 18 in Serm. ii. p. 246 Strype's Cranmer, B. ii. cap. xxvii.

fessions[5] prove, were heartily ashamed of the Stoical tendency of their early statements.

Thirdly—It is comparatively immaterial what are men's views respecting the Seventeenth Article, provided they are not led into a practical disbelief of the actions of the Mediator, as brought out in the Sacramental Services of the Church. It has never been disputed that the doctrine of grace involves a deep mystery, to which the faculties of man are unable to do justice. Its mystery lies in the fact, that all the good of human actions must be assigned to "the Father of Lights," in whom lies the ultimate fountain of illumination, and yet that the agency of man is to be so far admitted, that the evil of his doings may be chargeable on his own responsibility. This object the Church[6] has effected, not by such a minute analysis of motives as

[5] Vide Laurence's Bampton Lectures, Serm. ii. note 21: "Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio Stoicæ disputationes apud nostros de fato, et disciplinæ nocuerunt."—*Melanct. Epist.* Lib. iii. Ep. 42. This Epistle is addressed to Cranmer, Comp. Lib. iv. Ep. 796, where he calls Calvin "Zeno."

[6] If the reader asks for a specimen of the ingenious theories on this subject, which have been suggested by individuals, he may take the following statement of the views of St. Thomas Aquinas from Montagne (Turnellius) De Gratia; Diss. xi. De Jansenio: "Observant Thomistæ. Primo—Deum esse primam causam efficientem, hominem vero primam causam deficientem. Secundo—In omni opere, sive bono, sive malo, aliquid ex parte Dei, et aliquid ex parte hominis reperiri: scilicet in opere bono, ex parte Dei reperitur gratia; ex parte hominis consensus gratiæ; in opere malo, ex parte Dei voluntas denegandæ gratiæ præmoventis; ex parte hominis, mala peccandi voluntas, ipsumque actuale peccatum. Tertio—Id omne quod in opere bono ex parte Dei reperitur, prius esse et causam ejus, quod ex parte hominis adest in eodem opere; e contra in opere malo, quod ex parte hominis adest, eo prius esse et causam ejus, quod ex parte Dei contingit."

would adjudicate the different portions of every action to its proper parentage, but by putting side by side, in their fulness, the two doctrines of God's power and man's accountableness. For though our faculties are not adequate to lay down the exact laws under which the two principles concur, there is no contradiction in their joint statement. To assert that the means of salvation are only through grace, and that grace is only given arbitrarily to a selected few, is to say that the means of salvation are not given to the residue of men—it is to assert, therefore, the Calvinistic doctrine of Reprobation. And to affirm the first statement, but deny the second, would be a contradiction in terms: it would be to affirm a thing to be true, at the same time that we denied it. And therefore to assert the Calvinistic doctrine of Election, and profess to reject the doctrine of Reprobation, has been stated by Calvin himself to be childish and irrational ["nimis inscite et pueriliter."] But there is no such contradiction, in admitting that we are unable to discern by what laws two co-ordinate principles coalesce in the production of a certain set of actions. This is only a confession of human ignorance. And such has always been the Church's manner of treating the question. The statements of its doctrine on grace, which were collected by Celestine, conclude with the following declaration: "On the more profound and difficult questions, into which this subject runs, which those who opposed the heretics have treated at large, while we do not dare to despise them, we think it unnecessary to dogmatize."[7]

[7] Harduin, vol. i. p. 1258.

In discussing, then, the Calvinism imputed to the Reformers, it is not necessary, in this place, to enter into those more abstract questions, which might be raised respecting the Articles: the practical language of the Service is sufficient for our purpose. For the present subject does not lead us into a philosophical inquiry into the nature of things, but connects itself with the direct assurances of Holy Scripture. And however highly men estimate the doctrinal authority of the Articles, yet the statements of the Service-Book cannot be superseded. For not only do all the beneficed clergy affirm their assent and consent to it (which they could not do without believing its assertions to be correct,) but they use it on the most solemn occasions, and in the immediate presence of God. And the Laity also are compelled to give it a silent assent, because the affecting ordinances, which touch most nearly on family life, cannot be ministered without its employment. So that unless the assertions of the Prayer-Book were true, they could not in any wise be tolerated. But then Mr. Goode and others affirm, that though the language of the Service-Book is not what they like (which is a virtual admission that prima facie it makes against them,) yet that it is not so express, but that taking into account what its authors must have meant, they can honestly subscribe it. "My own view," says Mr. Goode, "would, even in theory, apart from the experience of the results, be adverse to the use of such language; while, knowing the meaning intended to be affixed to it by those who applied it in our Formularies, I have not the smallest difficulty in accepting it. Now, it is not to be denied that

this principle may fairly be applied in various cases. When language is dubious, the intention with which it is was uttered enables us to affix a definite meaning to that, which might otherwise be uncertain. But then the language employed must really be dubious, for if distinct assertions are in this manner to be explained away, of what use is language as the vehicle of thought? And, therefore, to introduce this principle as an argument against Baptismal Regeneration, would only issue, were the attempt successful, in the conclusion that the Reformers were dishonest men. But how far is Mr. Goode's assertion, respecting the opinions of the Reformers, well-founded? The point which he has to prove, is, that Calvinistic sentiments were entertained by those parties, by whom our different services for Baptism were drawn up. Thus he will obtain a principle for interpreting any ambiguous expressions. Who, then, were their compilers? This inquiry involves the consideration of that which passed at three several eras—the first compilation of the Prayer-Book, A. D. 1548-9, the addition of the last part of the Catechism, A. D. 1604, the passing of the last Act of Uniformity, A. D. 1662. It must be considered by whom the Church's Services were composed at these different periods, and what is known of the private opinions of those who compiled them.

The first period, A. D. 1548, is the most material, because the larger part of our present Offices of Baptism was then first put together. And the work which was then done was so avowedly referred to Cranmer (the only person whose name

was inserted in the Act passed upon the occasion,) that it will not be needful to go further in any inquiry into the sentiments of its authors. This First Book of King Edward underwent great alteration indeed, A. D. 1552, but as the changes then made consisted of the excision of various important rites, while that which remained received no material accession, the changes then made throw no light upon the intention of those original expressions which are left to us. And the same may be said respecting the ratification of the services on the accesssion of Elizabeth, A. D. 1559, by which the meaning to be attached to the expressions which were left untouched was wholly unaltered. For so far as this meaning is to be elicited from the natural force of the words, or from the intention of those who compiled them, their subsequent adoption at that period is immaterial.

It may be maintained, indeed, that we are not to look merely to the force of the words themselves, but to the general design of those from whom they receive legal validity. But this principle would be far from placing Mr. Goode in a more favourable position, for it would bring him down from the 1st Elizabeth, to the 14th Charles II. For since a subsequent Act of the Legislature supersedes those Acts which precede it, our present Act of Uniformity dates from A. D. 1662, and the parties to whose intention it would refer us, are the Convocation and Parliament which then assembled. And the intention of these parties is too well known to render it possible to suppose them favourable to Cal-

[8] Strype's Eccles. Mem. vol. ii. part i. p. 134.

vinism. So that Mr. Goode is concluded from going further than A. D. 1549, when the Prayer-Book was first published, by his unwillingness to go on to A. D. 1662, when it received that legal sanction, which at present accompanies it. To this, then, we come at present; and something shall afterwards be said respecting the additions to the Catechism after the Hampton Conference, A. D. 1604, and respecting the additions to the Baptismal Offices, A. D. 1662.

Now, in entering upon the consideration of Cranmer's opinions, it is necessary to follow Mr. Goode into the somewhat novel ground to which he has transferred the controversy. He opens his historical statements with the startling assertion, that Peter Lombard is on his side, and that in the blooming period of the Scholastic Philosophy, it was an open question whether "grace was always conferred upon infants in Baptism." The statement is surprising, considering the expressions which occur in those public services which were at that time employed by the Church, and considering the words of the Fathers, whom the Schoolmen were accustomed to acknowledge as paramount authorities. Mr. Goode rests his claim to Peter Lombard's sanction upon a passage quoted in part by Dr. Pusey,[9] in which inquiry is made, "whether to children in Baptism is given grace, by which they may profit in riper years." "The Master of the Sentences, no doubt, holds," says Mr. Goode, "that all the infants of Christians receive in Baptism remission of their sins." But he

[9] "Scriptural views of Baptism," p. 150. First Edition.

does not think, Mr. Goode implies, that "those gifts of grace that give spiritual life to the soul" . . . . . "were conferred at all upon infants." "And the doctrine that grace was always conferred upon infants in Baptism, did not become a ruled doctrine in the Church of Rome till the Council of Vienna, in 1311, and was then only laid down as the *more probable* opinion. For in a letter of Pope Innocent IV., in 1250, afterwards inserted in the Canon Law, it is distinctly recognized as an *open* question, whether grace is, or is not, conferred upon infants in Baptism."

To point out the groundlessness of these statements, is not a mere question of antiquarian research The assertions before us are a necessary step in Mr. Goode's argument, and their removal will be seen in the sequel to be fatal to those conclusions, of which Cranmer, and through him the English Church, are the subjects. And first, what is to be said respecting Peter Lombard? Did he deny, or even doubt, that grace was bestowed on infants in Baptism? Far from it: had Mr. Goode taken the trouble to look somewhat further in Lombard's pages, he would have seen this truth distinctly stated; and thus he might have been led to perceive that the passage which he has himself quoted, and which asserts that the grace given in infancy is not sufficient for the adult, but requires augmentation in riper years, is rather hostile to his own view than favourable to it. For Peter Lombard's words come, at the most, to no more than those of Hooker: "Baptism doth challenge to itself but the inchoation of those graces, the consummation whereof dependeth on mysteries ensuing." The following is Mr.

Goode's own translation: "Respecting infants, who have not arrived at the use of their reason, there is a question, whether in Baptism they have received grace by which, when they come to riper years, they may be able to will and work what is good. It appears that they have not received it; inasmuch as that grace is love and faith, which prepares and aids the will. And who will say that they have received faith and love? But if they have not received grace, by which they may be able to do good works when they have grown up, therefore the grace given in Baptism is not sufficient for them in this state (*i. e.* as adults,) nor can they now be good through it, but need the addition of other grace." Mr. Goode does not add, in his translation, the succeeding words, which, however, are very material to the argument: "And if this grace is not added, it is not their fault, because they have been justified from sin?"[10] Now these words might suggest the real meaning of the ambiguous expression, "the grace given in Baptism is not sufficient." Does this assertion mean, as Mr. Goode supposes, that Baptism does not confer "those gifts of grace that give spiritual life to the soul?" Or does it mean merely that though the life of the soul begins in Baptism, yet that an augmentation of grace is needed in riper years? The least acquaintance with Peter Lombard's system, will show that it means the second.

It is impossible to establish this statement by reference to other passages, without a passing notice of the relation which the Master of the Sentences bore to his predecessors. When he left his native

[10] Peter Lombard, Lib. iv. Dis. iv. H.

Lombardy to study at Paris, he found that the system of pure reasoning, which Abelard had carried to the extreme of skepticism, was likely to be altogether fatal to authority. His aim, therefore, when he rose into eminence, was to give shape and fixedness to the voice of the Church, by collecting its scattered dicta into a consistent body. The Book of Sentences, therefore, was little more than the opinions of the Fathers, collected into a methodized whole, and especially of those four Latin Doctors, St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Austin, by whom the final judgment of the Western Church had been expressed. It was not to be expected that such an author could directly oppose any synodical decree, which the Church had put forth as the basis of its teaching. It would have been strange indeed if he had been unmindful of that decree of the Council of Orange, which concluded the contentions respecting grace, by which the ancient Church had so long been agitated. "This, too, we consider to be accordant to the Catholic Faith, that all the baptized, having received grace through Baptism, can fulfil, if they will labour faithfully, and ought, by Christ's help and co-operation, to fulfil whatever is needed for the salvation of their souls."[11] Now here are the very conditions which Mr. Goode sets down as essential, in his judgment, to the assertion of Baptismal regeneration; the statement, namely—first, that grace is bestowed on *all* who are baptized; and, secondly, that the gift bestowed on the baptized "does not apply to them merely as infants, but extends to their condition as adults." For here it is *all* who are baptized,

[11] Harduin, ii. 1001.

and the gift bestowed is spoken of as contributing to future obedience.

Such, then, was the position in which this doctrine had been left by those Fathers whom Lombard epitomized. Neither had the succession of doctrine been since interrupted. For in the ninth century the same two criteria re-appear in the statements of the Council of Valence,[12] which makes especial reference to the previous Synod of Orange, as having fixed the consent of doctrine on this momentous subject. This Council was called on occasion of those disputes on Predestination, which had been revived in Dauphiny; and it affirms, first, the regeneration of all baptized persons; and, secondly, the necessity of their continuance in grace given. And thus are we carried on to the divines of the twelfth century, of whom it will be enough to mention two, as showing what was the mode of thought which Peter Lombard inherited. For he owed his first introduction to the University of Paris to the patronage of St. Bernard, who thus forms the link between the Fathers and the Schoolmen. And St. Bernard recommended him to the care of Gildin, Abbot of St. Victor, whose society was just then adorned by the celebrated Hugh of St. Victor. Now what were their sentiments on Baptism? Two

[12] "Quod *omnis* multitudo fidelium ex aqua et Spiritu sancto *regenerata*, ac per hoc veraciter ecclesiæ incorporata, et in morte Christi baptizata, in ejus sanguine sit a peccatis suis abluta. . . . Alios salvari æterna salute, quia per gratiam Dei in redemptione sua fideliter *permanent*, . . . alios, quia noluerunt permanere in salute fidei, quam initio acceperunt, redemptionisque *gratium* potius irritam facere quam servare elegerunt, ad perceptionem æternæ beatitudinis nullo modo pervenire."—*Harduin*, v. p. 91.

passages are subjoined from the second, showing that he maintained *every* infant to receive the gift which it bestows; and also that the gift communicated is spiritual grace.[13] The words of St. Bernard are still more to the point, because they indicate what it was which Lombard designed by that forgiveness of original sin, which Mr. Goode allows him to have attributed to Baptism. He did not conceive that the removal of man's guilt was effected by any technical alteration in his external circumstances, but by such inward purification, as the Holy Ghost only can effect. It was this real change, which the blood of the Son of God had purchased for the faithful. "What, therefore, is that *grace*, whereof we have investiture by Baptism? It is the purification, surely, of our sins. For who can make *him* clean, who is conceived of unclean seed, save He, who only is clean, to whom sin belongs not, God?" "We are washed, therefore, in Baptism, because the hand-writing of our condemnation is done away, and this *grace* is given to us, that henceforth concupiscence should harm us not, if only we abstain from giving consent to it."[14]

These statements lead us on to the doctrine of

[13] "Sacramentum et rem sacramenti suscipiunt parvuli ubicunque et a quibuscunque baptizantur in nomine S. Trinitatis."—*Hugo de. S. Victore. Summa Sententiarum*, vol. i. 460.

"Per verbum elementum canctificatur, ut virtutem sacramenti accipiat. Ut quemadmodum elementum ex naturali quadam qualitate repræsentat, ex superaddita institutione significat: sic ex sanctificatione contineat (quæ sanctificandis per eam impertienda est) gratiam spiritualem."—*De Sacramentis*, Lib. ii. p. 6, sec. ii. vol. iii. 620.

[14] Sermo in Cœna Domini, 2, 3, vol. i. p. 897. Paris, 1719.

Peter Lombard, which differed in one very essential point from that of the later Schoolmen. For whereas they separated those gifts, which grace bestows upon men, from their Divine Giver; speaking of them as habits infused into the mind, which, when bestowed, may, by some perhaps be supposed to be our own; he, on the contrary, keeping nearer to the statements of antiquity, identified the "love of God which is shed abroad in our hearts," with the spirit which sheds it. By this means he avoids a question which is sometimes raised respecting the words of the Apostles, whether by love they mean that principle of which God is the source, or that of which He is the object. For according to him these things differ from one another, only as the fountain differs from the stream.[15] "It has been stated that the Holy Ghost is that love of the Father and of the Son, whereby they love us, and whereby they are loved mutually by one another. Further, this Holy Ghost is that love or Charity, whereby we love God and our neighbour; and when this charity so prevails in us, as to make us love God and our neighbour, then the Holy Ghost is said to be given to us."[16] This is virtually the same statement for which Petavius produces abundant authorities from the writings of the Fathers. "That which even in this life gilds us with the glory of sons I mean the Holy Ghost, because it

[15] "Misit autem nobis de cœlo Paracletum, per quem et in quo nobiscum est, et in nobis habitat, non alienum nobis infundens, sed substantiæ suæ et Patris proprium Spiritum."—*S. Cyril de Sancta Trin*, Dial. vii. vol. v. p. 642.

[16] Lib. Sent. i. 17, B.

belongs to the Son, will produce the adoption of sons even in others: in Him its work is not wrought, because not coming to Him from without, but being substantially one with Him; and through Him it flows forth to those who are worthy to receive Him, by the good pleasure of the Father."[17] Or again take the following passage: "Our Lord says, 'He that is least in the Kingdom of God, is greater than John the Baptist.' The words can refer only in one way to the person who is newly baptized, and whose own conduct can as yet give him no claim to prominence; namely that the Blessed Baptist was born of woman, but he has been born of God, and has become partaker of the Divine nature, having the Holy Ghost dwelling in him, and being now the temple of God."[18] Now it is plain that those who entertained this view of things could not make that separation, which Mr. Goode attributes to Lombard, between the forgiveness of sins, and the gift of grace. For the first must be supposed to come through that participation in the Divine nature which is communicated through the second. And this, Lombard tells us in express words, is to refer the forgiveness of original sin in Baptism to that gift of grace, from which Mr. Goode alleges that he meant to discriminate it. "There are two ways in which original sin is said to be remitted in Baptism; by the *grace* of Baptism concupiscence is weakened, so as not to reign, unless man gives it strength by consenting to it;

[17] S. Cyril, Dial. de Trin. in Petavius de Trin. viii. iv. 10.
[18] St. Cyril on St. John, v. 39, vol. iv. p. 475.

and its guilt (reatus) is done away. Whence Augustin says in his book on the Baptism of Infants, that this is the work which is effected by grace through Baptism, that the old man is crucified, and the body of sin destroyed: yet that this work is not so completely effected, as that while we live, concupiscence is wholly destroyed, but only that what we bring with us into the world, will not injure us after we die." He concludes, therefore, "concupiscence is weakened in Baptism, and for this reason it is said to be put away, and *not merely* because guilt is expunged in it."[19]

This statement shows how utterly groundless is Mr. Goode's opinion, that the Master of the Sentences imagined original sin to be forgiven, but did not imagine grace to be conferred in Baptism. In concordance with those who preceded him, he did not dissever things, which are in their nature inseparable. For though the forgiveness of sins was purchased once for all upon the Cross, yet it does not belong to any, but those who, through the work of the Holy Ghost, are made members of Christ. Our own Lanfranc had expressed the same truth in the preceding century, when maintaining that Baptism, without the Holy Eucharist, sufficed for the salvation of infants. "'As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.' Now, to put on Christ, is to have God as our inhabitant through the remission of sins."[20] This, then, was Peter Lombard's notion of the forgiveness of original sin; it results, according to him, from that ap-

[19] Lib. ii. 32, B.

[20] Wilkins's Concilia, i. 361.

plication of Christ's merits, which is bestowed by the Holy Ghost on those in whom He takes up His dwelling. Thus, in speaking of Confirmation, he says that its advantage "is the gift of the Holy Ghost for corroboration, as in Baptism the same gift is bestowed for the forgiveness of sins." And he quotes an authority, which puts confirmation the higher of the two, as bestowing a greater amount of virtue, "although Baptism avails more to forgiveness. And this," he adds, "Raban seems to indicate when saying, that in Baptism the Holy Ghost descends to consecrate a dwelling for God."[21] These passages enable us to discern the nature of that gift of forgiveness of sins, which Lombard attributes to Baptism. It is a gift which, according to his statement, is attained through the presence of the Holy Ghost. When he asserts, therefore, that this gift is bestowed upon all infants, he asserts that in all there is the indwelling of grace. "The external sign, and the thing signified, are received simultaneously by all infants, who are washed from original sin in Baptism."[22] It is utterly erroneous, therefore, to represent Lombard as doubting that grace is bestowed in Baptism, because he states that the gift which has been imparted needs to be continually augmented as men grow in years, by the further influx of that Blessed Spirit, from whom it originally proceeded. This is all which he has said in the passage quoted by Mr. Goode; and his meaning is rendered with far more fairness by that honest epitomiser, Dupin: "Dans la qua-

[21] Lib. Sent. iv. 7, A, B.

[22] Lib. Sent. iv. 4, A.

triéme Distinction il traite des effets du Baptême; comment les uns reçoivent le Sacrement et la Grace du Sacrement, et comment les autres reçoivent le Sacrement sans la Grace, et la Grace sans le Sacrement. Il prouve que les enfans reçoivent l'un et l'autre, et insinuë qu'ils reçoivent même la Grace actuelle qui leur sert dans la suite pour faire de bonnes actions."

Enough has been said of Lombard. After his time the minds of men took a more speculative turn; and the nature of that gift, which was expressed by the name of grace, came into consideration. As the Aristotelian theory of habits mingled with the ancient theology, the notion that Divine assistance was nothing else than Christ's presence through the Spirit, was exchanged for the doctrine of habitual grace. Inasmuch as "light puts something into the illuminated body, and grace is a sort of light of the soul," it was held that "in the soul of the justified there was a habit of grace or a supernatural quality,"[23] which was something distinct from the spirit which infused it. On this arose the further question, whether the gift of the Spirit, which all admitted to be conferred at Baptism implied the infusion of that habit of grace, which was supposed to be its consequence. This, however, is a question which many great writers in the Church of Rome have declared to be immaterial. Out of the host of testimonies, which Morinus has collected, it will be enough to quote a few statements from Vasquez. He admits "that there was no dispute between the Fathers and the Pelagians about habitual grace; the only question regarded Divine

[23] Summa Theol. 1ma. 2dæ. Q. 110, 1 and 2.

assistance." Again he says, "that habitual grace without special assistance is very weak: and the will, even if it has it, needs some external stimulant to excite it to action. Habitual grace," he allows, "is not necessary to preserve man from mortal sin; actual grace preventing and assisting them is sufficient; and habitual grace contributes little to it." So that Morinus concludes, "if those most learned men of their day, Peter of Poitiers, Peter the Chanter of Paris, Stephen the Englishman, Præpositivus, and the other disciples of Peter Lombard, who were the first to sow the seeds of these questions, had referred rather to the dicta of the ancient Fathers, than to their own logical arguments, they would have saved themselves and their successors from falling into worse perplexities than those which Chrysippus suggested — perplexities from which their disciples have never been able to extricate themselves. Therefore, since men of such weight and name in the Church—Soto, Canus, Medina, Tapper, Pighius, Stapleton, Molina, Vasquez, teach us as they do about the opinion of the ancient Fathers, and the dogmas of the Schoolmen on this matter; and since experience convinces those who are versed in the writings of antiquity that their statements are true, I shall take no notice of these ingenious subtleties."[24] It is plain, then, that the question whether the grace infused in Baptism be actual or habitual, was one which arose only out of the reasonings of the Schoolmen, and was wholly irrespective of the inquiry, whether through Baptism infants became the dwelling-place of the Holy Ghost. This last point was assumed by Aquinas, as the

[24] "De Disciplina Pœnitentiæ," viii. 7, 11, 12.

basis, on which to found an argument for the infusion of virtues. "Baptism, as Augustin says in his book on the baptizing of infants, has this effect, that the baptized are incorporated into Christ as His members. But from Christ the Head, there flows into all His members the plenitude of grace and virtue, according to the words of St. John, 'of His fulness have all we received.'"[25] That which was recognized, therefore, by Pope Innocent in 1250, "as an open question," was not, as Mr. Goode supposes, whether the gift of the Holy Ghost is bestowed in Baptism, respecting which no dispute had existed among the learned men, to whom he alludes; the question concerned only the nature of the gift; whether it was merely the Spirit's presence, or that *habitual grace*, which was supposed to pass in some mysterious manner into human virtues. The question is so wholly independent of Baptismal Regeneration, that it does not appear to be ruled in the Roman Church at the present day. The Council of Trent passed it over. And the doctrine of habitual grace was only declared to be *more probable* by Clement V., when treated of A. D. 1312, at a Council, which was not held, as Mr. Goode supposes, at Vienna,[26] but at the more appropriate locality of Vienne,[27] in Dauphiny. So that there exists not a shadow of evidence for supposing that Baptismal grace was denied by any party in the Church from the time of Pelagius to that of Zuinglius. The universal concurrence of

[25] Summa Theol. iii. Q. 69, 4.

[26] I should attribute this mistake to an error of the press, but that Mr. Goode speaks more than once of what he calls "the Council of Vienna."

[27] Harduin, vii. 1359.

writers accords with that which was expressed by the ancient rituals; wherein it was entreated for every infant, "ut fiat templum Dei vivi, et Spiritus Sanctus habitet in eo."[28] And to suppose that this truth is invalidated by the disputes respecting habitual grace, is as if it were denied that Caxton introduced printing into England, because stereotype printing was introduced into this country by William Ged, in the eighteenth century.

The question has been treated more at large, because upon it rests Mr. Goode's weightiest argument—that which is drawn from the sentiments of Cranmer. It seems to be admitted, that Cranmer had the main hand in compiling King Edward's first Prayer-Book, and consequently in putting together the bulk of our Baptismal Offices. Mr. Goode, therefore, has sought diligently for proof of Cranmer's accordance with himself; and persuades himself that the result is decisive in his favour. "If it shall appear," he says, "and I believe it to be undeniable, that their doctrine" (*i. e.* of our Reformers) "was, in the most important points, what is now called 'Calvinistic,' there is, or ought to be, an *end* to the controversy, as to the interpretation they intended to be given to our Formularies, both as respects Baptism, and several other points." And after quoting various passages from "The Institution of a Christian Man," commonly attributed to Cranmer, he speaks of "these remarkable passages," as overthrowing the very foundations of that Laudean system of theology, pressed upon us by some under the name of 'Church principles.'" But Mr. Goode's career of

[28] Martene de Ant. Ritibus, i. 80.

success is of necessity checked by one circumstance. The passages which he selects as so decisive, were penned ten years before King Edward's first Prayer-Book, and, therefore, before Cranmer can be supposed, according to any hypothesis, to have shaken off that belief in Baptismal grace, which he must have acquired in his childhood. For it happens curiously enough, that the passages which Mr. Goode supposes to be most favourable to him in Cranmer's writings, are taken from the "Articles about Religion," A. D. 1536, "The Institution of a Christian Man," A. D. 1537, and Cranmer's remarks upon the same, A. D. 1538. And hence arises the absolute necessity under which Mr. Goode is placed, of proving that the Church of Rome, before the Council of Trent, did not teach Baptismal Regeneration, any more than the Church of England. To this opinion he frequently recurs; "we have already seen," he says, "how much the Romanists were divided among themselves on the question of the effects of Baptism in infants, previously to the Council of Trent." Whereas, that grace is bestowed upon infants in Baptism, has been shown to have been the unanimous and unquestioned opinion of the Mediæval Church; and, singularly enough, this particular point has been taken for granted by the Council of Trent,[29] and not supposed to require separate notice.

[29] So observes Bishop Davenant, when maintaining that the Roman Church has not decided that habits are infused at Baptism; he says, "Addo, Concilium Tridentinum non sic statuisse."—[*Letter to Ward.*] When Perrone, therefore, would establish the agency of grace, as doing away original sin in Baptism, he refers to the Scriptures, and to the testimony of the Ancient Church, and accounts for the omission of this subject

So that to suppose Cranmer to have dissented from the universal belief, ten years before he ceased to employ the ancient Service-Books, is to attribute to him a disingenuousness as strange as it is discreditable. For the very year in which the Articles about Religion "were put forth, Cranmer acted as Godfather[30] at the christening of King Edward the VI." If he really disbelieved in the gift of Baptismal grace, how could he have taken part in such services as the Adjuration? "Retire, Satan, from this servant of God, because Our God and Lord Jesus Christ has vouchsafed to call him for Himself to His grace and blessing, and the font of Baptism by the gift of the Holy Ghost."[31] Or take the words which Cranmer himself probably used at the Child's Confirmation:[32] "Almighty, eternal God, who has vouchsafed to regenerate this Thy servant by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given to him remission of all his sins, send down upon him Thy sevenfold Spirit."[33] Or take, as still more distinctive, the consecration of the font, which, whether used on that occasion or no, was a constituent part

by the Council of Trent. "Licet vero Concilium in eo non loquatur expresse nisi de reatu peccati originalis, prout ferebat ejus scopus; evidens tamen est, per gratiam, quæ ope Baptismi infunditur, tolli reatum," &c.—*Prælec. Theol.* vol. vi. *De Baptismo*, 170.

[30] "In October, on St. Edward's even, was born at Hampton Court, the noble Impe. Prince Edward, whose Godfathers at the Christening were the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Duke Norfolk, &c., and at the Bishopyng was Godfather the Duke of Suffolk, &c.—*Grafton's Chronicle.*

[31] Maskell's Monumenta Ritualia. i. 7.

[32] It appears from Grafton that he confirmed Elizabeth immediately after he had acted as her Sponsor at Baptism.

[33] Maskell, i. 34.

of the ancient offices. "May the Holy Ghost impregnate this water, which has been prepared for the regeneration of men, with the secret admixture of His own light: that through the sanctification conceived from Him, there may emerge from the unpolluted womb of the Divine fountain, a celestial seed, re-born into a new being." "May the font be living, its water regenerating, its wave purifying. That all who are to be washed in this salutary laver, through the operation within them of the Holy Ghost, may obtain the blessing of perfect purification."[34]

How can such expressions harmonize with unbelief in Baptismal blessings? Nor need Cranmer be supposed to have been acting under compulsion, if he sanctioned such statements as these, since he retained some of the most significant of the ancient usages in King Edward's days, when it was safe for him to follow his own will; and it was only in the Second Book of King Edward, A. D. 1552, that at Bucer's instance they were omitted. If we would understand Cranmer's position, then, up to 1548, we must take into account those parts of the Service, which at that time, and acting on his own motion, he retained in it. Of this kind is not only the benediction of the water, since happily restored, but the adjuration and the delivery of the Chrisome. "Take this white vesture, for a token of the innocency, which by God's *grace* in this holy Sacrament of Baptism is given unto thee." These seem to be sufficient evidences of Cranmer's mind. But if a

dogmatical statement be preferred, such an one may be found in the articles of agreement with the Germans, A. D. 1538, which Dr. Jenkyns[35] has identified with Cranmer's authority. After stating that "in adults, besides contrition, there must be faith, in those promises which the Sacraments exhibit," the Article on the Sacraments goes on to say, "as to infants, since it would be rash to exclude them from the mercy of God, especially when Our Lord says in the Gospel, 'suffer the little children to come unto Me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven;' and again, 'unless one be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven,' and since by the perpetual custom of the Catholic Church from the times of the Apostles, it has been received that infants ought to be baptized for the remission of sins and for salvation; we say that the Holy Ghost is efficacious in them, and purifies them in Baptism."[36] Now, with these facts before us, we may surely retort upon Mr. Goode his own argument, and say, "here then, in this very document of 1537, we find an end of the whole controversy." For his whole position rests upon the statement, first, that the Reformers were Calvinists; secondly, that Calvinists cannot believe Baptismal Regeneration. But the strongest ground which he can find, that on which alone he rests as deciding the matter, consists of expressions, which were used by Cranmer, at a time when it cannot be dis-

[35] "There ean be no doubt, either that the Book of Articles was considered at that time of great importance, or that Cranmer was concerned in framing it,"—*Jenkyns's Preface*, p. xxiii

[36] Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iv. p. 2, 286.

puted that he was a firm believer in the doctrine in question. What is the conclusion but that Mr. Goode is mistaken either in thinking that Cranmer's words really involve an admission of the tenets of Calvin; or else in supposing that a theoretic adoption of Calvinism is incompatible with a belief in Baptismal grace? His argument runs as follows:

Archbishop Cranmer, A. D. 1536–8, used strong language respecting the Divine decrees.

Those who use strong language respecting the Divine decrees cannot believe in the re-creation of man through baptismal grace.

Therefore Crammer did not believe this doctrine.

Now for this argument we may substitute the following:

Archbishop Cranmer, A. D. 1536–8, used strong language respecting the Divine decrees.

But the re-creation of men through Baptismal Grace was firmly held by Archbishop Cranmer, A. D. 1536–8.

Therefore this doctrine may be believed by those who hold strong language respecting the Divine decrees.

Now this conclusion is absolutely fatal to Mr. Goode's argument; for the great weight, which he has attached to these statements of Cranmer—the prominent place in which he has put them—shows that if these passages do not make out his case, he has no others which can do so. He has no other words so strong, by which to show that the Reformers agree with him; and if the use of equivocal expressions was compatible with a be-

lief in baptismal grace in Cranmer who compiled the service, it is so in others who have adopted it.

Here, then, so far as strict argument goes, we might stop; but I proceed to give some elucidations of the passages extracted. They are taken from the "Formularies of Faith," published at Oxford, A. D. 1825. Of these the "Articles about Religion," and the "Institution of a Christian Man," were supposed to have been written by Cranmer, or under his influence; in the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition," which followed A. D. 1543, he probably had less participation. The passages, however, which Mr. Goode has drawn from the two first works, only illustrate the rule, which has been attributed to the Fathers, that they sometimes speak of God's grace in respect to its *gift*, and sometimes in respect to its *employment*. Now,[37] regarded in the latter light, the possession of God's grace is equivalent to the certainty of salvation. In the passages before us accordingly, grace, election, predestination, are spoken of as the possession of God's people, but the statememt (as shall be shortly shown) is unaccompanied by those characteristic distinctions, which are required to give it a Calvinistic force. Another circumstance may be observed in these extracts; a tendency, namely, to that peculiar view of justifying faith (at one time strongly advocated by Luther,) whereby its essential quality was supposed to lie in the cer-

[37] Peter Lombard could say: "Prædestinatorum nullus videtur posse damnari, nec reproborum aliquis posse salvari." But he adds: Si enim cum dicis, Predæstinatus non potest damnari, intelligas ita, id est, non potest esse ut prædestinatus sit et damnetur, verum dicis."—*Lib. Senten.* i. 40, B.

tainty which each man entertained of his own salvation. This opinion Luther was compelled by experience to modify; and Cranmer took a very different view of things when he subsequently penned that Homily of Salvation, to which our Article refers us. Some of the strongest passages which Mr. Goode selects, are built upon this last principle. And yet it is not a principle, which is tied necessarily to the system of Calvin: Luther,[38] by whom it had been introduced, was writing strongly against the principles of Necessity, in the very year in which the "Articles about Religion" appeared; and the persons among whom the notion most prevails at the present day, are the Arminian Methodists. For, in truth, this principle is introduced into the Formularies before us, as a part of that work of Contrition, to which all sinners are exhorted. One requisite to Contrition has always been supposed to be the hope of pardon. And this

[38] Men should not turn their eyes on the secret sentence of Election, Foreknowledge, and Predestination, as they are called; for such speeches lead to doubts, security, or despair: are you elected? no fall can hurt you, and you cannot perish—are you not elected? there is no remedy for it. These are shocking speeches, and men ought not to fix their hearts on such thoughts; but the Gospel refers us to the proclaimed word of God, wherein He has revealed His will, and through which he will be known, and will work." "For if a man was to rule his life according to the secret counsels of God, we could make nothing of God's command of the Gospel, of the Sacrament, yea, of Christ Himself, but should go over head into excess like swine."—*Luther's Letters, No.* 1753, [*De Wette.*]

"The statements which here occur," says Seckendorf, "show what was Luther's view upon this subject, and what interpretation we ought to give to some overstrong statements of his, which are elsewhere to be met with."—*Hist. Lib.* 3, xlix.

hope, set forth in a somewhat unguarded form, and unaccompanied by the qualifications which are usually associated with it, has been mistaken by Mr. Goode for the assertion of Calvinism.

But how is the diversity of the two systems to be established? What proof can be brought, that Calvinism was not really designed? We must seek for some discriminating condition, by which the one system may be known from the other. Such a means of discrimination is afforded by the circumstance, that while Calvinism bases man's Predestination on an arbitrary decree, whereby some persons are assigned to happiness and others to misery (thus applying a coercive force to the ultimate springs of action, and superseding the responsibility of man,) the "Institution of a Christian man," on the contrary, assumes that salvation may be attained by all, and that a confiding faith is that appointed mean, through which men are to attain it. No doubt Calvinists would often express the same hope, but in them such a profession would be the same happy inconsistency which enables them to admit the doctrine of baptismal grace. And therefore this inconsistency cannot be pleaded by those who maintain, at the same time, that their system is incompatible with a belief in Sacramental efficacy. And this is the particular position which Mr. Goode claims for Cranmer. The archbishop's argument, as he understands it, is as follows:

All who are members of the Church will be saved.

But God's grace is not given to any except members of the Church.

Therefore God's grace is not given to any but

those who will finally be saved. Now, the defect in Mr. Goode's conclusion arises from the same cause which has already been pointed out; the Church is spoken of by Cranmer in a twofold sense;[39] in one case it is used for those to whom its blessings are *given*, in the other for those by whom they are *employed*. Such variety in the mode of speaking has the highest authority. "I am the vine: ye are the branches." "Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit He taketh away." Here is a sense in which Judas was a branch in the True Vine, and a sense in which he was not so. This double mode of speaking is professedly employed by Cranmer in the work before us. He speaks of those who, for "obstinate persevering in mortal sin," "shall finally be found *either* to be *out* of the same Church, *or else* to be as *dead* members therein."[40] No doubt he exhorts every one to such faith as that he should be able to say, "undoubtedly I trust that I am united and corporated as a living member into this Catholic Church." Again,

"I believe that in this catholic Church, I and all the lively and quick members of the same, shall continue, and from time to time, so long as we shall live here on earth, obtain remission and forgiveness of all our sins, as well original as actual, by the merits of Christ's blood and His Passion, and by the virtue and efficacy of Christ's Sacraments, instituted by Him for that purpose, so oft as we shall worthily receive the same.[41]

---

[39] The twofold way of speaking of the Church, is enlarged upon in the Articles agreed upon by Cranmer with the Lutheran Delegates: "Ecclesia acceptiones duas habet præcipuas," &c.—*Jenkyns's Cranmer*, iv. 277.

[40] Formularies, p. 59.

[41] Ibid. p. 58.

But with these passages are united various references[42] to final judgment, and to the possibility of self-deception, as well as assertions like that which concludes our Seventeenth Article, of the general applicability of the promises of God.

These statements, however, are not decisive. Some certain criterion is wanted, if we would separate Cranmer's words from the Calvinistic system. And such a criterion is provided by one of those passages, which Mr. Goode has himself selected—a passage so distinct, that he would surely have observed it, but for the hurry with which he professes that his work was written. For it is manifest that if Cranmer was precluded from admitting Baptismal Regeneration, by that rigid system of Calvinism which excludes all except those who

41 "All they transgress this commandment, which either so much presume upon the mercy of God that they fear not His justice, and by reason hereof still continue in their sin; or else so much fear His justice, that they have no trust in His mercy, and by reason thereof fall into desperation."—*Formularies.* p. 133.

"If in his lifetime he had not this right faith and belief in Christ, or having opportunity, did not express this obedience, but transgressed the laws of God, and so died without repentance, although he pretended and said that he believed never so much, and trusted in Christ's benefits never so much, yet shall he be judged and condemned to the everlasting pains of hell." *Id.* p. 71.

"It is greatly to be wished and desired, that as all Christian men do know the same, so that every man might knowledge and undoubtedly believe the same to be true and verified, even upon himself; so that both he may humble himself to God, and knowledge himself a miserable sinner not worthy to be called his son, and yet surely trust that to him, being repentant, God's mercy is ready to forgive.—*Annot.* 86 *on the King's Book. Jenkyns,* ii. p. 93.

will be saved from any real communication of spiritual blessings, he could not have spoken of persons who will finally be impenitent as partaking of grace. But what does he say? "Forasmuch as they," *i. e.*, the wicked, "do live in the common society or company of those which be the very quick and living members of Christ's Mystical Body, and outwardly do profess, receive, and consent with them for a season in the doctrine of the Gospel, and in the right using of the Sacraments; *yea, and oftentimes be endued with right excellent gifts of the Holy Ghost*, they be to be accounted and reputed here in this world, to be in the number of the said very members of Christ's Mystical Body, so long as they be not by open sentence of excommunication precided and excluded from the same."[43] Now, although it is plainly admitted, as Cranmer goes on to mention, that such persons are not members of Christ "in very deed," that they cannot be looked at as portions of the Church if the *employment* of grace be considered, how can it be doubted that he attributed this failure, not to the absence of the *gift* of grace, but to the carelessness which omitted to improve it?

The work under consideration contains, moreover, not a few distinct statements, that an especial gift of grace is bestowed in Holy Baptism. The "Articles about Religion" open with a statement that, touching the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, men must believe "those things which hath been always, by the whole consent of the Church approved, received, and used."[44] Now this of ne-

[43] Formularies, p. 54. [44] Ibid. p. 6.

cessity carries us back to the statements of the Council of Orange, where a gift of grace is said to be bestowed upon all the baptized. Then follow various assertions, as, for instance, that those "who minister the sacraments of God," "by the same confer and give the graces of the Holy Ghost:"[45] that the circumstances whereby Baptism and the Holy Eucharist are discriminated from various other Christian ordinances, is that "they have annexed and conjoined unto their said visible signs such spiritual graces, as whereby our sins be remitted and forgiven."[46] The distinction is carefully drawn between the efficacy of the work wrought upon the cross, and the efficacy of the work of the minister; the first is shown to contribute its whole value to the ordinance: "priests and ministers do break this" (third) "commandment, if, in the administration of the Sacraments, they yield not the whole efficacy, virtue and grace, thereof to our Lord, as the very author of the same; but ascribe the said efficacy, virtue and grace, or any part thereof, to themselves:"[47] but at the same time, we are told that "though parents be never so clean purged and pardoned of their original sin by Baptism, and by the *grace* and mercy of God, ... yet, nevertheless the children be full of corruption of original sin, until that by Baptism in the blood of Our Saviour Jesus Christ, they be washed and purged as their parents were."[48] But what can possibly be clearer than the following passage? Among the points of belief is said to be:—

[45] Formularies, p. 101.
[46] Ibid. p. 129.
[47] Ibid. p. 140.
[48] Ibid. p. 187.

"That it is offered unto all men as well as infants, as such as have the use of reason, that by Baptism they shall have remission of all their sins, the grace and favour of God, and everlasting life,[49] according to the saying of Christ, 'whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Item—That the promise of grace and everlasting life (which promise is adjoined unto this Sacrament of Baptism) pertaineth not only unto such as have the use of reason, but also to infants, innocents and children; and that they ought, therefore, and must needs be baptized; and that by the Sacrament of Baptism they do also obtain remission of their sins, the grace and favour of God, and be made thereby the very sons and children of God. Insomuch as infants and children dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, and else not. Item—that infants must needs be christened, because they be born in original sin, which sin must needs be remitted; which cannot be done but by the Sacrament of Baptism, *whereby they receive the Holy Ghost*, which exerciseth His grace and efficacy in them, and cleanseth and purifieth them from sin by His most secret virtue and operation."[50]

It seems astonishing that any one should misunderstand this language. But Mr. Goode sees nothing in it, which speaks of children at large; he thinks it applicable only to those whom a prevenient decree has marked out for salvation; and he thinks this explanation may be reconciled with the unqualified language of Cranmer, because similar expressions occur in writers by whom they are modified by qualifications. But Cranmer introduces no such qualifications. It had been usual for fifteen centuries, to speak of Baptism as being the instrument whereby infants were united to Christ. The first writers who disputed this truth did not venture to throw off the established

[49] At this point Cranmer professed himself willing that the following sentence should be inserted: "If they die in that grace, which by the Sacrament of Baptism is conferred to them, and not by sin alter the same."—*Jenkyns's Cran.* vol. i. p. 38 and 77.

[50] Formularies, p. 93.

language, but they introduced qualifying circumstances, by which its efficacy might be limited. And now Mr. Goode would have us suppose that these qualifications not only indicate the judgment of those by whom they were made, but likewise of those by whom they were not made. Cranmer is not to be allowed to speak generally when he says, "by the Sacrament of Baptism infants receive the Holy Ghost," because Calvin could have said as much, if he might have added that he spoke of that which was *possible* in *elect* infants. It may be truly affirmed that baptized adults will be saved, if they duly receive and rightly improve this ordinance. But it would not on that account be safe to say, unconditionally, that baptized adults will be saved. Neither would the qualifications which are used by others have justified Cranmer in making this general assertion respecting infants, unless he had believed it. And this brings us back to what was shown from external evidence; *i. e.* that at that period, at any rate, he could not have disbelieved the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. If there should be any passages, therefore, in the "Institution of a Christian man," which cannot be explained on the principles previously introduced—any which seem (as Mr. Goode alleges) to have a decidedly Calvinistic bearing, and to derogate from the responsibility of man—I have only to remind the reader that the more strong such passages may appear, the more decisive will be their testimony against Mr. Goode's hypothesis; since they would prove the more plainly that the Divine decree might be incautiously alluded to by men who never ques-

tioned the great truth of the re-creation of fallen Humanity through Sacramental union with the Incarnate Son.

A period of ten years from the time when Cranmer made his annotations on the King's Book, brings us to the year 1548, in which King Edward's First Prayer-Book was commenced. Now, it is upon the sentiments which he entertained at that time, that the interest of our inquiry into Cranmer's sentiments is mainly concentrated. For the object is not to know what he thought at large, but to disprove the assertion that those words of our Service-Book, which have come down unaltered from that period, were drawn up by parties who had a personal motive for rendering them equivocal. Whatever notions Cranmer might afterwards have adopted, supposing, of which there is no evidence, that he afterwards altered his mind respecting Baptism, as he did respecting the Eucharist, this circumstance would make no difference in respect to the meaning of those expressions, which the Church had previously taken under her guardianship.

> "Rursus cura patrum cadere et succedere matrum
> Incipit."

This circumstance gives peculiar importance to two documents—the first Book of Homilies, which was published the year before, and Cranmer's Catechism, published the same year with the composition of our Baptismal Offices. As a record of his opinions, of course, it is wholly immaterial whether the Archbishop employed Justus Jonas to translate this Catechism from the Latin, or

whether he translated it himself, since he published it under his own name, and prefixed a letter to King Edward, in which he expressed his hope that "by this little treatise the youth of your Grace's realm may learn to know God.[51] Now, this Catechism not only contains the most distinct statements that Regeneration is bestowed in Baptism, but by referring every individual to his Baptism, as a test whether he has received the gift of grace or no, it shows that the *general* statements, that this gift is bestowed upon children in Baptism, are meant to be truly *universal*. Mr. Goode's common objection to general statements of the efficacy of Baptism is, that they are intended to include the case of adults also; now in adults certain qualifications are required, *i. e.* faith and repentance, and since such general statements, therefore, must have been designed to admit one exception, they may have been designed to admit another.

Such a mode of reasoning has been already stated to be a violation of the received adage, *exceptio probat regulam;* by which it is not intended that you may take any exception which you please to every rule, but that the fact of thinking it necessary to justify deviation from a rule in one case, shows that you allow its authority in others. In the instance before us, the statements of Cranmer and of our Service-Book, that in the case of adults, Our Lord's general promises in Baptism require to be qualified by the condition of faith and repentance, show that in the case of infants,

[51] Jenkyns's Cran. i. 328.

in which no such condition is expressed, His *general* promises must be understood to be *universal.* But in the case of this Catechism, the objection which has been noticed cannot even rise. For it is not designed for adults, but for the profit of "children and young people." It states to them the necessity of knowing whether they have received the grace of the new Dispensation; and the manner of knowing it. "It is very necessary for us to know how we must be born again, and what this second birth is, without the which we cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Now, what is the means of knowing it? "He that is baptized may assuredly say thus: I am not now in this wavering opinion, that I only suppose myself to be a Christian man, but I am in a sure belief that I am made a Christian man. For I know of a surety that I am baptized, and I am sure also that Baptism was ordained of God, and that he which baptized me, did it by God's commission and commandment: and the Holy Ghost doth witness, that he which is baptized hath put upon him Christ. Wherefore the Holy Ghost in my Baptism assureth me that I am a Christian man."[52] One more passage shall be extracted from this Catechism. "The second birth is by the water of Baptism, which Paul calleth the bath of regeneration, because our sins be forgiven us in Baptism, and the Holy Ghost is poured into us, as into God's beloved children; so that by the power and working of the Holy Ghost, we be born again spiritually, and made new creatures.

[52] Fallow's "Baptismal Offices Illustrated," p. 74.

And so by Baptism we enter into the kingdom of God, and shall be saved for ever, if we continue to our lives' end in the faith of Christ."

It is a matter of some curiosity to see how Mr. Goode can escape the force of such plain language. He freely admits, that in Cranmer's works there occur "statements which, speaking of Baptism *in the abstract*, connect regeneration with it." But these *general* statements, he says, both in Cranmer and the Lutherans, are accompanied by qualifications, which show that they were not meant to be *universal*. These qualifications he states to arise from two sources, one, that though the promise is made at large, its effect does not follow unless the child possesses faith, which is not the case with all; the other qualification is supplied by a Divine decree, whereby some children are arbitrarily doomed to bliss, and others to misery. No doubt these two views might coincide in the same person, for those who refer to an arbitrary decree, might suppose that the gift of faith is the medium through which it operates. But in Mr. Goode's system, the two qualifications do duty in different cases: the Divine decree is commonly refered to; but when writers speak in a decidedly Anti-Calvinistic manner of the universal offer of grace, as did Luther and still more Melancthon, the argument from the necessity of faith comes in as a reserve. Now the case of Cranmer has been rested on the argument from decrees: the general language of the Archbishop is supposed to be qualified by that constant reference to a secret sentence on the part of God, which was ever present, as Mr. Goode feels assured, to his mind.

Here then the argument from faith is as needless, as Cranmer's own words show it to be inapplicable. For Cranmer,[53] as Mr. Goode himself allows, did not admit the qualification of faith to exist, or be possible in infants: indeed, he quotes approvingly St. Austin's words, that children "have not yet the mind to believe."[54] But when we come to this Catechism, Mr. Goode suddenly passes over from the qualification of decrees to that of faith, and suggests an explanation of Cranmer's words, which is wholly inconsistent with his own previous admissions. The reason appears to be, that the Catechism contains some such distinct statements of an Anti-Calvinistic kind, that it was necessary to have recourse to the other solution. "By Baptism we enter into the kingdom of God, and shall be saved for ever, *if we continue to our lives' end in the faith of Christ.*" Or again, "when they that believe and be baptized do *continue in this their faith to the end of their lives*, then God shall raise them up *from death to life.*"[55] Now, Mr. Goode having fully decided, that the words of the Reformers on Regeneration are not to be taken according to their natural sense, and having two qualifications present to his own mind, one or the other of which is to limit all the general expressions which they can possibly employ, forgets

[53] In the articles agreed upon with the Lutherans, A. D. 1538, the contrast drawn between children and adults seems to imply, that faith is not required in the *former*. "Nam in ratione utentibus necessum est, ut fides etiam utentis accedat."—*Jenkyns's Cran.* iv. p. 286.

[54] Cranmer's Works, ii. p. 385.

[55] "Fallow's Baptismal offices," p. 72, 79.

that, as regards Cranmer, he has as effectually shut himself out from employing the one, as the Archbishop's own expressions shut him out from employing the other. In the case of this Catechism, therefore, he tells us that "according to the well-known doctrine of Luther, faith is spoken of as essential to the salutary effect of Baptism." That this statement is ungrounded, even as respects Luther, has been already shown; but if it were true of him, what has this to do with Cranmer? Even if the Catechism were not, as Cranmer's Book against Gardiner says, "translated by himself, and set forth," yet its very title-page states it to have been "overseen and corrected by the Archbishop."[56] "This little book, by *me* offered to your Majesty,"[57] was received by Edward from Cranmer, and not from the Lutherans; and the argument from faith cannot therefore be brought in for the occasion, to supply the place of the argument from fatalism.

The main works of Cranmer, to which Mr. Goode refers, have now been mentioned: his other extracts prove nothing, but that Cranmer asserted that which is held by all Christians, that faith and love are essential, if the recipient would profit by that baptismal gift, which is bestowed upon him through the re-creation of his nature in Christ. These statements have no tendency to show him to have been a Calvinist; while passages in abundance show that he was not. Take the following words from the First Book of Homilies, published under his auspices:

[56] Strype's Cranmer, ii. 5. [57] Jenkyns's Cran. i. 329.

"Let us beware, good Christian people, lest that we rejecting or casting away God's word, by the which we obtain and retain true faith in God, *be not at length cast off* so far, that we become as the children of unbelief."[58] Or again take the words of his answer to Gardiner: "As the devil hath no power against Christ, so hath he none against us, *so long as we remain* grafted in that stock, and be clothed with that apparel, and harnessed with that armour."[59] But the reader shall not be detained by extracts from Cranmer's later works. For the point of moment in this case, is the view which he took at the compilation of the Prayer-Book, A. D. 1548. And again, my purpose is not to show that he asserted the reality of baptismal grace, as he does repeatedly in his works against Gardiner: but to prove only, that he was not possessed by such extreme Calvinism, as must render such words unmeaning. Now, it should not be forgotten, that in this case the burden of proof lies wholly on those, who would interpret our Formularies in a different sense from that which their words naturally convey. From the time of Pelagius it had always been supposed, in conformity with the decree of the Council of Orange, that all baptized infants receive grace. Why, then, are we to attribute any other meaning to the general statements of a similar kind, which occur in the private writings of the Reformers;

[58] Vide the whole Homily. "A sermon, how dangerous a thing it is to fall from God." It would be easy, of course, to make copious extracts to the same effect from Cranmer's own "Homily of Salvation."

[59] Defence, cap. xii.; Jenkyns's Cranmer, ii. p. 303.

or were introduced into the public offices of the Church? It is for those who, like Mr. Goode, suggests that some such qualifications are implied, to give distinct proof of it. But Mr. Goode is compelled to allow that, in the case of Cranmer, there is no direct proof that any such qualification was thought of. While he conceives that it may be gathered from "his general doctrine," he admits that "no direct testimony can be obtained from his writings respecting the particular case of infants; his subject not leading him any where to this point." Now a general concurrence might be sufficient to prove acquiescence in received opinions; but what force can it have when a wholly new position is to be adopted? Why should Cranmer be deemed to mean differently from all his predecessors unless he says so? Surely, it is a most rash and unwarrantable assumption to suppose that his distinct, repeated, and positive assurances, were meant to be set aside, on the ground of a secret condition, of which previous writers had afforded no precedent, and which was never expressed by himself in his numerous works.

So much respecting Cranmer. But there are two persons, to whose judgment Mr. Goode attaches such great importance, as indicating the Archbishop's mind, Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer, that something must be said respecting them. Now, considering that these persons had very recently arrived in England when Edward's first book was published (Martyr about the end of 1547, Bucer some time later,) their previous influence upon Cranmer cannot have been im-

portant. And since the question of Divine Decrees had not as yet become a leading matter of controversy, its connexion with the subject of baptismal grace was not a point by which men's agreement or disagreement would be tested. It was very possible, therefore, for the Archbishop to invite and entertain learned foreigners, with whom he agreed on many practical questions of immediate interest, while all along there lay at the bottom such a difference respecting the theory of Necessity, as is indicated by Cranmer's works. That such was the case is sufficiently proved by the fact, that Ochin, who is also said to have received a specific invitation from Cranmer, and of whom Strype tells us that he was entertained by him along with his other visiters, finally avowed himself a Socinian. Considering the nature of that heresy, it can hardly be supposed that its seeds were not even then latent in his mind. Now this circumstance, of which Strype takes no notice, shows that theoretical differences may have existed among those, whom the Archbishop found useful assistants in his practical designs.

The authority of Bucer has no doubt been the more referred to, because he had been engaged in drawing up the Cologne Service-Book of Archbishop Herman, A. D. 1543. This was no doubt consulted in the revision of our baptismal service; and a single Prayer, the Thanksgiving after the Gospel, has not been traced higher. But then it must be remembered that the Cologne Service-Book was drawn from that of Nuremberg, which itself was only a re-casting of the ancient bap-

tismal office of Germany. When Dr. Pusey[60] published the modern baptismal Offices in a tabular form, he was led by its internal structure to class Herman's Service among those of "Churches upon the Ancient Model," by way of discriminating it from those of the "Reformed Churches." The use therefore which was made by our Reformers of Herman's Service-Book, did not imply any accordance with the private opinions of Bucer, since it was only one instance of that rule which has been pointed out by Mr. Scott; "whence did the Church of England derive all the peculiar language, which she employs concerning newly-baptized infants? She did not invent it, she borrowed it from primitive times."[61]

And further, it must be remembered that Bucer occupied an intermediate position, which, in many respects brought him nearer to the Lutherans, by whom the doctrine of baptismal grace was affirmed, than to the Zuinglians, by whom it was rejected. In compiling Herman's Service-Book, he had been associated with Melancthon; and it was not possible therefore that in that case, he should have adopted the Anti-Sacramental system. Again, in 1536, he had joined in articles of agreement with the Lutherans, in which the reality of Baptismal grace is plainly admitted. It is to be regretted that Mr. Goode, who refers to this conference at Wittenberg, does not insert the resolutions which were adopted.[62] They are

[60] "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism," first edit. A. D. 1836.

[61] Scott's Defence, p. 47.

[62] "Cumque de talibus infantibus, qui sunt in Ecclesia dictum sit: Non est voluntas Patris, ut pereat unus ex illis; constat

introduced in Bucer's "Scripta Anglicana," as though indicating the principles which were avowed by him when he came into this country. Now these articles show that he fully adopted the tenet of Baptismal grace—in that sense, in which it was understood by Luther and Melancthon. If his words then were inconsistent with some theoretic notions of the Divine Decrees, which were not shared by those with whom he professed agreement, it by no means follows that he was practising any dishonest concealment; for the different fragments of which his judgment was composed, may have remained in his mind, without being fitted together. And this is the true cause of those orthodox expressions, which found their way even into various Zuinglian Confessions; so that to trace a work to "a staunch Calvinist," is no proof as Mr. Goode seems to suppose, that it may not speak the language of the ancient Church.

infantibus per baptismum contingere remissionem peccati originalis, et donationem Spiritus S. qui in eis efficax est pro ipsorum modo. Rejicimus enim errorem illorum, qui imaginantur infantes placere Deo, et salvos fieri sine actione illa Dei, cum Christus clare dicat, nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu, non potest intrare in regnum Dei.

"Et si igitur nos non intelligamus, qualis sit illa actio Dei in infantibus, tamen certum est in eis novos et sanctos motus effici: sicut et in Joanne in utero matris novi motus fiebant. Nam etiamsi non est imaginandum, quod infantes intelligant, tamen illi motus et inclinationes ad credendum Christo, et diligendum Deum sunt aliquo modo similes motui fidei et dilectionis. Hoc dicimus, cum infantes dicimus fidem habere. Ideo enim sic loquimur, ut intelligi possit, quod infantes non fiant sancti et salvi sine actione divina in ipsis." — *Bucer Scripta Anglic.* p. 668.

And here I must protest against the injustice with which Mr. Goode treats Archbishop Laurence. I say nothing of the criminative tone which Mr. Goode employs respecting living writers of every rank; both because it would be a needless presumption to interfere in such personal questions, and because I am satisfied that language of this sort is its own best antidote. Neither would I enter upon a general defence of Archbishop Laurence: indeed, I am ready to allow that it may be said of him in a measure, as it was of Bullinger, '*qu'il Melancthonizait:* had it been otherwise he would not have taken for granted the unjust accusations of the Lutheran writers against the Schoolmen. But to Mr. Goode's hostile judgment I would oppose the opinion of a less partial writer, who speaks of Laurence's Bampton Lectures, as "a work which contains, in small space, a larger quantity of valuable materials and original research, than almost any work I ever met with."[63] The point, however, to which I desire to call present attention, is the charge which Mr. Goode founds upon the case of Bucer. "Laurence," he says, "has by some unaccountable mistake, put down" Bucer "as a Lutheran, and hence used arguments grounded upon Bucer's case to the infinite damage of his own cause."[64] Now it is not true, on the one

[63] Faber, on "Primitive Election," p. 214.

[64] And again; "in short, the Archbishop has made a series of mistakes, and in consequence landed himself upon ground, where all that is left to him is to surrender at discretion. He has imagined Bucer to be a Lutheran," &c.—*Id.* p. 405.

"Nulli gravis est percussus Achilles."

hand, that Laurence puts down Bucer as a Lutheran; nor yet on the other was Bucer an Anti-Lutheran, as Mr. Goode's language would seem to imply. Laurence speaks of him as a mediator between the parties of Luther and Zuingle, who on the subject of the Eucharist was followed in a measure by Calvin.[65] Again, he observes upon the contrariety which existed between him and the Lutheran leaders, noticing, therefore, that Bucer was "not a too favourable judge"[66] of the sentiments of Melancthon. Again, when mentioning that "the leaders of the Reformation on both sides assembled at Wittenberg," A. D. 1536, he adds, "Bucer spoke on the part of the Zuinglians."[67] Indeed, it would seem that the charge, repeated more than once, that Bucer had been mistaken for a Lutheran, is grounded only upon the fact that Laurence speaks of the language of Herman's Service as Lutheran. But for this expression Laurence gives ample grounds —namely, that Melancthon co-operated with Bucer in the compilation of the Cologne Office; and further, that "it was not original, but in a great degree borrowed from a Liturgy previously established at Norimberg."[68] So that Laurence really represents Bucer as more completely identified with the Zuinglians, than, considering his

[65] Bampton Lecture, ii. p. 48.

[66] Id. note 13, on Serm. vii.

[67] "Doctrine of the Church of England upon the Efficacy of Baptism Vindicated from Misrepresentation," by Richard Laurence, part i. p. 90.

[68] Bamp. Lect. note ii. on Serm. viii.

accordance with Luther in 1536, can be altogether justified.

Even as respects Peter Martyr, Mr. Goode's strictures upon Laurence are hardly justifiable. "It is likewise certain," says Laurence, "that both immediately before and after" Martyr's "arrival here, the sentiments of Cranmer were completely at variance with his, upon one of the most important topics of the day, viz., the Sacramental Presence." On this passage Mr. Goode observes, that "evidence is producible that" Laurence "was mistaken." What is the evidence? It appears from letters recently printed, and to which Laurence had no access, that, September 28th, 1548, Cranmer was said, by one who probably agreed with Martyr, to have "come over to our opinion;" and that on the 14th December following, "contrary to general expectation" he avowed the same. But when did Martyr come into England? He left Strasburg in November, 1547, and was in England before the end of the year. And, therefore, that Cranmer should be spoken of as having "*come over*" to his opinion the following autumn, if so it were, is no proof that Laurence "was mistaken" in supposing that they differed "*immediately after his arrival.*" But there is no proof that these foreigners had at any time that complete agreement with the English Baptismal Service, which Mr. Goode attributes to them. Their approbation of it is limited altogether to that second Revision, from which Bucer's influence had obtained the omission of a most important part—the Prayer of Consecration, which

has been since restored. And Beza[69] vindicates Bucer from the imputation either of having been concerned in the compilation of our Prayer-Book, or of having agreed with it. In respect to Peter Martyr, the evidence of dissent is still more decisive. For it is admitted, that in the composition of the Baptismal Office, Lutheran models were freely followed, and when Cranmer would explain the nature of Baptism, he employed a Catechism derived from German sources. But Martyr's[70] judgment of the Lutheran Formularies was so entirely hostile, that he objected to employ the

[69] "Quod ad illam Anglicanam Reformationem attinet, quum dicis eam ex Buceri consilio ac voluntate fuisse institutam, magnam optimo viro injuriam facis," &c. "Nedum ut illa forma Anglicana acquieverit, cujus illum auctorem falso et impudenter facis."—*Bezæ Trac. Theol.* ii. 323. *Vide Laurence's Bamp. Lect.* note 20, in Serm. ii.

[70] Some English exiles at Frankfort "carried their children to be baptized by Lutheran Priests." Martyr, when consulted, objected to the practice. "They said, 'the difference was not so great between us in the matter of the Sacrament.' But Martyr said, 'it was of great moment, because in it there was a contest concerning the chief head of religion.' They added, 'that the Lutheran divines did think, in the matter of baptism, as they did!' But Martyr answered 'that they were mistaken; for those divines *affirmed more of the Sacrament than is fit;* and *tied the grace of God to Baptism;* and that they thought there was no salvation without baptism; and that they affirmed that infants had faith."—*Strype's Cranmer,* B. iii. cap. xv. How incomplete was Martyr's approval of our Service-Book, is manifest also from his own words to Bullinger, after the completion of the second Liturgy. He writes, June, 1552, "Reformatio in Anglia ob rem sacramentariam obtineri nequit. Liber tamen rituum ecclesiæ ac administrationis sacramentorum est emendatus. An usus sacramentorum gratiam Dei conferat, magnopere inter se disceptant Angli, qui ab operum meritis vix avelli possunt."—*Cardwell's Liturgies of Edward,* Introduction, p. xxxiii.

services of those who used them. And his objection seems to have rested upon that very assertion of the reality of Baptismal grace, which they share with the Offices of the Church of England.

From the First Book of King Edward, I pass at once to the additions to our Catechism after the Hampton Conference.* For the alteration of the Prayer-Book, A. D. 1552 (King Edward's Second Book,) and its resumption in the first year of Elizabeth, A. D. 1559, were events by which the meaning of our present offices are not affected. The great change in 1552 was the excision of many important usages. But the question respects not the meaning of that which was excinded, but of that which remains. Neither is it necessary to take any notice of the controversy on Free Will, which divided the Reformers in the time of Mary. A book, it seems, was written by Ridley, which has not come down to us. From the character of the man, and his own mention that he feared to make any assertion, to which the very words of Scripture did not lead him, it seems wholly impossible that he should have made any rash statements respecting the Divine Decrees. And had he done so, the Calvinistic party which for a time was in the ascendent, was not likely to have allowed his book to be forgotten. But it could indicate nothing respecting the meaning of those statements of our Service-Book, which had already been fixed by the Church.

The addition made to the Catechism after the Hampton Conference, A. D. 1604, is of considerable importance in the present inquiry, in consequence

of the subjects respecting which it treats. All which it is necessary to say here, is that its supposed author, Bishop Overall, was certainly not so wedded to Calvinistic opinions, as to be unable to assent, himself, to those distinct statements respecting Baptismal grace, into which his words have guided so many generations. His views on the subject are explained with great clearness in a (Latin) statement, which Mr. Goode attributes to him; and with still more fulness in a very interesting letter on the subject which he addressed to Grotius. Their peculiarity lies in this circumstance —that after setting forth the general doctrine of God's Decrees, somewhat in the manner which has been attributed to the ancient Church in the last Chapter, and affirming that *sufficient* grace is bestowed upon all members of Christ's Body; he proceeds to speak of a second and specific Decree (to which he supposed that St. Austin first called attention,) the object whereof is to bestow upon some few persons an irresistible gift of grace, which is never departed from. "This second Decree," he says, "does not supersede the previous arrangement" (whereby men are elected into the membership of the Church,) "but completes it; and, therefore, this system also is pious, or at least admissible." The objections to this notion are explained with great clearness by Hammond,[71] who shows that its results may "ra-

[71] "Your supposed intricacy is what it is that makes *sufficient* grace to be *effectual* to any. I say the *parable* of the *sower* was intended by Christ on purpose to answer that question, for here we see, the seed being the same (whether that were the *Word* or *grace* it matters not, as long as it is remembered that

ther be attributed to God's special Providence, than His special grace."[72] But whether this, as Hammond seems to have imagined, was Overall's design, or whether he supposed that while the majority would owe their salvation to sufficient grace, a few persons might be favoured with a gift which was irresistible, it is clear, at all events, that he had no such adherence to the Calvinistic system, as would be incompatible with the doctrine of baptismal grace. For he speaks of the denial that *sufficient grace* is given to all members of the Church, as a position which was not to be tolerated,[73] inasmuch as it militated against the

the *Word is the vehicle of grace*, and the instrument of conveying it to the heart,) all the difference taken notice of is only in the soil," &c.—*Hammond's Second Letter to Sanderson*, Works, i. 685. Compare the ancient Canon against re-baptizing: "Quia non inficit semen seminantis iniquitas."—*Wilkins's Concil.* i. 5.

[72] "In Overall's scheme the effectualness seems to be attributed to the giving what is given *tempore congruo*, at a time (whether by sickness or by any other circumstance of their state) they are foreseen by God to be so qualified and disposed, that they shall infallibly accept Christ offered, on His own conditions, and so convert and receive *the seed into good ground*, and so persevere and be saved, when the same man, out of those circumstances, would not have been wrought on by the same means. And if this be it which you mean, as I doubt not that it is, and herein you agree with Bishop Overall," &c.—*Hammond's Letter to Sanderson, concerning God's Grace and Decrees*, Works, i. 676.

[73] "Aliæ sententiæ ex utraque parte, sive ex solo absoluto decreto Dei, sive ex prævisa co-operatione humana, quæ ultra progreditur, ut aut ex una parte sic faciant homines liberos ut simul faciant sacrilegos, aut ex altera parte sic adstruant decretum Dei absolutum gratiamque efficacem, ut tollant voluntatem salutis communis conditionalem, et gratiam sufficientem, nullo modo in ecclesia Dei ferendæ sunt, ut quæ pugnent cum bonitate Dei," &c.—*Præstantium Virorum Epistolæ*, No. 210, p. 355. Amsterdam, 1704.

goodness and truth of God, He professes, moreover, that his rule of interpretation is the consent of the ancient Fathers;[74] and the party and system of Calvin he mentions with no kind of approbation; calling the one the sect of Zeno,"[75] and the other the "fatal dogma of Predestination."

There is nothing, then, in Overall's tenets which can justify any one in taking his statements in any other than their natural and obvious sense. And when we pass onward to the final settlement of the present Liturgy, A. D. 1662, there is still less reason to doubt that those who finally arranged the words, as at present employed, designed to affirm the reality of baptismal grace. For not only were all the Bishops who conducted the Savoy Conference, to use Mr. Goode's phraseology, "of the Laudian party;" but he allows that it had the majority in the Covocation. But he supposes that he is not bound by the opinions of these divines, which he admits to be hostile to his own; because the Act of Supremacy was not passed by them, but by Parliament; and because Parliament did not sanction "the book of Common-Prayer as the book of the convocation of that period," but the book sanctioned by the Act is "the book of Queen Elizabeth, with certain alterations and additions." So much, of course is true, that no new sense

[74] "Tota Prædestinationis nostræ cognitio, primum ex verbo sivinitus revelato in S. S., tum ex sensu et doctrina antiquorum Patrum sacram doctrinam interpretantium sumenda est, juxta illud Vincentii Lyrinensis," &c.—*Id.*

[75] "Ægre cedet Zenonia secta moderatis sententiis . . . sed mordicus ad iliud fatale prædestinationis dogma . . . . adhærescent."—*Id.*

was given to those ancient words of the Church, which had been received from the time of Queen Elizabeth, and before it. But how can those who deny the doctrine of baptismal grace receive those "*alterations and additions*," which are not attributable to the age of Elizabeth? Mr. Goode has avowed his dislike of the language employed in the Prayer-Book, "while," he says, "knowing the meaning intended to be affixed to it by those who applied it in our Formularies, I have not the smallest difficulty in accepting it." But what ground has he for the same confidence respecting the intentions of those who added to the Prayer-Book in 1662? Their intention of asserting the reality of baptismal grace is as well-known, as the words are express in which they have asserted it. The service for adult Baptism is to be dated wholly to their times. Can there be the least doubt with what intention they compiled it? Its words supply one important link in the chain of argument, because they establish, beyond doubt, the Church's opinion, that those who come as devout and well-disposed catechumens partake of Regeneration only by that act of Baptism, whereby they are engrafted into the Body of Christ. Thus is the efficacy of the human agent thrown altogether into the back-ground, and the whole weight of this momentous change is made to rest upon that gift of grace, which enters into the line of humanity through the Mediation of Christ Our Lord. Now this statement of the Service for baptizing adults, if taken literally, is, of course, inconsistent with Mr. Goode's opinion, that in adults Baptism is only the seal of a blessing already possessed, and that no persons are

regenerated in Baptism whose regeneration was not commenced before it. And why are not the words of this Service to be taken in their literal sense? Certainly not from any knowledge of the design of those who composed them. For the compilers were the very parties to whom Mr. Goode imputes a wish to have "introduced various alterations into our Formularies," with a view of giving more distinct expression to their own sentiments. Mr. Goode protests altogether against the divines, who conducted the Savoy Conference, and throws himself by preference upon the judgment of Convocation. But of the three bishops, comprised in its Committee for compiling the form of Adult Baptism, two, Laney and Henchman, had been Savoy Commissioners (the latter, says Baxter, "as high in his principles and resolutions as any of them,")[76] and Griffith the third,[77] though not appointed, had taken part in the Commission. There can be no question, then in what manner they must have regarded the subject. And although Mr. Goode seems to suppose that Convocation was likely to be more favourable to his views than the divines at the Savoy, yet the evidence supplied by its history is wholly adverse to such a supposition. The requirements of Baxter upon this head were, mainly that the Church should so far relax her doctrine as to allow of that sense, which Mr. Goode would assign to her words. There is much significance, therefore, in his statement that "the new Parliament and Convocation sat down, being constituted of men fitted and devoted to

[76] Life, by Sylvester, Part ii, 363. [77] Baxter's Life, p. 364.

the Diocesan interest."[78] And their choice of leaders plainly indicated this inclination: for they chose Fearne, an old Chaplain of Charles I., for their first, and afterwards Barwick, one of the Savoy Divines, for their second Prolocutor. Mr. Goode will not judge favourably of the moderation of those "clergy of the Convocation, who constantly came to" Peter Heylin "in matters relating to the Church, because he had been himself an ancient clerk in the old convocations."[79] And yet it would not seem that parties ran high, since it is related, "that in this Convocation there were no debates to speak of."[80]

But besides the "addition" of the services for baptizing adults, the Convocation of 1662 bequeathed some most material "alterations" to their successors. And these alterations, though not touching directly on the Divine Decrees, cannot be supposed to have been made with any Calvinistic bias; nor could it be thought that those who made them would be very anxious even to render them compatible with Calvinism. The first was the introduction of the Thanksgiving into the Office for Private Baptism in houses by which the Regeneration of infants is affirmed—even when there are no sponsors; the second, which is of still greater moment, was the restoration of that prayer for the consecration of the element of water, which had been excluded from King Edward's second Prayer-Book at the instance of Bucer.

[78] Baxters Life, Pt. ii. p. 334. [79] Heylin's Life, p. xxvi.
[80] Kennett's Register, p. 450.

The first alteration seems to have been grounded on a misrepresentation, which the Puritan party had made of the subsequent words of reception; "Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he, being born again, and being made heir of everlasting salvation," &c. This led them into the error, which has sometimes been made respecting the Collect for Christmas-Day, of fancying that the child "is now supposed to be regenerandus, not regeneratus;" to be a candidate, that is, for regeneration; not one who has been already regenerated. To shut out the possibility of such a cavil, the thanksgiving in question, appears to have been introduced. And it has had the happy effect of shutting out also the Pelagian notion, that the gifts of baptism are conditional upon the fulfilment of those engagements into which sponsors enter, inasmuch as the child's regeneration is not less confidently affirmed, in cases where there are no sponsors.

The re-insertion of the Prayer of Consecration is still more important. Though Bucer had professed his accordance with the Lutherans, of whom it was a main doctrine, as Martyr complained, that "they tied the grace of God to Baptism," (*vid. p.* 228,) yet one point to which he mainly objected in our Baptismal Office, was the Prayer for consecrating the water.[81] His fear was, lest it

[81] "Constat enim ad quam magicam rerum immutationem persuadendam hominibus, istæ benedictiones sint detortæ." And again, "Quasi Deus debeat his rebus immanentem aliquam immittere virtutem." But he admits that "Sacramenta nostra sunt in usu; actiones sunt, quibus Dominus peccatorum remissionem suique communionem suis impertit hominibus" &c.—*Scripta Anglicana*, p. 481.

should engender the idea, that into the elements[82] themselves there was infused some magical efficacy. Whereas, its purpose was not of course to imply, that material elements could ever become efficacious of themselves to the production of spiritual results, but that it was God's will to annex a certain spiritual power to a peculiar manner of using certain external elements. This is the idea conveyed by the Homily, when, as a necessary condition of a sacrament, it lays down that it must have a promise "annexed and tied to the visible sign."[83] The same thing is expressed by Archbishop Cranmer, when he says that the Holy Ghost is "sacramentally joined to the water in Baptism."[84] The object is to the error,[85] that to suppose Sacraments the channel of grace is to subordinate God's Spirit to man's will. For by thus

[82] Mr. Gorham maintains that there is so little danger of this mistake, that "though the more ignorant Papist might attribute a regenerative work *to the very element* of water, consecrated to a Sacamental use, yet the intelligent Romanist would doubtless allow, that it was to God giving His blessing to this *opus operatum*, that its never-failing efficacy must be ascribed."—*Examination*, Introd. p. 25. Mr. Goode also maintains that the doctrine taught by the formularies of the Church of England, that Baptism is efficacious whenever it is duly administered, is equivalent to the statement of the Church of Rome, that Sacraments owe their efficacy to the *opus operatum*, as contradistinguished from the *opus operantis*. He says, "To suppose that the spiritual effect always *accompanies* the outward action, is in fact much the same as to suppose that the spiritual effect is always *produced* by the outward action, because even in the latter case it is only supposed to take place through Divine influence;" p. 231.

[83] Of Common Prayer and Sacraments, p. 330.

[84] Defence, ii. 9; Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. ii. p. 338.

[85] This error appears in the fifty-eighth answer of Mr. Gorham, quoted Supra, p. 43.

associating the ordinance with those specific media, which are Divinely appointed, the mind is carried back to the virtue inherent in the man Christ Jesus, which extends through His constituted ordinances to all His members, instead of resting upon the excellence of the *doers*, by whom the earthly act is either administered or participated. The prayer of Consecration, therefore, is of the utmost importance, not indeed, as in the Eucharist, to the validity of the ordinance, which depends only on the concurrence of certain words and a certain element; but inasmuch as it wholly shuts out the idea that Baptism is only a significant seal and sign of that which God at some other period, either before or after, may be hoped to effect. Whereas the Church's doctrine has ever been that "*at the time* when God giveth His heavenly grace, He applieth by the hands of His ministers that which betokeneth the same; not only betokeneth, but, being also accompanied for ever with such power as doth truly work, is in that respect termed God's instrument, a true efficient cause of grace; a cause not in itself, but only by connection of that, which is in itself a cause, namely, God's own strength and power. Sacraments, that is to say, the outward signs in Sacraments, work nothing till they be blessed and sanctified of God. But what is God's heavenly benediction and sanctification, saving only the association of His Spirit. Shall we say that Sacraments are like magical signs, if thus they have their effect? Is it magic for God to manifest by things sensible what He doth, and to do by His own most glorious Spirit really what He mani-

festeth in His Sacraments? The delivery and administration whereof remaineth in the hands of mortal men, by whom as by personal instruments, God doth apply signs, and with signs inseparably join His Spirit, and through the power of His Spirit work grace."[86]

Whatever, then, may have been Bucer's notion, though he may not have designed to teach any thing contrary to Hooker's statement, but only to guard against an abuse, which at the time was prevalent, the act of Convocation, in restoring that to which he had successfully objected, is a distinct proof that, as members of the English Church, we are not bound to defer to his opinion. For here is a most important item in our service, which was not only inserted without his concurrence, but restored in spite of his opposition. And let it not be said, that those who made this alteration were exceeding their powers, and that they were bound to the principles of that earlier settlement, which had been made under Elizabeth. For from this obligation they were free, while all subsequent individuals are not only bound to the Prayer-Book in general, but likewise to the "additions and alterations" which they inserted. For, not to notice their right in conscience to represent the Church, they were freed from legal restraints by a special Commission.[87]

[86] Eccles, Polity, vi. 6, 11.

[87] "May 31, 1661. It was ordered by His Majesty in Council, that Mr. Attorney-General should forthwith prepare a Commission, to authorize the Convocation to consult of matters relating to the settlement of the Church, and *not to insert* therein the clause or proviso in the words following, nor any other clause or proviso to the like effect, Provided always, that the said

So that the statements then adopted have the same binding efficacy with any which preceded them. And while their verbal force cannot be evaded, the intentions of those who compiled them cannot be disputed.

And here, then, we may conclude this chapter with the assertion, that those who compiled the Service Books of the Church of England were not Calvinists. For the three periods of especial interest have been severally considered: and while respecting the Divines of 1662 no such pretence has been alleged, respecting Bishop Overall and Archbishop Cranmer none such can be substantiated.

Canons, Orders, Ordinances, Constitutions, Matters and Things, or any of them so to be considered, consulted and agreed upon as aforesaid, be not contrary or repugnant to the Liturgy established, or the Rubric in it, or the nine-and-thirty Articles, or any doctrine, order, or ceremonies of the Church of England already established."—*Kennet's Register*, p. 456.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ENGLISH DIVINES ALWAYS MAINTAINED THEIR BELIEF IN THE EFFICACY OF BAPTISMAL GRACE.

THE subject which remains for consideration is the second of Mr. Goode's three assertions—namely, that even though the compilers of our Public Formularies cannot be shown to have been Calvinists, yet that the prevalence which the Calvinistic Doctrine of Absolute Decrees at one time attained in the English Church, is a sufficient proof that her Baptismal Offices are not to be taken in that sense which "the expressions evidently favour." In support of this statement, he adduces a variety of extracts, which occupy the larger part of his volume. "No man, holding the system of doctrine called Calvinistic," he says, "can consistently hold that the universal effect of Baptism in Infants is to produce spiritual regeneration. And therefore the proofs already given of the Calvinistic views of our Archbishops, Bishops, and University Professors, are decisive, though indirect evidences of their general doctrine on the subject of Baptism." "While it is impossible to obtain testimonies from many of these divines on the particular subject of the effects of Baptism, from the circumstance of its not having been any where treated of by them, yet

the system of doctrine they held is a sufficient proof of the general character of their views."

Mr. Goode's extracts then may be divided into two classes: those which directly militate against the universal efficacy of Baptism: those which only imply such a Calvinistic bias, as he conceives to be incompatible with its belief. That passages of the former kind may be found in some English writers is generally acknowledged; but it would be easy to show that this part of the argument is carried to an extent which is wholly indefensible. Let us take, as an instance, the cases of Jewell and Davenant. In Jewell's works occur various direct statements of the general efficacy of infant Baptism. How does Mr. Goode meet them? He refers to Jewell's assertions of a truth which is universally acknowledged—the necessity, namely, of faith in the adult receiver—and assumes, therefore, that Jewell must have had some secret condition in his mind, by which his general statements of the efficacy of infant Baptism must be limited. What these conditions are, he leaves to be conjectured by the reader: "whether we suppose that the seed of faith is implanted in the infant previous to Baptism, or whether we hold that the provision of future faith and repentance avails in the case of an infant, or *whatever other theory may be adopted*." It is sufficient to reply, that Jewell himself makes no mention of such theories. What evidence is there that he held the strange notion that infants possess a developed reason; or that he supposed with the Pelagians, that man's desert determines God's election to privileges? And what general assertion is there which may not be rendered nuga

tory, if we are at liberty to explain it, by "whatever other theory may be adopted?"

That Bishop Davenant[1] has been misunderstood by Mr. Goode in one very material particular, has already been noticed; for Davenant has been shown not to have restricted Baptism, as Mr. Goode supposed, to the children of Christians.[2] Again, in his statement of Davenant's views, we meet with the same confusion between actual and habitual faith, which has been already noticed in connexion with the Council of Vienne. Davenant denies that infants can possess actual faith: in their case he observes, "it is enough to say that they have a faith which does not show itself in act, but is included in the habitual principle of grace. For that the Spirit of Christ is able, and is wont to work in them this habitual principle of grace, no reasonable man will deny." And he goes on to observe, that this opinion is not invalidated, because actual faith is not at once exhibited by them; because their lack of reason is a bar, which delays the effect of the gift bestowed upon them. It is plain, then, that Davenant supposed that some gift of grace was always bestowed upon infants in Baptism; but that as regarded faith, it was only the seed of its habitual influence, and not the intelligent act, of which that age was capable. And that such was his opinion might be substantiated from other parts of his writings.[3] "I remember," says

[1] Margaret, Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, A. D. 1609. Bishop of Salisbury, A. D. 1621. [2] Vide p. 93.

[3] "Hæc est illa Adoptio ad regnum cœleste quam omnibus parvulis baptizatis competere libenter agnoscimus."—*Epistola Davenantii, Vindiciæ Gratiæ*, p. 17.

Hammond, "the learned Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. Davenant, in his Lent Sermon (I think the last he preached before the king,) declared his opinion to be as for universal redemption, so for universal grace within the Church."[4] Davenant had maintained the same opinion previously at the Council of Dort.[5] Now these views of Davenant's are wholly misconceived by Mr. Goode. He supposes Davenant to mean that *some* infants possess faith, "qualifying them to derive an immediate salutary effect" from Baptism, by virtue of that grace which "*may* be given to infants by the Holy Spirit previous to Baptism." Thus would the validity of Baptism be thrown upon the act of the child; and *some* infants must be supposed to possess actual faith, of which Davenant rightly declares all to be incapable, lest that seed of grace, which he states to be bestowed upon *all*, should be thought to be really given to them. And hence issues the singular notion, "that where grace has been previously conferred, there, and there only, the full Baptismal blessing is immediately enjoyed;" as though baptismal grace were withstood by some incapacity on the part of the infant nature, by which anti-baptismal grace was not obstructed.

Such objections might be urged against many of Mr. Goode's quotations. But to produce them would be a needless trial of the reader's patience. For what would such quotations establish, so long as the language of our Formularies is clear and unequivocal, but that men have given to Our

[4] Hammond's Letter to Sanderson, Works, i. 673.
[5] Neal's History of the Puritans, part ii. cap. ii.

Church's words a different sense from that which, by Mr. Goode's confession, "the expressions evidently favour?" But because the Church's words were formerly evaded, must they be evaded for ever? It is needless, therefore, to enter upon the consideration of those passages, in which, as Mr. Goode alleges, the general efficacy of Sacraments is disputed. The other class of extracts, which show merely the Calvinistic tendency of their authors, admit of a different answer. For these quotations establish nothing, unless it can be proved also, that the Calvinism of Elizabeth's reign was the fixed point, round which all other notions were to arrange themselves. Whereas, it will be found on examination, that the Church's declarations were the settled basis, and that the theories of Calvin were only admitted, so far as they were not understood to militate with the established principles. This shall be shown in two ways—first, by adducing the case of those nominal Calvinists, whose Calvinism had never been tested by themselves, and fell to pieces, so soon as it was examined; secondly, by reference to an instance, in which avowed and deliberate Calvinism did not preclude the most unequivocal assertion of Baptismal Regeneration.

Since all which the present argument requires, is to show that disbelief in Sacramental grace was not, in fact, involved either by the nominal, nor even by the deliberate adoption of Calvin's theory, it will be sufficient if a few instances are adduced to the contrary. But something must first be said respecting the general course of events at that period. They illustrate the remarkable law, which regulates man's whole history, that no indi-

vidual mind is possessed of such power and comprehension, as to exercise a permanent control over the progress of thought. "The bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it." If the general laws of morals, or the Church's faith, as it was proclaimed at Nice, are too wide and fixed to be outgrown, it is because the one are dictated by that Divine wisdom, of which natural conscience is the expositor; and the other was the revealed teaching of that guiding Spirit, which has been pleased to take up its dwelling in the Mystical Body of Christ. It has been otherwise with all human systems; and in no case more remarkably than in the overthrow of that intellectual empire, which the eloquence and ability of Calvin had established among the Reformed of the Continent. Scarcely had the sixteenth century passed away, before those symptoms of dissatisfaction displayed themselves, which have led to the complete renunciation of his authority in the communities where it once was absolute. This process was, no doubt, hastened by the revolting character of that tenet of *Absolute Reprobation*, which is inseparable from his system. At the Synod of Dort, the ruling party complained because the Remonstrants began by directing their attacks against this vulnerable point of the Calvinistic theory. That which was "misliked," was "their urging so much to handle the point of reprobation, and that in the first place."[6] It was said, their "so hotly urging the question of reprobation, was only to ex-

[6] Hale's Letters, p. 94.

agitate the contra-remonstrants' doctrine." Mr. Goode has avoided all express statements on this point, although it is manifest that his sole ground for supposing that the Divines who followed the Reformation, could not believe in the universality of baptismal grace, is that such an opinion would break that logical chain of doctrine, in which Reprobation is an indispensable link. This deficiency in the completeness of Mr. Goode's statements, may be supplied out of a writer with whom in his general argument he strikingly accords, and by whom he has been anticipated in a large number of his quotations—but who speaks on this subject with less caution. "Our learned Divinity Professors in King Edward's days," says Prynne, "are full and copious on this point; witness Peter Martyr, in his Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. &c.; witness Dr. Martin Bucer in his Commentary on Romans, &c., and on Ephesians, &c.: whence eminent Dr. Whitakers, in his *Cygneo Cantio*, informs us that Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer, of honourable memory, did profess this doctrine of *absolute and irrespective Reprobation*, in both our famous Universities; and that our Church (which was most abundantly watered with the fountains of these two eminent Divines, in the days of King Edward VI.) did always hold it as the undoubted truth, ever since the restitution of the Gospel to her."[7]

The statements put forward by Prynne, and now insisted upon by Mr. Goode, have their real basis, not in the events which happened in King Edward's reign, during which the Calvinistic points had not

[7] Prynne's "Anti-Arminianism," p. 103.

become a main subject of controversy, but in the ascendency which Calvinism gained by the return of the Marian exiles. For a time Calvin's Institutes became the text book for our divinity students; and it was treason to dispute his authority in the pulpits of our Universities. But here, as on the Continent, the culminating point of the system was its triumph at the Synod of Dort, (A. D. 1618,) which, by revealing its harsher features, proved fatal to its authority. On the Continent the Remonstrants sunk gradually into Socinianism, while, as Mr. Hallam observes, "the defections" "to the faith of the Catholic Church," "from whatever cause, are numerous in the seventeenth century." He adds that two, more eminent than any who actually joined it, "must be owned to have given signs of wavering, Casaubon and Grotius."[8]

And now it appeared how great was the advantage enjoyed by the Church of England, in that she had retained the ancient Sacramental system, and had not broken that chain of continuity, which bound her to the Primitive Church. The system of Calvinism had been merely an extraneous influence, by which she had been infected, and had not formed the basis of her belief; it was capable of being thrown off therefore like other human inventions, while the great principles of the Gospel remained untouched. That which arrested Casaubon's progress was his removal to this country, from which he writes to Heinsius (A. D. 1611,) while Laud was yet almost unknown out of the University; "I desire, with Melancthon and the Church of England, that the truths of the faith

[8] "Literature of Europe, from 1600 to 1650," c. ii. 12.

should be brought to us through the channel of Antiquity, from the fountain of Scripture." "There are divines in England, men of admirable learning and piety, such as the Bishop of Ely (Andrews,) the Bishop of Winchester (Bilson,) the Dean of St. Paul's (Overall,) and others: these, just in proportion as they are pious and skilled in true doctrine, are ardent lovers of Antiquity. I wish you knew them."[9]

But the course of events in this country cannot be better understood than by the following account, which was given by the celebrated Bishop Sanderson, of the progress of his own mind. It clearly demonstrates how little hold Calvinism had taken of many who nominally acquiesced in it; and it therefore disproves Mr. Goode's assertion, that Calvinistic phraseology was incompatible with a full admission of the Church's statements respecting baptismal grace. The statement occurs in a letter addressed by Sanderson to Hammond, A. D. 1659; and which was published by the latter.

"I shall set out," says Hammond, "with a bare transcript of that, which will need no comment of mine, to render it useful to the reader, in discovering to him the true and sole original of thriving (for some time) of those doctrines among us, and how so many of our Church came to be seasoned with them, and in giving him a but necessary caution for the laying the ground of the Study of Divinity in the writings of the ancient Church, rather than in our modern systems and institutions."

The following is Sanderson's own statement.

"When I began to set myself to the study of Divinity as my proper business (which was after I had the degree of Master of Arts, being then newly twenty-one years of age,) [A. D. 1608,]

[9] Præstantium Epistolicæ Ecclesiastæ, Ep. 143.

the first thing I thought fit for me to do, was to consider well of the Articles of the Church of England, which I had formerly read over twice or thrice, and whereunto I had subscribed. And because I had then met with some Puritanical pamphlets, written against the Liturgy and Ceremonies, although most of the arguments therein were such as needed no great skill to give satisfactory answers unto, yet for my fuller satisfaction, (the questions being *de rebus agendis*, and so the more suitable to my proper inclination) I read over with great diligence, and no less delight, that excellent piece of learned Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. And I have great cause to bless God for it, that so I did, not only for that it much both cleared and settled my judgment for ever after in very many weighty points (as of scandal, Christian liberty, obligation of laws, obedience, &c.,) but that it also proved (by his good providence) a good preparative to me (that I say not antidote) for the reading of Calvin's Institutions with more caution than perhaps (otherwise) I should have done. For that book was commended to me, as it was generally to all young scholars in those times, as the best and perfectest system of Divinity, and fittest to be laid as a groundwork in the study of that profession. And, indeed, being so prepared as is said, my expectation was not at all deceived, in the reading of those institutions. I found, so far as I was then able to judge, the method exact, the expression clear, the style grave, equal, and unaffected; his doctrine for the most part conform to St. Augustin's, in a word, the whole work very elaborate, and useful to the Churches of God in a good measure; and might have been (I verily believe) much more useful, if the honour of his name had not given so much reputation to his very errors. I must acknowledge myself to have reaped great benefit by the reading thereof. But as for the questions of Election, Reprobation, Effectual Grace, Perseverance, &c., I took as little notice of the two first, as of any other thing contained in the book; both because I was always afraid to pry much into those secrets, and because I could not certainly inform myself from his own writings, whether he were a Supralapsarian (as most speak him, and he seemeth often to incline much that way,) or a Sublapsarian, as sundry passages in the book seem to import. But giving myself mostly still to the study of moral Divinity (and taking other things upon trust, as they were in a manner generally taught, both in the Schools and Pulpits in both Universities,) I did for many years together acquiesce, without troubling myself any farther about them, in the more commonly received opinions concerning both these

two, and the other points depending thereupon. Yet in the Sublapsarian way ever, which seemed to me of the two, the more moderate, rational, and agreeable to the goodness and justice of God: for the rigid Supralapsarian doctrine could never find any entertainment in my thoughts from first to last. But MDCXXV. a Parliament being called, wherein I was chosen one of the clerks of the Convocation for the Diocese of Lincoln, during the continuance of that Parliament (which was about four months as I remember,) there was some expectation that those Arminian points (the only questions almost in agitation at that time,) should have been debated by the clergy in that Convocation, which occasioned me (as it did sundry others) being then at some leisure, to endeavour by study and conference to inform myself, as thoroughly and exactly, in the state of those controversies, as I could have opportunity, and as my wit would serve me for it. In order whereunto I made it my first business to take a survey of the several different opinions concerning the ordering of God's Decrees, as to the salvation and damnation of men; which opinions, the better to represent their differences to the eye, I reduced into schemes or tables. . . . Having all these schemes before my eyes at once, so as I might with ease compare them with one another, and having considered of the conveniences and inconveniences of each, as well as I could, I soon discerned a necessity of quitting the Sublapsarian way, of which I had a better liking before, as well as the Supralapsarian, which I could never fancy."[10]

Now, it cannot be inferred that persons, who merely acquiesced in this manner in a prevalent theory, might not be firmly attached to those truths, which they learnt from the Formularies of the Church. Still more must this have been the case, when they found that the statements which occur in our baptismal offices, were universally adopted in Primitive times, and had been finally vindicated against the Semi-Pelagians by the Council of Orange. The system, therefore, which they heard

[10] Hammond's "Pacific Discourse of God's Grace and Decrees," Works, i. 669.

in the schools, was gradually modified by that which they learnt from Scripture and Antiquity. If Mr. Goode had convinced them, that the Absolute Decrees of Calvin were incompatible with the free grace of St. Augustin, he would only have hastened their migration from the school of Geneva to that of Hippo. That in this way our English Divinity advanced to a riper judgment, as it gradually shook off those fetters, which the genius of Calvin had imposed upon it, appears from the very extracts of Mr. Goode. For he finds the system of Calvinism not only in Abbot and Downame, but in Andrews and Hooker. And this is in fact to confute himself. For that which is complained of in the persons whom Mr. Goode defends, is not that they adopt the theories of Calvin, but that they assert themselves to be precluded from receiving the Church's judgment respecting God's promises. If they are deemed unsound Churchmen, it is not for accepting the doctrine of Absolute Decrees, but for rejecting the doctrine of baptismal grace. Now, what countenance can Hooker afford to such a course? For how could the universality of Sacramental grace be more plainly stated than in Book V. of the Ecclesiastical Polity. Here the doctrine of Mediation is fully set forth; and the Humanity of the Son of God is shown to be the very medium of that grace, whereby He renews His fallen brethren. And this is the central point of the whole controversy. For let this truth be once understood, and children will be seen to be in their degree as competent recipients of the blessing as their elders. For as certainly as infancy can parti-

cipate in the corruption of the old Adam, can it be regenerated by the graces of the New.

But there remains yet clearer proof behind. For not only was the popular language of Calvinism employed, where the system was not received in its rigour; in cases, therefore, which furnish no presumption against the admission of Sacramental grace; but baptismal regeneration could not be affirmed in broader terms, nor language which was more directly opposed to Mr. Goode's hypothesis be employed in stating it, than was used by a leading Calvinistic Divine of the age of James I. The Council of Dort has been already referred to, as marking the highest point, which was attained by the Calvinistic party. Among the reputed heads, therefore, of that party, were the English Divines who attended at Dort—not, indeed, according to Mr. Goode's statement, as "representatives of our Church," but as delegates deputed by the King. One of these was Dr. Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney College, Cambridge, who was appointed Margaret Professor of Divinity three years afterwards. He is cited in Prynne's work against Arminianism as one of the "three famous reverend Divines of especial eminency, note, and credit in our Church."[11] He was a valued correspondent of Usher's,[12] who seems to

[11] Anti-Arminianism, p. 260.

[12] "You have done me a great pleasure, in communicating unto me my Lord of Salisbury's (Davenant's) and your own determination, touching the efficacy of Baptism in Infants: for it is an obscure point, and such as I desire to be taught in by such as you are, rather than deliver my own opinion thereof."—*Usher's Lett. to Dr. Ward; vid. Parr's Life of Usher*, No. 159, p. 434.

have deferred to his powers of reasoning, as much as Ward did to the great acquirements of the Archbishop. He always professed himself opposed to the Arminian party,[13] and on this account, apparently, was chosen a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. If there be any one then, on whose opposition to the universal efficacy of Baptism Mr. Goode could reckon, it would be Dr. Ward. But it will be found not only that Dr. Ward asserted this doctrine, but that he asserted it in that very manner, by which Mr. Goode's hypothesis is most exactly contradicted.

It is well known that the Savoy Divines employed words, which were usual among the Schoolmen, that "God's Sacraments have their effects, where the receiver doth not '*ponere obicem*,' put any bar against them (which children cannot do") [*vid.* p. 110.] This was the opinion of those Bishops who were concerned in the composition of the Form for Adult Baptism, and who also suggested various other alterations, which were adopted by the Convocation of 1662. It is obvious how directly this statement conflicts with the fundamental principle of Mr. Goode's volume, namely, that infants are not all "fit subjects" for Baptism; but require certain "qualifications" over and above the presence of original sin, which renders grace so needful, and the absence of actual sin, whereby they are unable to oppose it. Against this statement, therefore, of the com-

[13] "He speaks with thankfulness of "the repression of the Arminian Faction."—*Usher's Lett.* No. 108.

pilers of one of our Baptismal Offices, Mr. Goode takes up arms, and declares it, in words borrowed from Abbot, Bishop of Salisbury, to be a Papistical statement, and to form the basis of the doctrine of the *opus operatum*. Those who agree with the Catechism of the Church of England, are not likely to think more highly than did Bishop Overall,[14] by whom the conclusion of the Catechism was penned, of Abbot's authority. But the point to which I call attention is, that Dr. Ward employed this obnoxious form of expression, both in his private writings, and when presiding as Professor in the Divinity Exercises at Cambridge.

Mr. Goode closes his list of authorities with Dr. Ward's predecessor, Davenant; but (while speaking of Davenant as "one of the representatives of our Church at the Synod of Dort, . . . whose Calvinism will not of course be disputed") he mentions Dr. Ward as "agreeing with Devenant's view, and perhaps carrying it a little further." It would not be inferred from this statement, that Dr. Ward was accustomed to employ that particular mode of expressing this doctrine, against which Mr. Goode so peculiarly protests. Such, however, was the case. In his work on Justification, after

[14] "Audio tractatum quendam Episcopi nunc Sarisburiensis, fratris Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, modo sub prælo esse, contra Arminianos et diatribam Thompsoni; nec multum miror, cum Perkinsium cum suo reformato Catholico prius defenderit. Utinam res theologicas et quæstiones de fide Christianâ, non ex studiis partium, et priviatis opinionibus aut affectibus, sed ex certo verbo Dei et consensu veteris Ecclesiæ tractaremus et definiremus, majorem spem concordiæ simul et veritatis Evangelicæ teneremus."—*Overall to Grotius, Epistolæ Præstantium Virorum*, No, 295.

defining Sacraments to be signs of grace, but stating that they are unprofitable, unless there be fitness on the part of the receiver, he adds; "from this rule infants are to be excepted, in whose Baptism there needs no previous disposition on the part of the receiver. For the circumstance of their interposing no bar by any voluntary act, is their sufficient qualification for obtaining the effect of Baptism."[15] But the subject is treated of at length in two "Determinations" pronounced in the Divinity Schools at Cambridge. And these are of the more interest in the present inquiry, because, in transmitting them to Usher (with a letter, a part of which is quoted by Mr. Goode,) Dr. Ward states, that he had discussed the question of "the efficacy of Baptism in infants," with Bishop Davenant, and that they agreed that the full admission of this truth was not inconsistent with that view of the question of Perseverance, which they both accepted. Now how is Mr. Goode to reconcile these statements? On the one hand, we are told that the doctrine of the Schoolmen, that Baptismal grace profits infants, because they are incapable of opposing a bar to its efficacy, is absolutely to be rejected as "Papisticum illud pronunciatum;" and therefore it must be as much without the "limit laid down by Our Church on the doctrine of the Sacraments," as the opinion (for which Mr. Goode arraigns the Bishop of Exeter in no very courteous terms,) "that on the subject of Baptism we are

[15] "Ut obicem nullum ponant actu voluntario."—*Tractatus de Justificatione*, cap. xxx.

agreed with Rome." But, on the other hand, Bishop Davenant is a person "whose Calvinism will not be disputed;" and we find Dr. Ward, also a Calvinist, and a delegate at Dort, "agreeing with Bishop Davenant's view, and perhaps carrying it a little further." But the view of Dr. Ward is the very statement which is so absolutely incompatible with Mr. Goode's interpretation of our Baptismal Offices. "Infants place no bar. On them, therefore, we say that Sacraments infallibly confer grace."[16] How utterly groundless, then, is Mr. Goode's confidence, even were the fact such as he supposes, that if it should appear that the doctrine of the Reformers "was, in the most important points, what is now called Calvinistic, there is, or ought to be, an *end* to the controversy as to the interpretation they intended to be given to our Formularies as respects Baptism."

If Mr. Goode was aware of the testimony which is thus given against him by his own witnesses, he must have felt that he was treading upon precarious ground. And it seems unlikely that it had escaped his notice, since he refers to the volume[17] in which Dr. Ward's two Determinations originally appeared. They were sub-

[16] "Non ponunt obicem parvuli. Illis ergo dicimus sacramenta infallibiliter conferre gratiam."—*Samuelis Wardi Determinationes Theologicæ.*

[17] "Vindiciæ Gratiæ Sacramentalis duobus Tractatulis comprehensæ — 1. De Efficacia Sacramentorum in genere. 2. De efficacia Baptismi quantum ad Parvulos. Quibus præfigitur Epistola Reverendiss. Patris et Præsulis dignissimi Joan. Davenantii, nuper Episcopi Sarisbur. Argumenti non dissimilis." —*Op. et Studio,* T. B. S. Th. B. London, 1650, 12mo.

sequently published with Dr. Ward's other works, A. D. 1658, by his pupil and namesake, Seth Ward, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury. But these two Determinations had been printed, A. D. 1650, by Thomas Bedford, whose exercises in the Divinity School, A. D. 1629, had given occasion to them. Bedford, as it appears from his preface, had suggested two sets of questions, of which Dr. Ward, for reasons unknown to him, selected those which had reference to the validity of Sacraments. We learn from Ward's own statement to Usher,[18] that the choice did not really originate with him; he was very loath the question should be brought upon the Commencement-Stage; but he was overborne by the importunity of the Answerer, and by the authority of the Vice-Chancellor, and "the major part of the Doctors." There were those, it seems, who thought with Mr. Goode, that this question would "impugn the doctrine of Perseverance by an undeniable argument." So thought Bedford himself, as he stated to the Divinity Professor. But Ward, as he tells Usher, had "heretofore thought upon this point; and my Lord of Sarum, and myself, at Dort, had speech of it, when we signified in our judgment, that the case of infants was not appertaining to the question of Perseverance." He therefore told Bedford that the case of infants had nothing to do with the question of Final Perseverance, adding "here is a letter, which I lately received on this subject from the learned and reverend Bishop of Salisbury."

[18] Parr's "Life of Usher," Lett. 160, p. 438.

To this circumstance probably we owe the preservation of Davenant's letter. A copy of it was kept by Bedford, which many years afterwards he was recommended to print by Archbishop Usher. Dr. Ward was by this time dead. Usher took this opportunity of making public the two "Determinations," and a "Vindication,"[19] which Ward had at the time transmitted to him. So that the work supplies us with the judgment of three leading men of the Calvinistic party, respecting the fundamental principle of Mr. Goode's book. Bishop Davenant, one of the delegates at Dort, "whose Calvinism will not be disputed," writes a letter to Ward, to show that it is not true, as Mr. Goode supposes, that "the Calvinistic views of our Bishops are decisive evidences of their general doctrine on the subject of Baptism." Ward, another delegate at Dort, agrees with him: "that the case of infants was not appertaining to the question of Perseverance." And Archbishop Usher, one of the most respected authorities which Calvinists are accustomed to lay claim to, contributes to the publication of their decision.

The reader will see that on these facts it would not be difficult to found a charge of disingenuous conduct against Mr. Goode. Why not tell his readers plainly the purpose of Davenant's letter? Why not state more fully the sentiments of Dr.

[19] It seems that this Vindication consisted of papers which passed between Ward and Gataker. Upon the appearance of Bedford's work, Gataker published both Ward's Thesis (A. D. 1652) and Davenant's Letter (A. D. 1654,) with his own strictures.

Ward, instead of saying that he "agreed with Davenant's view, perhaps carrying it a little further?" I mention the matter, only lest I should be supposed to imply such an imputation.[20] For I feel a full persuasion, that Mr. Goode has not estimated the force of this evidence, in consequence of that false position which he has assumed. He has set out with the impression that the Church of England was founded about three hundred years ago; its fundamental principles being certain abstract dicta respecting God's dealings with mankind, which Calvin and other able men had discovered by an attentive study of the text of Scripture. He felt confident, therefore, that so long as he kept within the logical consequences of Calvin's system, he could not possibly misunderstand our leading writers. And no doubt this would have been a perfectly safe mode of proceeding, provided he had built his opinions on the broad ground of the ancient Church; or supposing his inquiries had been confined within the narrow limits of some strictly Calvinistic Confession. But the principle fails, so soon as it is applied to a portion of that Church Catholic, which was founded by Our Lord and His Apostles. Its writers may have been partially infected by the contagion of modern opinions, but they could not shake off

[20] "Baro's conduct," says Mr. Goode, "seems to me to have been what we should now call very Tractarian, that is, thoroughly disingenuous." Surely Mr. Goode does not act wisely in throwing out imputations of this sort. The rules of Christian charity should lead us to hope that our opponents may be honest as well as ourselves.

their allegiance to the Confessions and Offices of the Primitive Church. The consent of the Catholic Fathers had been formally recognized by Convocation, A. D. 1571, as the standard of Scriptural exposition. Now these circumstances led Davenant and Ward, as well as various others to whom Mr. Goode refers, into results which, upon his theory, must seem wholly impossible.

There were three especial causes which contributed to produce this effect. The first was the repulsive nature of the doctrine of *Absolute Reprobation;* from which the Calvinistic system cannot really be dissociated. And the case of infants is exactly that, in which its harshness is most striking. It was plainly a great relief, therefore, to be able to say with Davenant, "this is that adoption to the kingdom of Heaven, which we willingly acknowledge is afforded to *all* baptized infants."[21] This feeling was rendered still stronger, when men came to compare the Calvinistic dogma of the Reprobation of some infants, which the Church's declaration (before the Savoy Conference,) "that children being baptized, have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved." When Ward quoted these words, Gataker objected that the certainty with which the Church speaks of the salvation of baptized infants is not exactly affirmed to be attributable to the virtue of Baptism (ex vi Baptismi.) Ward answers; "but Our Church plainly implies this, although it does

[21] Lett. to Ward. Vind. Grat. Sac. p. 17.

not state it in express words. Why, then, may we not say that this work is brought about by the efficacy of Baptism as its instrumental cause, as by the sacrifice of Christ as its principal one?"[22]

To these circumstances was added a third: the reference made to the judgment of Antiquity; and its unequivocal witness to the belief, that some real gift of grace is always bestowed upon infants in Baptism. To this circumstance Ward directly refers in his letter to Usher; and Davenant quotes as his authority the statement of St. Austin: "the Holy Spirit dwells in baptized infants, although they know it not."[23] Now, such arguments were enough to show that the doctrine of Reprobation ought not to be applied in the case of infants, even though it was supposed to be tenable in the case of adults. And let this point of the Reprobation of infants be abandoned, and (so far as concerns infant Baptism) men might receive the whole doctrine of baptismal grace. For since Calvin's system supposed God to adopt the elect when He pleased, He might adopt them in Baptism as well as at any other season. Abandon the idea that any infants were excluded by arbitrary sentence, and why should not all be adopted, who were baptized? It had been held, as has been shown, in the Ancient Church, that God's dealings with men are the counterpart of His Decrees; but that those dealings might be looked at as regarded the *gift* of grace, or as regarded its *employment*. The tendency of Calvin's teaching was to confuse the

[22] Vindiciæ Gratiæ, p. 183. [23] Vindiciæ Gratiæ, p. 16.

scriptural statements, which express these two relations of the Divine Economy; and thus to peril the responsibility of man. But on one point the Ancient Church was fully agreed with him; that as regarded the *gift* of grace, its sole cause was the Divine mercy, and not in any respect that prevision of future excellence, which undiscerning interpreters have supposed to be the key to our baptismal offices. It will be obvious then how easy it was for men, who yet retained some Calvinistic prejudices, to adopt, as regarded the case of infants, the more liberal system of the Ancient Church. For in respect to the *ground* of election the two systems were agreed, and all which it was necessary to lop off, was the offensive tenet of infant Reprobation.

Thus it came to pass, then, that even those who had been delegates at Dort, and whom the bitter Anti-Arminian Prynne refers to as oracles, adopted views, which Mr. Goode thinks it impossible to attribute to any Calvinist. As they did not impugn Calvin's system of interpretation, they were perplexed, as Ward states, at finding so little Scriptural authority for their teaching; but they could not shut their eyes to consequences, which followed from the general tenor of God's Word, and to which such unequivocal witness was borne by the Universal Church, and by the Church of England. Had it not been from deference for Calvin's system, Ward needed not have said, "touching the efficacy of Baptism in infants, I do acknowledge it a point, in which the Scriptures are sparing:" but he adds, "howsoever the Scripture speaks sparingly, yet there are general grounds, from the nature of Sacra-

ments, which may serve to inform and direct our judgments herein. Again, I considered the perpetual Tradition of the Church in no way to be slighted, where it doth not cross the Scripture, but is consonant *to general grounds* contained in them."[24] The point of real moment, however, is the unequivocal manner in which they express the judgment, to which these grounds conducted them. Some extracts from Dr. Ward's statements respecting the efficacy of infant Baptism are added in an Appendix, not as a complete view of the subject which they treat, but as showing that a theoretical admission of Calvin's doctrine of Decrees is not incompatible with a belief in baptismal grace. Nor are Davenant's words much less decisive. He affirms that in Baptism "Infants are translated out of the old Adam, and incorporated into the New." "So soon as the guilt which he had contracted in the first Adam is removed from an infant, he is numbered *ipso facto* in the family of the second Adam."[25] And this is a change, which he speaks of as befalling "*all* baptized infants."[26] And the following passage from his letter to Ward leaves scarcely any thing to desire. After stating that the sanctification of baptized infants depends chiefly on the remission of original sin, he adds: "Although I would not deny that they are holy or sanctified on other grounds also, as for example, because they are dedicated to the Holy Trinity; for to be dedicated to God is in some sort to be sanctified: because they are sprinkled with the sacred blood of Christ, for the purpose of obtaining the remission of the sin,

[24] Usher's Life, p. 438. [25] Vindiciæ Gratiæ, p. 215. [26] Id. p. 17.

which dwells in them ; because they have the Holy Spirit dwelling in them, though not like adults by faith, yet in some secret manner to us unknown. Whence Augustin says, 'in baptized infants, although they know it not, the Holy Spirit dwells.' But by the inhabitation of so divine and sacred a guest, the dwelling cannot but receive such sanctification as its condition admits of. Finally, they may justly be called holy and sanctified, although they receive neither the acts or habits of faith, justice, nor infused grace, on account of the Author of Sanctity, who works in them, in some unspeakable manner, whatever is required of such as they are, in order that they may be esteemed holy. What this work is in its nature, let those explain who understand it : I confess that I understand it not."[27]

The above passage will seem to most readers a decisive argument against Mr. Goode's opinion, that Bishop Davenant "held that spiritual regeneration in its full and proper sense is not bestowed at Baptism." But the evidence will not be complete, unless it is shown how it happens that he supposes himself to be really borne out by Davenant's opinion. For such an inquiry will make it appear, not only that this divine did not accord with him in the essential points of the case, but that all who maintained those positions which were admitted by Davenant, and were enforced by the laws of the Church of England, could not fail to be directly opposed to him. Now it is needful to state in the first place (that which Mr. Goode has wholly misconceived,) what is the fundamental point of difference between

[27] Vindiciæ Gratiæ, p. 16.

him and his antagonists. "The great and all-important point to be contended for," he says, "is that an adult is not necessarily in a state of spiritual regeneration, because he was baptized as an infant; that is, that such spiritual regeneration as is necessary for an adult, is not always conferred upon infants when they are baptized." Now this is so far from being the real point at issue, that the first of these propositions is affirmed by no one. The affirmation of baptismal regeneration has no tendency to lead men to deny that "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given." The only parties to whom this error is attributed are the Calvinists; and it is singular that Mr. Goode should at once deny that a Calvinist can hold baptismal regeneration, and yet charge upon baptismal regeneration the very error, which is characteristic of Calvinism. Whereas, in truth, no advocate for baptismal regeneration need assert more than is stated by St Paul: "Know ye not, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" And as to the second proposition which is insisted upon by Mr. Goode, it is universally admitted that "Baptism doth challenge to itself but the inchoation of those graces, the consummation whereof dependeth on mysteries ensuing." The only thing which Mr. Goode can allege, as giving a colour to his statements, is that those who have been baptized are, or ought to be, reminded that if any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy. They should be exhorted therefore to thank God for calling them "to this state of salvation," and to pray for grace that they may "continue in the same" to their lives' end. They should be taught that "re-

novation" is not, as Mr. Goode represents, "the most important part of regeneration;" because however necessary the exertions of men, the most momentous point is the communication of that Divine seed, whereby those who are "born in sin" are made "children of grace." Hence they may learn that the want of that "good fruit," the absence of which is so often to be regretted, is to be attributed to the unkindliness of the stony soil, not to the denial of that seed which is designed to fecundate it. The real point at issue therefore, is not whether all who have been baptized attain these results (a thing which none affirm,) but whether such a gift was originally bestowed upon them. Now this turns on the fact, whether *all* infants are fit candicates for the blessings of Baptism or no.[28] And if it be necessary to carry the question higher, that into which it resolves itself is, whether those gifts of grace which the Son of God bestows through His Mediation are capable of benefiting every age: whether all who draw corruption from the old Adam, are capable of the spiritual indwelling of the New. And this will be found to involve a still further question, whether those spiritual blessings, which are promised by God in Holy Scripture, are *all* bestowed through the Mediation of Christ, or whether there exists any other declared channel through which Divine gifts are bestowed upon men.

Taking these, then, as the main points of difference between Mr. Goode and his opponents, with

[28] Mr. Goode states the essential point of his own system to be a denial of the universal worthiness of infants for Baptism. He puts forth as "the grand cause of the mistakes" of his opponents, that there must be "qualifications in infants for enjoying that blessing."

which does Bishop Davenant really agree? Mr. Goode alleges, that the system of Davenant is separated from his own by points "comparatively of little moment." He calls Davenant's notion that of "an infantine regeneration," and declares it to be "clearly maintainable in our Church." It must obviously be compatible, then, with his own main position—namely, that a difference exists in infants; that some are qualified recipients of baptismal grace, while others are incapable of receiving it. Now, upon what does this capacity or incapacity of the infant depend? If it were an adult, Mr. Goode might say that it depended upon its faith. This would lead to another question; but since the infant neither has faith, nor can have it, we may return to the former one. On what, then, does it depend, that some infants are qualified recipients of the pardoning grace bestowed in Baptism, others not so? The notion of a gift implies two parties, and we may look either to Him who gives, or him who receives it. Does the discrepancy arise from an absolute Decree passed by Almighty God, bestowing a capacity upon some infants, of which others are not made partakers? This would be to admit the doctrine of Reprobation in its harshest form; for it would be to recognize an absolute sentence, from which, therefore, the children of Christian parents would not be exempted any more than others. From such a conclusion Mr. Goode revolts. Such children, he says, speaking of those devout persons "as infants," are "acceptable in the eye of God." This plainly throws us on the other side of the alternative, as supplying the reason why some children are to be discriminated from others. For it

is to renounce the idea of such an absolute Decree, as is based solely on the sovereignty of God.

We turn then to the receiver of the gift, and ask what there is in his condition or circumstances, on which his qualification can be built? Now the infant's *condition* can plainly supply no qualification, by which one infant can be discriminated from another. Every child of Adam is born a child of wrath; he can in himself merit nothing. And even the provision of future faith and repentance (to which Mr. Goode and others frequently refer as a not improbable qualification for baptismal fitness,) has been shown to be a consideration which none but Pelagians can consistently adduce. There remains nothing, then, but the child's circumstances. And what circumstances can there be in an infant's history, except the accidents of his birth? To ask what are the peculiar circumstances of the infant, is only to ask of what parents he is born. So that this is the qualification to which we ultimately come, as the only one, except an Absolute Decree, which can consistently be adduced. This it is, accordingly, which Mr. Goode adduces. "Many might be inclined to think," he says, "that all infants of a true believer receive in Baptism a spiritual blessing." On this, then, he rests that theory of "infantine regeneration," which he attributes to Davenant; and it is plain, in the nature of the case, that if any blessing is supposed to accrue from Baptism, there remains no other qualification which can be referred to, so soon as the theory of Reprobation has been abandoned.

Now what is the real nature of this system,

which Mr. Goode tells us, falls clearly within the limits of a Churchman's belief? "The faith of the parent is," he says, "so far as concerns original sin, mercifully reckoned by God as imputable to the infant." And he adds, "if we can justly call the children of every true believer *holy*, we can as justly, after they have received the seal of the covenant in Baptism, call them regenerate." Mr. Goode would seem to ascribe that Holiness, which St. Paul attributes to the infants of Christians, to something which they have by birth, and not, as did the ancient[29] interpreters of St. Paul's words (1 *Cor.* vii. 14,) to that holiness which they gain by Baptism. But supposing this interpretation to be admitted in the greatest latitude of which it is susceptible, "it is yet obvious," as St. Austin maintained against Pelagius, by whom this view of the passage was adopted, "that whatever be meant by St. Paul's word "holy," it cannot refer to the making children Christians, nor to the remission of their sins, unless they are admitted among the faithful by the institution of Christ—by His Church and Sacraments."[30] No limit can be assigned, of course, to that infinite mercy of God, which may, if He wills, be extended to all children: but in this place we are concerned only with His revealed will—with the Christian covenant. In what way is it then, that within the revealed Kingdom of grace, "children are so far interested in their

[29] Wall on Infant Baptism, Part i. c. 19, vol. i. p. 386. Oxf. 1844. Vide also the fourth of Hammond's Six Queries.

[30] St. Aug. quoted by Wall, p. 385.

parents' faith, that," as Mr. Goode affirms, "they may be reckoned by us, as infants, acceptable in the eye of God"—so that "the faith of the parent is accepted on behalf of the child, as giving it a title to Baptism?"

Now in what manner are children allied to their parents? Are they really one with them or no? They are surely separate beings, with an individuality of their own, in which their parents have no part. Their parents may be bound to them by sympathy; by identity they cannot. The children are near to them; but not themselves. Else what would be the condition of infants whose parents are removed by death? It follows that though the faith of the parents may lead them to do many acts, by which the condition of the children may be effected, yet that the faith of the parent cannot be actually *imputed* to the child. The parent has by God's law a certain authority over the child, and this involves various coercive acts, by which the child's destiny is largely affected. But this is wholly different from any mystical transfusion of the one into the other. The parent may bring his child in his arms to the font, but no exercise of his volition will put motion into the child's limbs and enable it to walk there. So that the two beings remain wholly distinct: "the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son." There is One Only Partaker of man's nature, whose perfect merits are capable of overflowing, so as to supply the deficiencies of His brethren. And specific means have been ordained—namely, his Holy Sacraments, whereby

His sanctified Manhood may be transfused into all members of His Mystical Body. To attribute the same thing to every devout parent, to imagine that his faith and devotion is so efficacious that "the faith of the parent" may be "reckoned by God as imputable to the infant," is to make every Christian parent a Mediator between God and man. It is something distinct from the assertion, which none deny, that the parent's outward acts affect the condition of his child: for it is to suppose an influence independent of those outward acts, whereby men are naturally able to benefit one another. It is to assert that there exists two recognized means of salvation, one through that gift of saving grace, which Christ bestows upon those who by their own act are joined to him, the other through that faith of parents, which is imputable to their children. The common objection to the Invocation of Saints applies, therefore, with tenfold force to this system of doctrine. Without entering upon a subject foreign to the present inquiry, it is sufficient to say that the Invocation of Saints is defended by those who practise it, on the ground that their advocacy is not irrespective of Our Lord's Mediation, but is built upon it. If the Saints were supposed to be mediators between God and man, independently of the One Mediator by whom God and man are truly united, its very defenders admit that the practice would be unjustifiable. But the doctrine before us is directly opposed to Christ's Mediation, because it does not profess merely to employ, but to supersede it. A mode of Union with Christ having been provided in Holy Baptism, it steps in and denies

its validity, unless children have first been brought near to God through the excellence of their parents. The primary sanctification of Infants cannot be based therefore on the Mediation of Christ, because they are not competent subjects for His Mediation until it has been effected. Unless they have first obtained access to God through the intervention of the earthly mediators, the influence of that Heavenly Mediator cannot avail them. So that not only is something added to the Christian system, but a new system is substituted in its place.

Such is the opinion which Mr. Goode in effect attributes to Davenant, and which he affirms to be "clearly maintainable in our Church." No doubt he is far from designing to countenance so fatal a heresy, any more than he intends to sanction Pelagianism, by representing the gifts of grace as contingent on the prevision of future excellence. But since the system of Sacraments is the real mean whereby the Mediation of Christ Our Lord has its effect, these errors are the invariable and necessary effect of denying the efficacy of baptismal grace. Ask at Geneva and at Boston, whether such is not the case. And even those who do not discern this as an intellectual consequence, ought at least to profit by the lessons of experience. For nothing is more certain than that the gradual progress of societies is the true exponent of the principles and opinions upon which they are built. Individuals may admit a theory for years without following it into its legitimate consequences; but communities are controlled by laws, not less inexorable than those of physical nature, and cannot

admit principles, without accepting their logical results. Now since Sacraments are our appointed means of union with the Humanity of Christ, and since it is through His human nature that He discharges that work of Mediation, whereby He is the One only revealed channel of intercourse between God and man, those who deny or undervalue these means of access, must needs appease the longings of their nature through some other method of approach.

It is wholly without ground, however, that Mr. Goode attributes such a theory to Davenant. This may be shown by referring to that characteristic feature in Mr. Goode's own system—namely, that the benefits of Baptism are not supposed by him to be offered to *all* infants, but only to those who have certain qualifications. Since these qualifications cannot be found in the infant itself, Mr. Goode, we have seen, is compelled to seek for them in its parents. Unless infants are first partakers of a Divine gift through the intervention of their parents, they are not qualified, he says, to receive that gift of a new nature which is bestowed upon all members of His Body through the Mediation of Christ. Baptism, that is, does not make any persons holy, whom it does not find so. The presence of original sin, which renders it necessary; and the absence of actual sin, which precludes the opposition of the responsible principle —these are not sufficient qualifications for Baptism, since these all children possess; but they must first be rendered holy by the faith of their parents, and then they may be brought to Christ. Now, this view of things is so far identical with that of

the Anabaptists, that if Mr. Goode differs from them in maintaining that the children of devout Christians ought to be baptized, he agrees with them in thinking that all other children ought not. For "those who think themselves bound to baptize children only by virtue of the parent's right," says Bishop Stillingfleet, "must run into many perplexing scruples about baptizing children, and be forced to exclude the far greater number of those that are offered."[31] But whatever may be Mr. Goode's mode of reconciling it with his practice, he puts forward this principle repeatedly, as one which in theory cannot be disputed. His whole opinions respecting Baptism are based on the supposition, that "not *all* infants, even in the sight of men, can be considered as fit subjects for that holy rite." And this point he supposes must be conceded by all who agree with him; "*otherwise*," he says, "*our system of theology is thrown into utter confusion.*" And here, therefore, Mr. Goode's system comes into direct collision with that of Davenant, since Davenant was one of those divines who gave judgment at the Council of Dort, that the "children of ethnic parents ought to be baptized." And herein he did but express the same judgment, which had been pronounced by the whole English Church, A. D. 1604, through its Convocation. For at the very period, when Mr. Goode alleges Calvinism to have been so absolutely predominant (the first year of James I.,) were passed those Canons—the twenty-ninth forbidding a "parent to act a Godfather for his own

[31] Unreasonableness of Separation, Part iii. 36, 3.

child," and the sixty-eighth enjoining that ministers should "not refuse to christen"—by which the Church gave a practical proof that whatever theories might prevail respecting God's Decrees, there was no intention of surrendering the ancient belief in the validity of Sacraments. Now, it has been often observed that the Canons of 1604 were not the publication of a new law, but only an arrangement and ratification of those usages, which were previously in existence. And of this the instance before us is an example. For our Church's chief advocate in the time of Elizabeth defends her for *not* adopting that course, which Mr. Goode confesses on his theory to be absolutely essential. And he defends her by pointing out the very inconvenience which this system has been shown to involve—namely, that it would attribute to parents that office of Mediation, which belongs only to Christ. "It is not the virtue of our parents, nor the faith of any other, that can give us the true holiness, which we have by virtue of our new birth."[32] It is in vain, therefore, for Mr. Goode to quote a few words from Hooker, which imply, as he supposes, that in his earlier years that great man had received the Calvinistic doctrine of Perseverance. If this were as certain as it is dubious, it would furnish no kind of answer to Dr. Ward's assertion: "Mr. Hooker saith as we say, touching the efficacy of Baptism in infants, and yet holdeth the doctrine *de perseverantia fidelium* as well as we do.[33]

Nor is it Hooker only, but every one of those great lights of the Elizabethan age, to whom Mr.

[32] Eccles. Pol. v. 64. [33] Usher's Life, p. 439.

Goode has referred, by whom in this capital particular he is deserted. So that we have a decisive proof that the *theory* of Ward and Davenant gave expression only to those truths, which had been affirmed by the *acts* of their predecessors. Mr. Goode could not, therefore, even if he would, cut these men off from the chain of his authorities, to which they are linked by unity of principle as well as by the opinion of their age. Davenant, Mr. Goode admits, "no one will deny to be a Calvinist;" and Prynne, with whom in his arguments he precisely harmonizes, appeals to Ward as one of the "three famous Divines of our Church," whom he cites as witnesses against Arminianism. Who, indeed, were the reputed heads of the Calvinistic party, if not the delegates at Dort? So that Mr. Goode is utterly put out of court by his own witnesses. His whole theory turns upon the assertion, that "no man, holding the system of doctrines called Calvinistic, can consistently hold that the universal effect of Baptism in infants is to produce spiritual regeneration." But here we have leaders of the Calvinistic party, who not only affirmed this last truth, but wrote letters, and published disputations to prove their consistency. How could things, which were incompatible in theory, be harmonized in fact? And these men are linked to the generations which preceded them, not only by uniformity in their theoretical professions, but by the more weighty argument of accordance in their acts.

Here, then, I terminate this historical survey of the sentiments of our older writers. It has been seen, that our Formularies were not compiled by

Calvinists; and that if some of the distinguished men who have adorned our Church accepted the Calvinistic theory of Absolute Decrees, yet that it does not follow that they must have rejected the doctrine of Sacramental grace. It was open to any of them to adopt that course, which some of them have been shown to have adopted. Suppose, however, the matter were otherwise. Suppose, for argument's sake, that Mr. Goode's theory could be substantiated; and that those who compiled our Liturgical Offices could be shown to have been such rigid Calvinists, that they could not believe in the universality of those gifts of grace which they proffered to others. Yet how after all would this profit him—what excuse would the example of their forefathers afford to the clergy of the present day, if they say one thing and believe another? Would not the people of England rise up as one man against our established system, if they were satisfied that it was only to be supported by suppositions which were based upon artifice and fraud?

That very many, of the laity especially, have been induced to question or disbelieve baptismal grace, is too true; but most of them are rather influenced by its lack of effect (a thing which must be traced to those various causes by which Our Lord accounts for the unfruitfulness of the Divine seed,) than by any affection for the rigors of Calvinism. Indeed, I feel persuaded that Mr. Goode did not take the best means of rendering his principles acceptable to the English mind when he based them on this system. For besides the harshness, which has been commonly objected to it—its

combination with our established Formularies offends against that love of truth, which is the characteristic virtue of our nation. For what is Mr. Goode's hypothesis? Grace, he says, is offered generally and unconditionally in the ordinances of the Church, but this general offer was meant to be qualified by the fact, that for a certain portion only of mankind is this blessing of salvation designed, while the rest must fall by inevitable sentence into endless misery. This secret decree and sentence of God is that which puts a limit upon the apparently expansive language of our service. Now I wave all mention of the harshness of this system—of its tendency to encourage some in carelessness, and to plunge others into despair. At present I speak of it only as offending against that fairness and love of truth, which is at the basis of all morality. For suppose these events to have happened in the case of some earthly sovereign, who offered terms of pardon and grace to his rebellious subjects. Suppose that through his appointed ministers he made known those general offers, from which there seemed to be no exceptions. Let them include, not only the adult offenders, but likewise the infant heirs of those whose parents had forfeited their rights. Suppose, then, that after these terms had been publicly promulgated, it was found that they were limited by some private list of exceptions prepared by the Prince. Let this list not extend merely to the grown offenders, who might be supposed to provoke censure by their suspected disloyalty, but let it compromise also the infant claimants of the promised grace. Now, would it be any excuse to the ministers by whom such pro-

mises were made public, that they had themselves entertained a private conviction that they were not unqualified? Would their conviction of the existence of a secret decree, by which alone men were capacitated to share in the public offer, exonerate them for making public what they knew to be deceptive? What would be said of such ministers? We may add, what would be said of such a Prince? And shall that which would discredit a human Potentate, be attributed to the God of truth? "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Let not men question, then the certainty of the Divine Promises, even if they are unable to reconcile them with those mysteries of the Divine Decrees, which lie too deep for their sight. Let not man "make his retreat to the mysteries of God's unfathomable counsels, as the reason of that (which is its contradictory,) his attempting to fathom and define them." God's promises are to be "taken as they be generally set forth in Holy Scripture." For His promises are as certain as His existence, and His truth as unfailing as His power.

CONCLUSION.

The considerations adduced in the previous Chapters, have been designed to lead to a more full comprehension of the exact points, respecting which those who differ on the question of Holy Baptism are at issue; and thus to enable the reader to discern whether the Church of England has really pronounced any opinion between the conflicting parties. I shall now briefly recapitulate what has been stated, in order that the different systems which claim assent may be brought more pointedly into contrast, and that it may be distinctly understood what are the alternatives which lie before us.

It has been stated, then, in the preceding pages, that Regeneration is the re-creation of man's nature in Christ (*Chap.* i.) That great event, which so long lay hid in the womb of time, was not fully made known till in the Advent of the Son of Man it was accomplished. Yet its Decree in the secret counsels of the All-merciful was the redeeming principle of man's race ever since the Fall; and its Promulgation through tradition, type, or prophecy, gave their significance to the various rites either of Jewish or Patriarchal worship. But with these we have no present concern; we need not ask how far they rested on supernatural gifts, and how far on natural devotion; seeing that the present inquiry refers to the religion of grace, not

that of nature; nor yet that its object is Judaism, but Christianity. By the Christian religion is meant the scheme of Christ's Mediation—that new law, whereby it pleased God that in the Humanity of the One Atoning Mediator there should be embodied those Divine gifts, by which the degeneracy of man's nature might be remedied. Now the apppointed means, whereby each individual enters into the line of this regenerate race, is Holy Baptism. This has been shown to be the revealed statement of Holy Scripture (*Chap.* ii.,) and to be taught by the Church of England in her public Offices (*Chap.* iii.) And it has been shown further, that belief in this doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is of radical importance; not merely on account of the practical consequences which it directly involves (by suggesting grounds for watchfulness and gratitude,) but still more as furnishing a criterion of men's general belief in the sacramental efficacy of Our Lord's Mediation (*Chap.* iv.)

These positive statements received fuller elucidation in the course of those negative ones, by which they were followed. For it was essential to show in vindication of the views just recited, that the Primitive doctrine of Divine Decrees in no way interfered with those scriptural promises, which are founded upon the Mediator's Sacramental agency (*Chap.* v.) And when we pass from the Primitive doctrine of Decrees to that of Calvinism, we found that the efficacy of Sacramental grace was fully avowed by some of very chief adherents of the latter system (*Chap.* vii.) Yet this circumstance is more valuable, as prov-

ing the fairness of those who thus expressed themselves, than as indicating the judgment of the English Church. For not only are its Formularies too explicit to be explained away, but it has been shown that those who compiled them did not themselves accord with the sentiments of Calvin (*Chap.* vi.)

The Church's estimate, then, of Holy Baptism, may be expressed in the two following propositions—first, Baptism is the appointed means whereby the Divine Giver is pleased to bestow His grace for the regeneration of men. Secondly, This gift is bestowed upon *all* infants, to whom Holy Baptism is duly administered. And these assertions bring the Church's doctrine into direct contrast with the two counter-systems, by which it is opposed. For they will be found to turn upon the denial of these two assertions—the first maintaining that Grace is *not* bestowed by the Giver through Baptism; the second, that if bestowed at times, it is not bestowed upon *all* infants, to whom Holy Baptism is duly administered. I shall briefly recall to the reader's attention the grounds upon which these two counter-systems are founded, and the considerations by which the Church's doctrine has been maintained against them.

Those who deny that God bestows grace through Baptism, found their objections on two circumstances; first, the incongruity between an outward rite and an inward blessing; and next, the want of result by which it is actually attended. It has been shown, in reply to the last objection, that no argument, based on the inefficiency of

Baptism, can be admitted, while the Church-Discipline and Church-Education remain in their present unsatisfactory state (*p.* 43.) The other objection was shown to be directed against the system of Mediation at large; and to be founded upon a forgetfulness that the law of grace has superseded the law of nature (*p.* 46.) For if it be allowed that all spiritual blessings are communicated to mankind through the Humanity of the Second Adam, it is no objection against the revealed media of Christian communion, that they are not founded on that natural relation of mind to mind, whereby the spirits of men were originally fitted to hold intercourse with their Spiritual Maker. So that the efficacy of Baptism is an outpost which the Church has to maintain in that protracted but ineffectual warfare, which the pride of human reason continues to wage against the Faith of the Cross.

The objection just mentioned, which is founded, in truth, upon the system of Rationalism, is of course applicable to Baptism at large; but the Baptism of infants is the point against which its assaults are peculiarly directed. This may be owing in part to the circumstance that infant Baptism is the rule, and adult Baptism the exception. For though Baptism began with adults, yet so soon as the Church had entered upon her course, she gathered to herself infants, as the natural recipients of her earliest blessing. So that their case has suggested her common usages, and the language of her offices. A further reason is, that infant Baptism supplies so effectual a criterion for discriminating the agency of the Divine Giver

of grace from its human receivers (*p.* 128.) So that if the efficacy of infant Baptism be admitted, it follows at once that the Humanity of the Second Adam is a channel through which God bestows heavenly blessings. And this is the very point in contest between the Church and the Rationalism of the age. Men admit readily that God bestows spiritual gifts, provided He is supposed to bestow them through those secret influences, by which He sways the hearts of His creatures. For this is but to admit that law of creation, which supposes the mind to retain a natural relation to its Parent Spirit; it is no interruption therefore of the course of nature, and does not supersede the usual process of thought (*p.* 136.) That which men are reluctant to admit is the Mediation of the God-man—that "God" is "in Christ, reconciling to Himself the world." For this brings in the whole system of the Church—its services, its servants, its Sacramental ordinances, as being that peculiar agency, whereby the line of the New Adam supersedes the line of the old one.

Now this leads to the second of those two systems, which is opposed to that of the Church; a system which has its origin in different motives from the first, and rests its objections on other grounds. If its adherents deny the efficacy of the Sacramental system, it is not from any professed intent of maintaining the dignity of nature, but from fear lest religion herself should be prejudiced by dependence on external forms. This is no doubt a groundless apprehension; for there is no reason why a high estimate of the importance and efficacy of God's grace should interfere with any

man's conscientiousness. Yet this fear leads many persons, who allow that God bestows grace at times in Baptism, to deny that grace is bestowed upon all infants who are duly baptized.

The reason why infant Baptism is the peculiar point in which these parties come into collision with the Church's declarations, is only because it affords the readiest criterion for determining whether the blessing is supposed to depend on God's act in the ordinance itself, or on the value of those dispositions which men bring to its reception. Mr. Goode states that his anxiety is, lest the dignity of the ministerial office should be overrated, and too much importance be attached to the persons by whom Baptism is administered. He forgets, apparently, that where this Sacrament is most highly thought of, as for example in the Church of Rome, its validity is not supposed to rest upon the character of the administrator; and that in our own Church it was the Puritan party who were anxious to confine its ministration to the clergy, and its celebration to the occasions of public worship. So that the case does not turn upon the person of the administrator, but on the question whether words and elements have been really invested with any supernatural efficacy, by being appointed to be the means of admission into the mystical Body of Christ.

However distinct therefore, this system may be from that of Rationalism, it touches upon it in some important particulars. Those who maintain it are not conscious, undoubtedly, of the least intention of derogating from the reality of Our Lord's Mediation. Yet they are sometimes found to borrow arguments, and derive co-operation from quarters

with which they ought to have no sympathy. And since they deny that grace is *always* bestowed by God in Holy Baptism, there is danger lest His casual and uncertain action should be confounded with that general agency of the Creative Power, the times and laws whereof it is impossible to restrict. For those who deny Divine help to mean any thing more than that activity of the created mind, which may ultimately be referred to the workmanship of its Creator (thus overthrowing the whole scheme of Mediation,) yet allow that this activity may display itself simultaneously with the exhibition of sacraments, as well as at any other period (*p.* 136.) The only security against such misunderstanding, is the full admission of the Church's doctrine; the avowal, namely, that a spiritual gift is bestowed upon *all* infants through that act, whereby they are taken out of the line of Adam and grafted into the line of Christ. So that the opposition which is founded upon the first or Rationalistic principle—upon the alleged inefficacy, that is, of Baptism, or upon the unreasonableness of expecting material means to involve a spiritual effect—is not unfrequently countenanced by those, whose objections are founded on a professedly religious basis (*p.* 134.) For while these last go beyond the Rationalistic system in allowing that *some* infants receive grace in Baptism, they agree with it in falling short of the Church's doctrine, that grace is bestowed upon *all*.

The alleged ground upon which this second counter-system is rested, is that certain conditions are requisite, where infant Baptism is to have its due effect. These conditions are stated by Mr. Goode to be either a sentence of election on the

part of God, or the prevision of faith and repentance in the child, or, finally, the character of its parents. It is not possible to adduce any express words, either of Holy Scripture or of the Church, in which it is stated that such qualifications are required by infants. But the analogy of adult Baptism suggests the consideration,[1] that since this rite implies both a giver and a receiver, its efficacy may possibly be invalidated by questioning the intention of the one, or the fitness of the other. And, further, since the present condition of the infant receiver affords no ground on which exceptions can be built, those who desire to discriminate the qualifications of one infant from those of another, are led to push their inquiries forward into its future life, or back into the circumstances of its parentage. Such is the history of those qualifications for infant Baptism, the introduction of which Mr. Goode states to be the fundamental principle of his work. The reader shall be reminded what qualification for infant Baptism is allowed by the Church—and on what grounds the others have been asserted to be inadmissible.

The intention of the Giver of grace is held by the Church to be sufficiently expounded by His actions. To suppose that God sanctions the ministration of Baptism to infants as a means of joining them to the Body of Christ, while by a secret

[1] So Mr Gorham says, "the unconditional efficacy of Baptism, when rightly administered, was the point enforced by the Bishop;" "the conditional efficacy of that Sacrament as dependent on due reception, was the doctrine defended by myself."—(*Introduction*, p. xxiv.)

Decree He incapacitates those on whom the blessing is bestowed from profiting by his bounty, is incompatible not only with His mercy but with His truth. Such a supposition was rejected, as we have seen, even by Divines who had been delegates at Dort, as rendering the tenet of Reprobation too revolting, and outdoing the rigors of Fatalism itself (*p.* 261.) And the Church pronounces against it, by declaring to the friends of *every* child; "Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will likewise favourably receive this present infant" (*p.* 83.)

From this condition of "a previous sentence of election," which Mr. Goode himself virtually abandons (*p.* 268,) we turn to the other party in Baptism—namely, the receiver of grace. What qualifications can the child possess, as fitting it to be the receiver of Baptism?

Now the main difference between the Church's system, and that which Mr. Goode opposes to it, is that according to the first the child's qualification is its present state; according to the second, either its future condition or the character of its parents. The child's present condition is simply its possession of that corrupt nature, which it inherits from our common parent. And this is all which the Church requires as its qualification for Baptism (*p.* 66.) So soon as the individual responsibility is able either to oppose God's grace or to accept it, she adds such conditions as grow out of this power. In respect to infants she adds none. And the fact that she *expresses* such conditions in the case of adults, instead of showing, as Mr. Goode supposes, that she designed them to be

implied in the case of infants, is a clear proof that in the latter case she employs none, because she designs that none should be employed (*p.* 74, 212.) She does not bestow Baptism, indeed, where there is no hope of a Christian education; not however because such children are incapable of receiving the gift, but because they must be expected to profane it. All this is evident, not only by reference to her more extended services, but especially from that office which is provided for cases of emergency, in which, therefore none but essential particulars are included (*p.* 113.)

Such is the Church's system; a system which considers *all* infants who inherit the nature of the old Adam, to be fit candidates for the blessings of the new. Now for this qualification Mr. Goode has substituted two others—one drawn from a prevision of the child's future conduct, the other from the character of its parents. It has been shown, however, that the words of our Catechism were not designed, as Mr. Goode imagines, to afford any countenance to the first of these conditions; neither is it possible that they should countenance it. For this condition has been proved to be distinctly Pelagian in its tendency; and therefore to be opposed to the whole system of the Church (*p.* 105.) There remains the other condition, derived from the character of the parents. And this likewise has been shown to be incompatible with the system of Christianity, and to militate against its cardinal principle, the Mediation of Christ (*p.* 272.) So that both these conditions are as inconsistent with the principles of revealed, as that which is adduced from God's

absolute decrees, with those of natural religion. And the qualification which is rested on the faith of the parents is no less contrary to the laws of the Church than to its doctrines. For to act upon it would be a direct infraction of Canons, which the Church's Courts neither would nor could allow (*p.* 98, 276.)

There remains no alternative, then, but the acceptance of that more tolerant course, which the Church Catholic has ever pursued. And this is not less accordant with the best feelings of men, than with the revelation of God. For what so much commends infancy even to human aid as its helplessness? And what, therefore, can more fitly commend it to *His* pity, whose mercy is over all His works? Why, then, should we doubt that their necessities are our best plea in bringing our infants to the Good Shepherd?

EXTRACTS,

Translated from Dr. Samuel Ward's "Determinationes Theologicæ," published by Seth Ward, D. D., London, 1658, p. 44–47.

Sacraments confer grace on those who place no bar.

* * * * *

We say that Sacraments confer grace in the above mentioned manner on those who place no bar, whereby we mean on all who place no bar against them. That this may be understood, we must say what would be a bar. This term the Schoolmen took from St. Augustin, who says, in his 23d Epistle, that an infant receives the Sacrament of faith to his salvation, if he does not oppose to faith the bar of any contradictory thought; as for instance an act of unbelief, or of contempt, or of indifference. The Schoolmen, following St. Augustin, understand by a bar any mortal sin, which opposes saving grace; whether it be the refusal of consent, or dissent; whether it be the not opening the heart when grace is given, or the shutting it—as Bradwardin explains the matter.—(*De Causa Dei.* ii. 32.)

When we say, then, that Sacraments confer grace on those who do not place a bar, we do not say that Sacraments confer grace absolutely on every receiver, inasmuch as men who are indisposed and unworthy are not meet subjects, and therefore, by reason of their state, not capable of Divine grace. The conferring, therefore, of grace by Sacraments must be conditional, and depend upon a certain law; neither can there be a more suitable condition laid down, than that no bar should be found in the recipient—nothing, that is, which withstands God's grace. There are two ways in which sin puts a bar; either by the commission of an offence, or by the omission of a bounden and possible duty. From which it may be understood what it is *not* to place a bar to the Sacraments. A man is said *not* to place a bar, either—first, By not opposing a fresh sin, when he might oppose it; secondly, By preparing himself properly for the reception of the Sacrament, and removing hindrances; thirdly, By being simply negative so far as concerns any previous dis-

positions, in case it is neither in his power to commit any new sin, nor to prepare himself to be a fit and worthy receiver.

In the third of these ways infants place no bar; as well as all those, who are capable of grace, and yet cannot act as moral agents, from the deficiency of their understanding, and from not possessing the power of will. Their condition makes it impossible that they should oppose a bar; and therefore we say, that on them Sacraments infallibly confer grace.

Every one who comes to the Sacrament fitly and rightly prepared, may be said in the second way to place no bar.

The first mode—that is, the not opposing a new sin, when one might oppose it—is not sufficient to obtain the effect of a Sacrament for its adult receivers For not to opppose a bar by abstaining from fresh sin is not sufficient; but a right disposition, and positive preparation is required to render an adult a fit receiver. It is most material to observe, that though the death of Christ is the most powerful and efficacious remedy against every kind of sin; yet, that unless taken and applied, it is profitless. And this application is not made by an adult receiver of the Sacrament, unless he comes fitly prepared to these Holy Mysteries. And that any one may be prepared, there need various dispositions—a belief in the Catholic Faith, the hope of pardon, fear of punishment, sorrow for sin, purpose of amendment, intent to lead a new life—all which are things which prepare the receiver. There must also be a true and living faith in Christ the Mediator for the remission of sins, seeing that He is the only medium whereby the redemption of Christ is applied instrumentally for the remission of sins. On a man who is thus prepared, by virtue of the Divine promise there is infallibly conferred grace; as well to secure to him the righteousness of faith, as to increase and seal inherent righteousness.

After these previous explanations, our Thesis may be conveniently proved by some conclusions, both in the Sacrament of Baptism, and in that of the Eucharist.

Our first conclusion is this; as infants place no bar, Baptism always confers upon them the first measure of grace, namely, the forgiveness of Original Sin. The proofs are:—

First—Every infant is conceived and born in sin, as David confesses about himself, *Ps.* li. 7; *Job* xiv. 4; *Eph.* ii. 3; that is, he is subject to Original Sin. But when a child of this sort has been received by Baptism, a promise of remission of sins is

made to him; *Acts* ii. 38, 39. Here a promise of forgiveness of sins is made to the baptized seed of the Israelites; as to the circumcised seed of pious men was given a promise of peculiar protection, in which was involved the promise of forgiveness. You therefore visibly perform the Sacrament of initiation; it applies and confers, on the part of God, the real thing, which is promised--namely, grace for the remission of Original Sin. The infant receiver, on his part, makes no opposition, nor can make any; so as to prevent him from being a capable suscipient of the remission which is exhibited and conferred. Therefore on infants as putting no bar, the Sacrament of Baptism infallibly confers grace for the remission of Original Sin.

Secondly—If Baptism is only a sign of grace, and does not confer it, nothing is given to those who die in infancy, nor on non-elect infants who survive is any thing ever conferred by virtue of the Sacrament. To them, therefore, it would be nothing but a naked and ineffacious sign, which ought not to be asserted. For either Baptism confers grace for the remission of Original Guilt, so far as no impediment is opposed on the part of the receiver, or it is possible to assign some more fitting condition, by his legitimate compliance with which it would be efficacious to him. But it is impossible to assign any more fitting condition, which *can* be complied with by those parties, who, from want of reason and will (of which this age is incapable,) are unable to do any thing as moral agents. Hence Augustin most truly says (*Ep.* xxiii.,) that infants receive the Sacrament of faith, *i. e.* Baptism, to their salvation, if they do not oppose against faith the bar of hostile thought, or of any evil action. But an infant cannot oppose the bar of evil thought, or an evil action, since it can neither think nor act with any freedom. In its case, therefore, because it places no bar, Baptism is sure of having its proper efficacy, so far as concerns the conferring grace for the remission of Original Guilt.

Thirdly—God has ordered the infants of the faithful to be baptized under the new Covenant, as under the old he ordered them to be circumcised; and to this command he has annexed the promise of remitting their original guilt, which is the first and main benefit, whereof an infant is capable; and so much the very symbol of ablution expresses. But God does not order any to be baptized, except those who are capable of the benefits of Baptism, and who need them: and seeing that infants are incapable of opposing any bar, and need no predisposition, they

are fit to receive the thing, which baptismal ablution expresses. What is to hinder this Sacrament therefore from being a true sign of the grace which it expresses; why should it not be a real exhibition of the purpose, which is intended on the part of God, and proceed without fail to the completion of its purpose? Therefore, when an infant is baptized according to the Divine appointment, the thing which is expressed by the Sacrament is regularly conferred upon it; and this thing is not merely the giving a pledge of the forgiveness of original guilt, when it shall have grown up, and become capable of faith and penitence; but it is the actual application of the first remission of original guilt (before unforgiven,) which is bestowed in the Sacramental ablution itself.

Fourthly—The ordinary media of applying the merits of Christ are no other than the Word and the Sacraments. But the Word does not apply the merits of Christ to an infant, who is brought to be baptized, because the Word cannot have its effect till it is understood; neither is there any Sacrament, except Baptism, which is applicable to infants. Either, therefore, no ordinary medium is provided on the part of God, for the application of Christ's merits to unresisting infants, or the Sacrament of Baptism is such a medium; seeing that no other ordinary medium on the part of God is revealed in Scripture. On infants, therefore, since they place no bar against it, the Sacrament of Baptism infallibly confers grace for the remission of original sin.

Fifthly—Supposing that infants, not placing a bar, do not receive grace for the remission of original sin from Baptism, it might seem that God does not act seriously and truly with the recipient, whom He wills and orders to be baptized. Whereas a new covenant was made with the whole human race, God would seem to be wanting to its signs and Sacraments, though the same were ordered and were rightly administered; and (which it were an impiety to suppose) not to stand to His promises. Wherefore it must be said, that God, whom no impediment withstands on the part of the receiver (no resistance, that is, from his free-agency,) is not wanting to His own appointment, but confers the remission of original guilt on the baptized infant. Hence Augustin says, *Ep.* clvii., "The remission of sins, even in the Baptism of infants, is no unreal process, no matter of words, but an actual fact." I say nothing about the consent of Antiquity in this matter, about which it were crimi-

nal to doubt. I will only adduce Prosper's statement: "if any one says that the grace conferred in Baptism does not take away original sin in those who are not predestinated, he is no Catholic." . . . . . .

All baptized infants are undoubtedly justified.[1] *p.* 50-53.

* * * * * * * *

. . . . It is further inquired, whether all infants rightly baptized are undoubtedly justified. Here some very learned theologians hesitate; inasmuch as they restrict this effect of justification from original sin to elect infants. We make two assertions—first, that all infants, rightly baptized, who die in their infancy, are unquestionably justified.

This is laid down by the Church of England in her Ritual; in the Rubric, which speaks of the delay of Confirmation. Lest any "man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their Confirmation, he shall know for truth, that it is certain, by God's word, that children being baptized, have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved." Now, here it is said that infants who are baptized have all things necessary for their salvation (necessary, that is, in the infant state;) and are undoubtedly saved. This must mean

---

[1] This proposition does not affirm more than the Homily of Salvation, to which we are referred by the XIth Art., as explaining, the nature of Justification. "Our office is not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly, after that we are *baptized or justified*." Mr. Goode would escape from the force of this passage on the ground that it is possible to assign "another sense" "for the word '*or*'" But though the word '*or*' is used to indicate both identity and contrast, yet the context always indicates which it means. Again, if it does not mean the first, it must mean the second. So that if Cranmer did not mean to affirm that which his words naturally imply, he must have designed to say that there were two ways of entering into a state of grace, one being Holy Baptism, the other that which was to be employed in the case of those who were not baptized, namely, Justification.

of course, if they die as children, for it is certain that many who have been baptized and grow up are not saved. These expressions, as they occur in our present Ritual, are taken, word for word, from the Ritual which was published A. D. 1552, in the fifth year of Edward VI.; but they are still more plainly put in the first revision, in the second year of Edward, A. D. 1549, which may be found in Bucer's Scripta Anglicana. "And that no man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their confirmation: he shall know for truth, that it is certain by God's word, that children being baptized (if they depart out of this life in their infancy,) are undoubtedly saved." Now this is nearly the same statement which was made in the synodal book, issued by the authority of the whole English clergy, A. D. 1537, called the "Institution of a Christian Man," in the Chapter on the Sacrament of Confirmation. "It is not to be thought that there is any such necessity of Confirmation of infants, but that they being baptized, and dying innocent before they be confirmed, shall be assured to attain everlasting life, and salvation by the effect of the Sacrament of Baptism before received." Nearly the same thing is to be found in another book, called the "Institution of a Christian Man," which was published six years afterwards, by the authority of Henry VIII., [*i. e*, the necessary Doctrine and Erudition, &c.] In the "Homily of Salvation," published 1547, in the first year of Edward VI., occurs the statement, "that infants, being baptized, and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made His children, and inheritors of His kingdom of heaven."

From the passages which have been quoted we see, that, according to the received doctrine of the Church of England, it is clear by God's Word, that infants who are rightly baptized have all things necessary for their salvation, *i. e.*, in the state of infancy; and if they die in that state, must undoubtedly be saved. Now, when our Church says that the salvation of such infants is certain by God's Word, much more must she intend to affirm the same thing respecting their justification, by the removal of the guilt of original sin, since there can be no salvation, unless original guilt has first been done away.

This justification of baptized infants, dying in that tender age, stands on these firm principles. First—It rests on the nature of this Sacrament, which is the only mean, remedy, or Sacrament appointed by God to apply Christ's merits to such infants,

for the washing away of original sin. Either, therefore, it must be held that Baptism is not by God's appointment a sufficient remedy to those whose only remedy it is, which is an intolerable supposition; or else that it is an efficacious Sacrament, whereby in such infants original sin is done away.

. . . Thirdly—God always works efficaciously in His Sacraments in these cases, in which the receiver, being unable to give any positive assent, opposes no obstacle. Hence Augustin says that an infant receives the Sacrament of Faith, *i. e.* Baptism, to his salvation, if he does not oppose to faith the obstacle of opposing thought (Ep. 23.) But infants cannot oppose such a bar: in them therefore Baptism is sure to be efficacious for the removal of original sin. Let us see what was the sense of Antiquity in this matter. . . . . .

This was our first assertion: our second is, that all infants, even those who are non-elect, and who will ultimately perish, if duly baptized in their infancy, are freed in Baptism from the guilt of original sin.

The grounds of this assertion are—first, the nature of Sacraments; which by Divine appointment are efficacious signs, and so efficacious, that where no impediment is opposed by the receiver, they have their effect, according to the receiver's capacity. . . . . .

Secondly—The same thing is shown by the words of administration, which the Minister pronounces in the present tense, while he is baptizing. He says, "I dip," or, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" from which it is obvious that Baptism really effects that which the Minister pronounces. . . . . Fourthly—Sacraments are rightly called moral[2] instruments, and organs which exhibit the grace which they signify. How, then, shall Baptism be called an instrument of grace, when used respecting infants, if when it is actually used and applied to them, and is

---

[2] On the statement that Sacraments are moral instruments, Mr. Goode, quotes a passage from Estius, which is referred to also by Dr. Pusey ("Scriptural Views of Baptism," p. 127, 1st Ed.) Estius denies respecting Sacraments "virtutem aliquam creatam eis incesse:" he maintains that "divinia virtus sacramentis ad producendum gratiæ effectum certo et infallibiter ex Christi promisione assistit."—*In Lib.* iv. *Sentent. Dist.* i. n. 5.

not hindered of its perfect action by any resistance derived from the free-agency of the receiver, it yet fails to produce that effect, for which by Divine appointment it was ordained. . . . .

You will say that Sacraments produce this effect, when they are rightly used. Now, whatever may be the intention of the Church, it may be thought that it is not God's intention that this remedy should be rightly applied to a non-elect infant. I reply, that it is not true that this remedy is not rightly applied to a non-elect infant. I assert that the Church rightly and savingly presents as well elect as non-elect infants to Baptism; that she does right in washing both indiscriminately in the laver of Baptism, and that God renders His appointment effectual, so far as the doing away original sin, whatever previous decree may have been passed, in all cases in which opposition is not made by the receiver's free agency. And this I will prove by the consent of Antiquity. . . . . .

THE END.