



BX 5133.M62 S39 1846
Moberly, George
The sayings of the great forty
days



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

FEBRUARY, 1846.

NEW BOOKS

IN THE COURSE OF PUBLICATION

BY

MESSRS. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

I.

The DOCTRINE of DEVELOPMENT, and of CONSCIENCE, Examined. In reply to Mr. WARD'S IDEAL of a CHRISTIAN CHURCH, and Mr. NEWMAN'S ESSAY on DEVELOPMENT. By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford. In 8vo. (*In preparation.*)

II.

VIRGILII OPERA, VOL. II. (Æn. 1—6.) Addita est Interpretatio quam ex Adnotationibus Heynii, Wunderlichii, Wagneri, Forbigeri, aliorum, excerptis THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Collegii SS. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienses quondam Socius. In 8vo. 12s. (*Just published.*)

III.

A MANUAL of COUNCILS of the HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, comprising the Substance of the most remarkable and important CANONS. Alphabetically arranged. By the Rev. EDWARD H. LANDON, M.A., late of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. In 12mo. (*Nearly ready.*)

IV.

SERMONS preached in LENT, 1845, and on several former Occasions, before the University of Cambridge. By W. H. MILL, D.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta; Chaplain to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. In 8vo. 12s.

Lately published, by the same Author,

1. An ANALYSIS of BISHOP PEARSON'S EXPOSITION of the CREED. 5s.
2. FIVE SERMONS on OUR LORD'S TEMPTATION. 6s. 6d.

V.

SACRED POEMS for MOURNERS. In Illustration of the BURIAL SERVICE. Selected from Various Authors. With an Introduction by the Rev. R. C. TRENCH, M.A. In small 8vo. (*In a few days.*)

VI.

The **FIRST GERMAN BOOK**, on the Plan of "Henry's First Latin Book." By the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (With the Assistance and Advice of J. W. FRÄEDERSDORFF, formerly of the University of Berlin.) In 12mo. 5s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

VII.

A Second Volume of **PAROCHIAL SERMONS**, preached in the Parish Church of Heversham, Westmoreland. By the Rev. ROBERT WILSON EVANS, B.D., Vicar; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and Author of "The Rectory of Valehead," and "Bishopric of Souls." In small 8vo. 6s. (*Now ready.*)

* * * *The Second Edition of the FIRST VOLUME is now ready.* 6s.

VIII.

LECTURES upon the **COLLECTS** of the **CHURCH** of **ENGLAND** and **IRELAND**. By the Rev. F. D. LEMPRIERE, M.A., Rector of Newton St. Petrock, Devon; Author of "Lessons on the Prophecies." **FIRST SERIES.** In 8vo. 12s. (*Just published.*)

IX.

RECATANTION; or, the **CONFESSIONS** of a **CONVERT** to **ROMANISM**: a **TALE**, written during a Residence in Tuscany and the Papal States. In small 8vo. 6s.

X.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS for **DOMESTIC USE**. By GEORGE D'OYLY, D.D., F.R.S., Rector of Lambeth; and of Sundridge in Kent. In 2 vols. 8vo. (*In the press.*)

XI.

The **SAYINGS** of the **GREAT FORTY DAYS** between the **RESURRECTION** and **ASCENSION**, regarded as the Outlines of the Kingdom of God. In Five Discourses, preached in Winchester College Chapel. By GEORGE MOBERLY, D.D., Head Master. **SECOND EDITION**, very much enlarged. With a Preface, containing some Examination of Mr. NEWMAN'S THEORY of DEVELOPMENT. In 8vo. (*Nearly ready.*)

XII.

A **PRACTICAL COMMENT** on the **ORDINATION SERVICE**. By the Rev. JOHN JAMES, D.D., Canon of Peterborough. In 12mo. (*In the press.*)

Also, by the same Author (uniformly printed),

1. *On the COLLECTS*—A COMMENT on the COLLECTS of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Tenth Edition.* 5s.
2. *On the PRAYER BOOK*.—CHRISTIAN WATCHFULNESS, in the prospect of Sickness, Mourning, and Death. *Fifth Edition.* 6s.
3. *On the SUNDAY LESSONS*.—THE SUNDAY LESSONS. With Practical and Explanatory Notes. 12s.
4. *On the OCCASIONAL OFFICES*.—THE MOTHER'S HELP towards instructing her Children in the Excellencies of the CATECHISM and the OCCASIONAL SERVICES. 8s. 6d.
5. *On the ORDINATION SERVICE*.—(*The Volume above mentioned, in the press*)

XIII.

THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS; or, Instruction for the Young Student concerning the CHURCH, and our own Branch of it. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Head Master of Harrow School. *Fourth Edition.* In post 8vo. 8s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

XIV.

SERMONS, published at the request of many of his late Parishioners. By JOHN, Bishop of Fredericton. 12mo. *Second Edition.* 7s.

XV.

PRACTICAL RELIGION Exemplified by LETTERS and PASSAGES from the LIFE of the late Rev. ROBERT ANDERSON, Perpetual Curate of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. By the Hon. Mrs. ANDERSON. In small 8vo. *Third Edition.* 6s. (*Now ready.*)

XVI.

HENGSTENBERG'S CHRISTOLOGY of the OLD TESTAMENT, Translated from the German, and abridged and condensed. By the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 8vo. (*Nearly ready.*)

XVII.

LECTURES on the First Seventeen Chapters of the ACTS of the APOSTLES. Delivered at St. George's Church, Hanover-square. By the Very Rev. ROBERT HODGSON, D.D., late Dean of Carlisle, and Rector. In 8vo. 12s.

XVIII.

EARLY INFLUENCES. By the Author of "Truth without Prejudice." In small 8vo. 3s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

XIX.

The Sixth Volume of **PLAIN PAROCHIAL SERMONS.** By the Rev. JAMES SLADE, M.A., Vicar of Bolton, and Canon of Chester. In 12mo. 6s. (*Just published.*)

Lately published, New Edition of Vols. I. to V. (sold separately), 6s. each.

XX.

SONGS of the BIRDS; or, Analogies of Animal and Spiritual Life. By the Rev. W. E. EVANS, M.A., Prebendary of Hereford. In small 8vo. 5s. 6d.

XXI.

The **LIVING** and the **DEAD**: a Course of **PRACTICAL SERMONS** on the BURIAL SERVICE. By FRANCIS E. PAGET, M.A., Rector of Elford. In 12mo. 6s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

XXII.

The OLD-CHURCH CLOCK. By RICHARD PARKINSON, B.D., Canon of Manchester. *Third Edition.* 5s. (with Engravings.)

Also, lately published, by the same Author,

1. The CONSTITUTION of the VISIBLE CHURCH of CHRIST CONSIDERED; being the Hulsean Lectures for the Year 1839. 8vo. 6s.
2. RATIONALISM and REVELATION; being the Hulsean Lectures for the Year 1838. 8vo. 6s.
3. SERMONS on POINTS of DOCTRINE and RULES of DUTY. 2 vols. 12mo. 12s. *Third Edition.*
4. PRAYERS for the YOUNG. *Second Edition.* 1s.

XXIII.

PRACTICAL SERMONS. By the Rev. B. E. NICHOLLS, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Walthamstow; Author of a "Help to the Reading of the Bible." In 12mo. 6s.

XXIV.

DIARY in FRANCE; Mainly on Topics concerning EDUCATION and the CHURCH. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of St. Peter's, Westminster. In post 8vo. 6s. 6d.

XXV.

An HISTORICAL INQUIRY into the TRUE INTERPRETATION of the RUBRICS in the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER respecting the SERMON and the COMMUNION SERVICE. By the Rev. BENJAMIN HARRISON, M.A., Student of Christ Church; Domestic Chaplain to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. (*Dedicated, by permission, to His Grace.*) In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

XXVI.

TALES for the BUSH. By Mrs. FRANCIS VIDAL. In 18mo. (*In preparation.*)

XXVII.

SERMONS, preached at BRIGHTON. By the Rev. C. E. KENNAWAY, M.A., Minister of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. In small 8vo. 7s 6d.

XXVIII.

FIVE GENERATIONS of a LOYAL HOUSE. (In Two Parts.) PART I. containing the LIVES of RICHARD BERTIE, and HIS SON PEREGRINE, LORD WILLOUGHBY, Queen Elizabeth's General in the Low Countries. By Lady GEORGINA BERTIE. In small 4to. £1 15s.

XXIX.

BP. JEREMY TAYLOR'S HOLY LIVING and DYING. Adapted to General Use. By the Rev. W. H. HALE, M.A., Archdeacon of London, and Master of the Charter House. *Second Edition.* In small 8vo. 8s. 6d.

XXX.

The ENGLISH REVIEW, No. VIII. CONTENTS.—

1. MODERN POETS—MISS BARRETT, BROWNING, PATMORE.
2. WELLINGTON.
3. SYRIAC EPISTLES OF ST. IGNATIUS.
4. COLLETTA'S HISTORY OF NAPLES.
5. NEWMAN'S ESSAY ON DEVELOPMENT.
6. STATE OF POLITICAL PARTIES.
7. THE NATIONAL CLUB.
8. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.
9. FOREIGN AND COLONIAL INTELLIGENCE.

In 8vo. 6s. (*Continued Quarterly.*)

XXXI.

The Seventh Volume of PLAIN SERMONS. By Contributors to the "TRACTS FOR THE TIMES." In 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Lately published, VOLS. I. TO VI., price 6s. 6d. each.

XXXII.

REVIEW of the LATEST EVENTS and PRESENT STATE of the CHURCH of CHRIST. By C. F. AF WINGARD, D.D., Archbishop of Upsal, and Primate of all Sweden. Translated from the Swedish, by the Rev. G. W. CARLSON. In small 8vo. 6s. 6d.

* * This Volume contains a particular account of the Greek Church and its Sects, and of the Church in Sweden, with a notice of the other branches of the Christian Church.

XXXIII.

The ANNUAL REGISTER; or, a View of the History and Politics of the YEAR 1844. In 8vo. 16s. (*Now ready.*)

XXXIV.

EIGHT SERMONS, preached in ST. PANCRAS CHURCH. With an Appendix. By the Rev. G. S. DREW, B.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge, Minister of St. Pancras Parochial Chapel. In 8vo. 6s.

XXXV.

The DOCTRINE of the RUSSIAN CHURCH; being TRANSLATIONS, by the Rev. R. W. BLACKMORE. Edited by the Rev. W. PALMER, Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford. (Printed uniformly with Mouravieff's History of the Russian Church.) In 8vo. 10s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

XXXVI.

The ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY of the SECOND and THIRD CENTURIES, illustrated from the Writings of TERTULLIAN. By JOHN KAYE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Lincoln. *Third Edition.* In 8vo. 13s.

XXXVII.

POEMS, Scriptural, Classical, and Miscellaneous. By R. C. COXE, M.A., Vicar of Newcastle-on-Tyne. In small 8vo. 7s.

XXXVIII.

The DARK AGES; being a Series of ESSAYS intended to illustrate the State of RELIGION and LITERATURE in the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th Centuries. Reprinted from the "British Magazine," with Corrections, and some Additions. By the Rev. S. R. MAITLAND, F.R.S. & F.S.A., Librarian to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth. *Second Edition, with additional Notes.* In 8vo. 12s.

* * * The Additional Notes may be had separately (to complete the First Edition). *Price 1s.*

XXXIX.

A SELECTION of PSALMS and HYMNS for PUBLIC WORSHIP. By the late Rev. THOMAS COTTERILL, M.A. In 24mo. *Thirty-third Edition.* 2s. 6d. (or on fine paper, 3s. 6d.)

Also, by the same Author, FAMILY PRAYERS. *Eighth Edition.* 7s.

XL.

A PLAIN and SHORT HISTORY of ENGLAND for CHILDREN: in Letters from a Father to his Son. With Questions. By GEORGE DAVYS, D.D., Lord Bishop of Peterborough. *Seventh Edition.* 2s. 6d.

XLI.

The GOSPEL NARRATIVE of OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION HARMONIZED: with REFLECTIONS. By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. In small 8vo. 8s.

XLII.

A GENERAL VIEW of the DOCTRINE of REGENERATION in BAPTISM. By the Right Rev. CHRISTOPHER BETHELL, D.D., Lord Bishop of Bangor. *Fourth Edition.* In 8vo. 9s.

* * * An Appendix of 76 pages is added to this Edition, consisting of Remarks on Mr. Faber's "*Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration.*"

XLIII.

ORIGINES LITURGICÆ; or, the ANTIQUITIES of the ENGLISH RITUAL: with a Dissertation on PRIMITIVE LITURGIES. By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford. *Fourth Edition, enlarged.* In 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

* * * This Edition contains a notice of those Rites of the English Church which are not comprised in the Prayer-Book; including (amongst others) the Inthronization of Bishops—the forms of Holding Synods and Convocations—Visitation and Diocesan Synod—Coronation of Kings—and Consecration of Churches and Cemeteries.

A SUPPLEMENT may be had, containing these Additions, (to complete the former Editions), *price 2s. 6d.*

XLIV.

INSTRUCTIONS for the USE of CANDIDATES for HOLY ORDERS, and of the PAROCHIAL CLERGY, as to ORDINATION, LICENSES, INDUCTION, PLURALITIES, RESIDENCE, &c. &c.; with Acts of Parliament relating to the above, and Forms to be used. By CHRISTOPHER HODGSON, M.A., Secretary to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. *Sixth Edition.* In 8vo. 12s.

* * * This Edition contains many important alterations, in consequence of Acts of Parliament passed since the last Edition (1838); including a complete Digest of the Powers enabling Incumbents to provide or improve Glebe Houses, and Instructions for the grant of Leases of Glebe Lands under the recent Act; with other additions of importance to the Clergy and their Solicitors or Agents.

XLV.

The Second Part of the **BOY'S ARITHMETIC.** By the Rev. CHARLES ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Tinwell. In 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Lately published, PART I. Price 3s. 6d.

XLVI.

The **COTTAGER'S MONTHLY VISITOR** for the YEAR 1845. This work is continued in Numbers, price 4d. each, and forms a Manual of Religious Instruction and Domestic Economy, suited to Family Reading, the Parochial Library, or the Servants' Hall. Its contents include Scriptural Exposition, Instructive Tales, Hints on Gardening and Agriculture, short Extracts from the best Authors, and occasionally from the Public News. The Volumes are sold separately, and are included in the List of Books recommended by the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.* (With Woodcuts.) 4s.

XLVII.

The **OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.** By A COUNTRY CLERGYMAN. In Simple Language for the Use of Children and Village Schools. A New Edition, with Sixteen Illustrations from original Drawings, and a Map. Royal 16mo. 6s. 6d.

The aim of this Work is to supply, for the use of the young and the unlearned, a clear and connected outline of Old Testament History, with an explanation of its chief difficulties, and at the same time to impress on the minds of children the truths and practical religious lessons which Holy Scripture was intended to convey.

An Edition of the same Work is prepared for the Use of Schools, without illustrations, strongly bound, price 3s. 6d. It may be also had without the Questions for Examination, price 2s. 6d.; or, bound in two parts, 1s. 6d. each.

XLVIII.

BP. COSIN'S DEVOTIONS. A Collection of PRIVATE DEVOTIONS, in the Practice of the Ancient Church, called the HOURS of PRAYER: as they were much after this manner published by authority of Queen Elizabeth, 1560. Taken out of the Holy Scriptures, the Ancient Fathers, and the Divine Service of our Church. *Thirteenth Edition.* Pocket size. 5s. 6d.

XLIX.

A Second Volume of SERMONS on SOME of the less prominent FACTS and REFERENCES in SACRED STORY. By the Rev. HENRY MELVILL, B.D., Principal of the East India College, Haileybury. In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

* * * The SECOND EDITION of VOL. I. is now ready. 10s. 6d.

L.

The Ancient Syriac Version of the EPISTLES of St. IGNA TIUS to POLYCARP, the EPHESIANS and the ROMANS, together with FRAGMENTS of his OTHER EPISTLES, extracted from Syriac Writers, discovered in MSS. of very great antiquity, and edited, with an ENGLISH TRANSLATION and NOTES, by the Rev. WILLIAM CURETON, M.A., F.R.S., of the British Museum. In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LI.

MISSIONS to the HEATHEN: being the BAMPTON LECTURE for 1843. By ANTHONY GRANT, D.C.L., Vicar of Romford, Essex; late Fellow of New College, Oxford. *Second Edition.* In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LII.

SCRIPTURAL COMMUNION with GOD; or, the HOLY BIBLE, arranged in HISTORICAL and CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER, divided into Sections, with INTRODUCTIONS, PRAYERS, and NOTES. By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, M.A., Canon of Durham. VOL. I. 8vo. 1l.

PART III. (which completes this Volume) is dedicated to the Bishop of Rome, on the Repentance of himself and his Church, as the foundation of the Reunion of Christians.

Lately published,

PART I. (Dedicated to Mothers of Families.) 6s.

PART II. (Dedicated to a Layman not in communion with the Established Church.) 6s.

LIII.

COMFORT for the AFFLICTED. Selected from Various Authors. Edited by the Rev. C. E. KENNAWAY. With a Preface by Archdeacon S. WILBERFORCE. *Second Edition.* In small 8vo. 5s.

LIV.

The Second Edition of the CLOUD of WITNESSES: a Series of Discourses on the Eleventh Chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews. By the Rev. JAMES S. M. ANDERSON, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, and Perpetual Curate of St. George's Chapel, Brighton. 8vo. VOL. I. 10s. 6d.

* * * THE THIRD AND CONCLUDING VOLUMES are in preparation.

LV.

QUESTIONS ILLUSTRATING the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES of the CHURCH of ENGLAND; with PROOFS from SCRIPTURE and the PRIMITIVE CHURCH. By the Rev. EDWARD BICKERSTETH, M.A., Curate of Holy Cross and St. Giles's, Shrewsbury. In 12mo. 4s.

Philip H. Wiley.

Herbert H. Evans.

THE
SAYINGS OF THE GREAT FORTY DAYS,

BETWEEN THE

RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION,

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.

Τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. ACT. SS. APOST. i. 3.

Ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται, ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

S. JOAN. XX. 31.

Fratres, pro magno audiri solent verba novissima parentis ituri in sepulcrum, et contemnuntur Domini verba novissima ascendentis in cælum? Existimemus Dominum nostrum testamentum scripsisse, et in testamento suo novissima verba possuisse.

S. AUGUSTIN. Serm. cclxv. de Asc. Dom.

Ad dies quadraginta remoratus est, ut de eo ad præcepta vitalia instrui possent, et discerent quæ docerent. S. CYPRIAN. de Idol. Van.

Second Edition.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1846.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

P R E F A C E.

THE alterations which have been made in this Edition have been principally expansions and enlargements of the argument, which had before been more shortly and summarily stated. These I must leave to speak for themselves; only expressing my regret that still they are more summary than I could wish them. But the greatness of the subject, and my own continual and pressing occupations, have made it impossible for me to take so wide a range of argument and illustration as the subject admits, and perhaps requires.

In one point I have made an alteration of arrangement; for whereas in the former Edition I had placed the Pastoral Commission before the Commissions to baptize and to absolve, on the ground of its appearing to be a larger and vaguer Commission, capable of being, as it were, divided,

or regarded more particularly in the other Commissions, I have now placed it after those Commissions. This has been done partly because the solemnity with which the other two Commissions were given appears to put them into a more eminent and important rank than the Pastoral; and partly because the Pastoral having been given, although to all the Apostles in design, yet to one only in word, I was unwilling to write or print any thing which might, even mistakenly, lead to the impression of my wishing to support that doctrine which I cannot but regard as the source of corruption in the Church, the true cause and provocative of all the manifold schisms of later years, the *πρώτον ψεῦδος* of debased Christianity, the doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope, or the absolute need of submission to him in order to membership of the Church of Christ, and his consequent infallibility in matters of doctrine.

This impression, which I would never have incurred willingly, it has now become most important to render impossible. And I therefore trust that I may not be doing what is faulty, in point either of taste or duty, in expressing my deep conviction of the soundness of the ground taken by the Church in England as against the See of Rome. The equality of the Apostles, which is capable of the most abundant proof, seems to lead directly to the equality of Bishops, and of Churches. Nor is it easy to conceive that what

was a real and acknowledged equality in the primitive ages, can have become a legitimate and due dominion in later ones. When this claim of dominion is found to involve an actual denial of the full Episcopal power to all Bishops throughout Christendom, except the single holder of the See of St. Peter, from whom all other Bishops are thought to hold only a delegated and vicarious authority; when this claim of dominion is used to substantiate and accredit a body of doctrine widely dissimilar from what the Holy Scriptures teach, and the writings of the primitive Fathers exhibit as believed in their times, it becomes a matter of the very first and most momentous consequence to ascertain whether that claim itself is well-founded, or whether, in fact, it be an usurpation, and therefore to be resisted by those who tender the true constitution of the Church of Christ, and the integrity of the Faith once delivered to the Saints. It is no longer then a question of peace, or of a meek spirit which can yield itself even to illegitimate claims of superiority; but it is a real, vital question. The Pope is not an individual whom for honour's sake, or for the sake of the antiquity or apostolicity of his See, we may inoffensively, and without evil consequence, regard with even more respect and submission than is his due; but he is the claimant of an universal monarchy, the very symbol of a theory of Church government unheard of for

many centuries of the Church's existence; the representative and enforcer of a system of doctrine, uniform in spirit, but very various in details, which, be it true or be it false, is very far from being identical with the system of doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, or the Creeds, or the primitive Church.

To a person bred within the bosom of the Church of Rome it is probably extremely difficult to gain the point of view from which the question of the validity of this wonderful claim can be rightly regarded, and adequately judged. His entire Christian knowledge and training have been so mixed up with the acknowledgment of the monarchical constitution of the visible Church, it so occupies the foreground of his view, that he can hardly, by any exercise of mind and judgment, disembarass himself of it sufficiently to test the real, historical grounds on which that monarchical constitution claims to rest; and the comparative withdrawal of the Holy Scripture from popular use, and other like measures of keeping Christian doctrine at a distance from popular examination and study, greatly increase the difficulty.

But every legitimate claim must have assignable grounds. Even though some persons may not be in a condition to see them, and though it may not be desirable for them to be often brought forward, or much talked of (as in the case of the regal authority and others such), yet grounds it

must have, or else it is groundless. And these grounds must be such as can be produced, and being produced, such as can be judged of.

Whatever these grounds be, a candid member of the Church of England, living in this age, and desirous above all things to assure himself that he is a "very member incorporate in the mystical Body of Christ, which is the blessed Company of all faithful people," would seem to be not unfavourably situated to judge of it. The heats of the Reformation are to him long since passed away. He neither participates in the sins of many of the individuals who contributed to place the Church of England in her independent position, nor in the angry feelings with which his fathers regarded their long since dead antagonists as merciless tyrants and persecutors, who only lacked the power, not the will, to force them either to recantation or the flames. If the Pope be indeed the Vicar of Christ, so that his decisions are indeed the present form of the Divine scheme of mercy for the restoration of the world, then, in the name of Him whom we desire to serve, let the point be proved, and we are ready to yield. If Christ be personally represented on earth by one man, so that to be, even reluctantly, painfully, and by compulsion out of communion with that one man, is equivalent to not having the Spirit of Christ, and so being none of His, then let the case be cleared, the argument made good, and we will

submit; yes, and if his priests declare it necessary, undo our very baptisms, acknowledge ourselves to have been no members of Christ, nor children of God, nor inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, by receiving re-baptism at the hand of his delegates.

But, alas! this very acknowledgment has been made, this very re-baptism received, the point of argument yielded, the Bishop of Rome's power submitted to as the true and legitimate ordinance of God, by many, and those not of small name, nor light esteem in the English Church, within these few weeks. We lament their loss; we lament it sore for ourselves, for we have lost their zeal, their learning, their piety, their fraternal love; still more do we lament it sore for them, for we believe them to have incurred the guilt of schism, to have contributed to strengthen a grievous usurpation and tyranny in God's Church, and therewith to have given their support to a mass of unauthorized and unfounded "*traditions of men,*" to the corruption of the true primitive Faith of Christ.

But why have they done this? what grounds do they state? what argument has told upon them with weight unfelt before? what have they seen, or read, or thought, which has caused them to desert the place in which they found themselves, and yielding to the Roman submission, to confess that every Church is essentially in schism which does not maintain, by acknowledgment of

the claim of dominion and infallibility, the supremacy in all the Church of the Bishop of the See of Rome?

For, if they have done it, why do we not do it? A few weeks, or months ago, they were at our side; acting together with us, feeling together, wishing together. They have changed, not we. Why do we not follow them? If they are right, we are wrong; if we are right, they are wrong. We are in schism, or they are. Unity has received a further rent, and which of us is guilty of the sin?

I know not whether we are to take the recently published volume of Mr. Newman as containing the answer to these questions. Certainly the publications of Mr. Ward and Mr. Oakeley were so far from offering an adequate answer to them, that it was nearly equally difficult to conclude from them, why they stayed so long with us, or why they went at last; what they thought upon the questions which divide the Churches, or whether they thought upon them at all. They "held all Roman doctrine," not submitting to the Pope, which is the heart of Roman doctrine: they submitted to the Pope, and one at least of them acknowledged that when he did so, he had not examined the argument of the Supremacy.

It may well be believed that I should not venture to take notice of Mr. Newman's volume, if I

did not feel myself imperatively called upon to do so. It is too obviously impossible to need a disclaimer, that I should willingly put myself in any position where I should provoke comparison with the immense learning and extraordinary ability of Mr. Newman.

But as his book has appeared while these sheets are passing through the press, and as it happens that the course of my argument in the Fourth Discourse has actually carried me in some degree over part of the subject of *Developments in Christian Doctrine*, which is the subject of his *Essay*, I do not feel at liberty to shrink from considering and stating how far his argument has appeared to me to overthrow or confirm the views stated by myself.

Mr. Newman then having before held, "what there is not the shadow of a reason for saying that the Fathers held, what has not the faintest pretensions of being a Catholic truth, is this, that St. Peter or his successors were and are universal Bishops, that they have the whole of Christendom for their one Diocese in a way in which other Apostles and Bishops had and have not;" has now submitted himself to this very claim, and holds that Popes, with all their alleged powers, are as fully implied in the Apostles, "as creation argues continual governance." And why so?

For these reasons.

“Christianity (*after M. Guizot's suggestion*) came into the world as an idea, rather than an institution¹.”

Every idea must of necessity admit of development².

“Unless then some special ground of exception can be assigned, it is as evident that Christianity, as a doctrine and worship, will develop in the minds of recipients, as that it conforms, in other respects, to the general methods by which the course of things is carried forward³.” “The idea of Christianity, as originally revealed, cannot but develop⁴.”

Christianity thus necessarily requiring development, requires equally necessarily an infallible present guide.

“The common sense of mankind feels that the very idea of revelation implies a present informant and guide, and that an infallible one⁵.” “If Christianity is both social and dogmatic, and intended for all ages, it must, humanly speaking, have an infallible expounder⁶.”

Thus there is a strong antecedent probability in favour of developments; and “if this probability is great, it almost supersedes evidence altogether⁷.”

The history of the three first centuries presents

¹ Pages 116. 52.

² Pp. 57. 94. 30—37.

³ P. 96.

⁴ P. 135.

⁵ P. 125.

⁶ P. 128.

⁷ P. 131.

only “dim notices⁸” of these developments; of some of them “we are able to assign the date of their formal establishment to the fourth or fifth, or eighth or thirteenth century, as it may happen, yet their substance may, for what appears, be coeval with the Apostles, and be expressed or implied in texts of Scripture⁹.”

The Roman Creed “comes recommended to us on strong antecedent grounds, and presents no striking opposition to the sacred text¹.”

There is nothing in the early history of the Church to contradict the Papal supremacy².

In the fourth and fifth centuries there is “clear light³” upon these developments.

The particular development of the Papal supremacy is one of which there was “absolute need⁴ :” “no Church can do without its Pope⁵.”

“The absolute need of a spiritual supremacy is at present the strongest of arguments in favour of its supply⁶.”

“As creation argues continual governance, so are Apostles harbingers of Popes⁷.”

The developments of Rome form a single and uniform body; of which “it is a solemn thing to receive any part; for before you know where you are, you may be carried on by a stern logical necessity to accept the whole⁸.”

⁸ Page 179.

⁹ P. 146.

¹ P. 152.

² P. 170.

³ P. 179.

⁴ P. 170.

⁵ P. 171.

⁶ P. 127.

⁷ P. 124.

⁸ P. 155.

“No one has power over the issues of his principles: we cannot manage an argument, and have as much as we please of it and no more⁹.”

“Nor is it more reasonable to express surprise that at this time of day a theory is necessary, granting for argument’s sake that the theory is novel, than to have directed a similar wonder in disparagement of the theory of gravitation, or the Plutonian theory in geology¹.”

“I have called the doctrine of Infallibility an hypothesis; let it be so considered for the sake of argument².”

“The view on which it, ‘the Essay,’ is written, has at all times perhaps been implicitly adopted by theologians³.”

“Already infidelity has its views and ideas on which it arranges the facts of ecclesiastical history; and it is sure to consider the absence of any antagonist theory as an evidence of the reality of its own⁴.” “An argument is needed, unless Christianity is to abandon the province of argument; and those who find fault with the explanation here offered of its historical phenomena, will find it their duty to provide one of their own⁵.”

“The same philosophical elements, received into a certain sensibility or insensibility to sin and

⁹ Page 29.

¹ P. 28.

² P. 129.

³ P. 27.

⁴ P. 29.

⁵ P. 29.

its consequences, leads one mind to the Church of Rome; another to what, for want of a better word, may be called Germanism⁶.”

“Hence, too, men may pass from infidelity to Rome, and from Rome to infidelity, from a conviction that there is no tangible intellectual position between the two⁷.”

“And if the very claim to infallible arbitration in religious disputes is of so weighty importance and interest in all ages of the world, much more is it welcome at a time like the present, when the human intellect is so busy, and thought so fertile, and opinion so indefinitely divided. The absolute need of a spiritual supremacy is at present the strongest of arguments in favour of its supply⁸.”

It appears from these passages, and many others like them, that the writer has, to say the least, yielded to the Roman dominion on very different grounds to those of Mr. Ward and Mr. Oakeley. It is not because he has held all Roman doctrine. If he now holds all Roman doctrine, it is because he has submitted to the Roman dominion. But again, why has he submitted to the Roman dominion?

He used to hold, and no man has urged it with stronger force than he, that the Roman supremacy was utterly devoid of all claim of being a Catholic truth, that it had no shadow of adequate

⁶ Page 71.

⁷ P. 73.

⁸ P. 127.

support in early ecclesiastical history, that it was quite without scriptural basis or foundation.

Why has he changed his mind? Has he found new evidence of consent in the early Church? Has he found new facts in the early history of the Church? Has he lighted upon new Scripture, or new principles of interpreting Scripture?

None of these things. Those who go to Holy Scripture, or to early Church History, or to consent of primitive Doctors, cannot but come to the same conclusion which he came to when he wrote his book on the Prophetical Office of the Church; and which he has in that book maintained with a clearness of argument, and a force of truth, which will be his own principal obstacle in recommending his new views.

If then he has found nothing new in these points, what has he found?

A theory; an *à priori* philosophical theory; a theory of which it is obvious to remark, that it is so far from being certain and self-evident, that Mr. Newman himself, after many years of deep theological reading, has only recently adopted it, and that it is, as far as can be known, absolutely new in the present generation.

Mr. Newman, indeed, says, that "it has, *perhaps*, been *implicitly* adopted by theologians of all ages." But are the theologians of the primitive and medieval times, the very theologians of the times of Luther and the Council of Trent, them-

selves to be understood to have held implicit theories to defend implicit doctrines? Are they to be thought to have believed what they did not state, on grounds which they did not urge? Are we to think that though they stated a belief, and urged the grounds of it; and though both belief and its grounds appear inconsistent, and even contradictory to those which are now attributed to them, yet it matters not; that the new development conserves, interprets, illustrates the old; that they neither believed what they said they believed, nor believed it on the grounds on which they said that they believed it?

And what has set Mr. Newman upon finding this "theory," or "novel hypothesis," as "for argument's sake" he will allow it to be called? I do not think it is possible to read through his book without perceiving in every few pages, what is the pressure under which he has acted. It is the pressure of philosophy; *the pressure of infidelity*; the pressure of the fertile thought, the many theories of the present age⁹.

He seems to fear that there is no tangible intellectual position between Rome and infidelity. The same philosophical elements would lead in either direction, and it is according to a man's sensibility or insensibility to sin that he adopts this or that conclusion from them.

⁹ Page 127.

A theory is become absolutely necessary; and those who decline to receive the one which he has adopted, will be bound to find a better.

Does he appear satisfied with his theory? Alas! not much. His opinion of the barrenness of Ante-Nicene facts in support of it is not materially changed. He seems to feel the "stern logical necessity" of going all lengths. He thinks, that '*perhaps*' his argument has been held 'implicitly' by theologians of all ages, but for argument's sake it may be called 'novel,' a 'theory,' an 'hypothesis.' He really speaks of Papal Infallibility¹, not as if it were absolutely and proveably true, but as a choice of difficulties; as if men made Rome infallible by yielding to her². He who formerly argued, and with no slight force of logic, and, as it seems, of reason, on the other side of these very questions, has now deliberately put himself into the position which he formerly described in these weighty words. "A Romanist cannot really argue in defence of the Roman doctrines; he has too firm a confidence in their truth, if he is sincere in his profession, to enable him critically to adjust the due weight to be given to this or that evidence. He assumes his Church's conclusions as true; and the facts or witnesses he adduces are rather brought to receive an interpretation, than to furnish a proof. His highest aim is

¹ Pages 128, 129.

² P. 161.

to show the mere consistency of his theory, its possible adjustment with the records of antiquity³." Alas! then, for the peace of mind of him, who instead of having grown into this state of blindness to evidence by the steady lifelong convictions of a born Roman Catholic, has first adopted a theory whose philosophical elements are capable, by his own confession, of leading either to Rome or infidelity, and then deliberately *shuts his eyes!* deliberately resolves henceforward "to have no higher aim than to show the mere consistency of his theory, and its possible adjustment with the records of antiquity."

But can a man do this? Is it possible? Are the eyes of the mind to be shut at pleasure? Is it possible to gain artificially the state of one born blind? Inexpressibly painful as this part of the argument is, it must be spoken. If infidelity, and the pressure of its theories, have driven a man, who thought and wrote as Mr. Newman thought and wrote, to that other "intellectual position," the Church of Rome; and if he have reached that position, not by changing, or finding the weakness or insufficiency of his former views, but by adopting a philosophical, *à priori* theory, the effect of which is to transmute no-evidence into evidence, silence into confirmation, a series of historical indications such as those alleged in pp. 22 and 23,

³ Page 186.

(most of which are, when examined, really full of force against his own argument, and the remainder of no force in favour of it,) into "a body of proof" of the authority of the Holy See, then it is to be feared that we have not yet seen the end; but that other changes, and deeper unhappinesses may ensue, (at least to those who adopt his argumentative grounds, without having the same moral protection against the other dreadful alternative,) from the continued pressure of the same miserable cause. An Anglican, learned and clear of view, can hardly become a happy Roman Catholic by means of *à priori* philosophy. Perfect peace can hardly be expected for such as, unable to relinquish their learning, or to annihilate their own arguments, endeavour to repose on an infallibility of their own creation, founded upon philosophical grounds of their own discovering.

But it is time to consider the theory itself which has thus been wakened into life in order to bridge over the whole of the first three, and great part of the succeeding centuries of the Christian Church, in order to be the *substitute* for *history, Creeds, Scripture, and consent of Doctors*, in substantiating and supporting the Roman developments.

I. Christianity came into the world as an idea ⁴.

In a certain sense, I presume, this position may be granted. The vision of "all Truth" which was

⁴ Page 116.

granted to the Apostles was not given in words, but in the form, it is probable, of a mental illumination. To this divinely imparted conception doubtless no words could be adequate. To themselves it transcended all words; being richer, fuller, more various, and deeper than words could have imparted to themselves or could convey to others. By words it was immeasurable, inexhaustible. No doubt they spoke of it with great richness and variety of expression. In all their preachings in all the world, they clothed, no doubt, in much variety of language, and exhibited in many aspects, the glorious and unfathomable truth which God had revealed, by His Spirit, to themselves. But not all together, nor yet any multiplication of the vividest and justest words, or ways of speaking or writing, could ever have adequately spanned and measured, with full equality of dimension, the wonderful vision of truth which, it is probable, their eyes had seen, and their hearts contemplated.

But in what form was the idea of Christian Truth communicated from the inspired Apostles to their uninspired converts? If it be granted that in St. Paul the mental conception of the real objective Christian Truth was beyond all proportion greater and grander than the words in which he taught it, in what form was it conceived by the people whom he baptized or caused to be baptized at Corinth, Philippi, or Ephesus? Did

not they conceive what they were told? We never heard, nor supposed that they were separately inspired. They heard a divine message of good tidings, and, the Lord opening their hearts, they believed it; but what ground is there for supposing that the idea which words imparted, over-passed, or was wider, or larger, or not bounded by these words? As far as we know, God implanted in their minds the idea of Christianity, no otherwise than by blessing the word of preaching to be effectual to them, and their hearts to be willing to receive it. How then should not their conception of Christian truth be such as the words employed would naturally produce, the conception that corresponds to the words, and none other?

Of course it is not meant by such expressions to deny that this conception, so produced in the minds of uninspired converts, was itself capable of very many varieties of expression, and statement, and aspect, besides the one in which the actual preaching of the Apostles presented it to them. But all these varieties (and the range of them will be considered presently) would limit themselves rigidly to the true and logical scope of original Apostolic words. The original Apostolic words struck the type of the idea, and every permissible variety of statement or thought on the subject, must surely be strictly accordant with

that type, and subservient to it as derived from it.

II. Christianity came into the world as an idea, *rather than an institution* ⁵.

Granted that in some sense Christianity came into the world as an idea, how is it to be granted that it did not come as an institution? To the Apostles, perhaps, it came only an idea, but they left it an institution. They ordained the Deacons, who forthwith did signs and wonders ⁶, “spoke with wisdom and the Holy Spirit⁷,” taught of the alteration of the law of Moses ⁸, preached Christ ⁹, and baptized ¹, for they were not ministers of meats and drinks, but servants of the Church of God ². They ordained Elders in every city, who were thereby made overseers of the flock of God by the Holy Ghost, and had authority to be united with the Apostles in council, and in a divinely inspired decree. They left successors in the cities ³, with authority to reprove, to govern, and to ordain. Such were “St. Timothy, Bishop of Ephesus,” Titus, Bishop of Crete, and others whom the history records in various towns, so that “we are able to count,” says St. Irenæus ⁴, “those who by the Apostles were ap-

⁵ Page 116.

⁶ Acts vi. 8.

⁷ Ib. vi. 10.

⁸ Ib. vi. 14.

⁹ Ib. viii. 5. 12.

¹ Ib. viii. 12. 38. 40.

² S. Ignat. ad Trall. cf. Beverg. in Can. Ap. 2.

³ v. S. Clem. Rom. p. 154.

⁴ iii. 3.

pointed Bishops in the Churches, and their successors to our own time." How then can Mr. Newman possibly say, as he repeatedly does⁵, that "St. Ignatius established the doctrine of Episcopacy," "applied the fitting remedy" to dissensions, *i. e.* Episcopacy; and that, though he himself in the next page calls St. Timothy Bishop of Ephesus? What can this mean? Alas! does it mean that all is to be risked upon this "novel theory," and that the Episcopal constitution of the Church, as well as the doctrine of the Trinity, are to be absolutely given up, and pronounced indefensible, unless they are defended by an argument which is to prove the supremacy of the Pope, and the *cultus* of the blessed Virgin also? Has Mr. Newman thus set his life upon the hazard of this die, and does he use all his wonderful stores of history and powers of argument to prove that we must also set ours? God forbid. If any point of historical Christianity is clear, it is that the Apostles left the Church with its Creed, its triple constitution of Ministers, its Sacraments, its Scriptures; left it an institution, a temple of Christ, in which He already dwelt as fully as God dwelt in Him⁶, transfiguring it by degrees from glory to glory⁷, making it fit to be presented to Himself a holy and blameless Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing⁸.

⁵ Pages 165. 167. 107.

⁶ Col. ii. 9, 10.

⁷ 2 Cor. iii. 18.

⁸ Eph. v. 27.

III. But again, every idea must of necessity admit of development⁹.

It is impossible, as far as I see, to deny it in the abstract. Perhaps all ideas of every sort and kind do admit of what may be called developments. But it is surely most certain that they admit of various sorts of development, according to their various kinds.

For instance¹, an idea of physical things, conceived in a man's mind, who is the first to conceive it, is conceived in a seminal, imperfect, possibly very incorrect form. He tries it by experiment; he applies it to many various cases. He tests it by ascertaining how it harmonizes or combines with other ideas which represent already ascertained truth. He tries how well it accounts for the phenomena which belong to it. Other people hear of it, they vary it in statement, regard it in different lights, use their own ways of thinking, and their own various knowledge, and modes of experiment upon it, and by degrees the original idea is developed into a full, accurate, and exact conception.

2. A social idea, again, admits of development. Man has had in great measure to find out and develope society for himself. His instincts of natural affection lead him, to a certain extent, in the direction of a formed society; but as he goes

⁹ Pages 30—37.

¹ Chap. i. sec. 2.

along, he thinks thoughts which are the germs of further things. On these he makes rules, enacts laws, sets on foot institutions. These things tend to encourage and keep up the idea on which they are themselves based, if it have any vitality in it; if not, it soon dies out. By degrees it grows, expands, develops into a state, a polity, a legislation.

3. Ideas of Religion, invented by man, may develope. The portion of truth which they represent keeping them from instant or very speedy decay, they will pass through changes, according to the fancies or interests of the different persons who entertain them, or as different obstacles impede them, or as different circumstances require new applications of them.

4. Or a divine Religion, of prophetic or typical character, may develope, as the Jewish did. The Prophets developed the law. The kingdom developed the theocracy. But when the governors of that nation undertook to develope of themselves, as they did from the days of the great Synagogue, then, in spite of the uniform character and naturalness of the developments, and the universality of their reception among the people, they justly incurred those strong denunciations of the Lord, "that they had made the word of God of none effect by their traditions."

But will any, or all of these cases, or any like them, establish an analogy by which we can pro-

nounce that the idea of Christianity must of necessity be liable to similar developments?

Surely not; given once, given with inspiration; an inspiration, not, as far as we know, continued to others besides the first preachers; given "in the end of the world," so that "the ends of the world," that is, the fulfilment of all types and prophecies, "had come" on those who received it; given so that though an apostle or an angel from heaven should preach any other Gospel, he should be accursed; given for the salvation of mankind, and entirely adequate to effect that salvation to the thousands and millions of men who died before the first developments of Roman Catholic doctrine were heard of in the world; how can we possibly conceive that the analogy of physical, or social ideas, or the ideas of Mahometanism or Judaism establish the likelihood, much less the certainty of developments of faith in it? What perfection did the faith once delivered to the Saints need from development, if it were already Divine, if it were already so revealed as to be able to save men's souls? There was a reason why those who received a good report through faith, in the Jewish history, received not the promise, because God had provided some better thing for His Christian people. What likelihood can be supposed to arise from that case to prove the imperfection of that "better thing"² itself?

² Heb. xi. 40.

IV. But is it then to be denied altogether that the idea of Christianity, as imparted by the first inspired teachers to the uninspired converts, undergoes, or can undergo, development? Allowing that it is guarded by appointed governors, pillared and grounded on the Church, fenced by Creeds and Scriptures, is it to be altogether denied that the mentally conceived truth, that is, the idea of Christianity, is capable of any of those varieties of statement, applications, differences of aspect, combinations of parts, exactnesses of identification, which Mr. Newman calls developments, confounding them thereby, as I think, with those doctrinal novelties which he is maintaining?

I have in the fourth of these discourses ventured to offer a distinction, arising out of the examination of the three Creeds, which appears to me, I know not how justly, to suggest the line of difference between true ecclesiastical developments, and those which the modern Church of Rome proposes to our submission. I have there observed, that the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, in so far as they differ from the Apostles' Creed and add to it, add to it nothing of a strictly affirmative kind, as a new matter of faith, but only such things as may be properly accounted *logical* or *negative*. It will perhaps be well to explain my meaning more at length.

On the supposition, explained in the ensuing discourses, that the name of the Father, the Son,

and the Holy Ghost, sacredly delivered to the Apostles to baptize the world into, contains the sum of all Christian Truth, all the three Creeds may properly be called a development. The doctrine contained in the Name is, the greater part of it, only implicitly contained in it. This doctrine is evolved, enlarged, exhibited, developed, and the three Creeds contain what the Church in England holds to be the sole authoritative dogmatic developments of it.

Of this development, the first portion may be called Apostolical; the second, ecclesiastical: the first is contained in the Apostles' Creed; the second in those parts of the Nicene Creed, which differ from the Apostles' Creed, and in the Creed of St. Athanasius.

When we examine the Apostolic development, we find in respect of its nature, first, that it unfolds new doctrine; doctrine, that is, which could not have been discovered to be implicit in the original terms of the baptismal institution by human sight, or deduced from them by human logic. Such are, for instance, the doctrines of the resurrection of the body, the life everlasting, the communion of saints, the session on the right hand of God.

If we ask, secondly, on what ground of authority or knowledge it did so, the answer is obvious,—because the Apostles, whose oral teaching it contained, were inspired by the Holy Ghost.

Not only had they, as representing God's Church, the sacred presence of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, whose ordinary graces should be the inheritance of God's Church until the end of the world, but also separately and individually they had received that personal and extraordinary aid of the same Spirit, who, dividing unto men severally as He would, enabled them to say, as St. Paul said, that that which they had received of the Lord, they also delivered unto the Churches³.

But, thirdly, where are these developments to be found, and what assurance have we that we possess them, and possess them accurately?

They are to be found in the Apostolic Epistles, and they are to be found in the authentic record of the Apostolic oral preaching, the Apostles' Creed. Either might have sufficed, if it had been God's will; but He has given both. By God's good Providence, there is no portion of the record of the oral teaching, which He has not caused His penmen to substantiate by the less sophisticated evidence of written letters. Are there "gaps in the structure of the original Creed of the Church⁴?" The written record fills up the interstices, and shows us, not dogmatically, but according as the various occasions and persons addressed called for them, the general strain of doctrine and teaching which the Apostles used.

³ 1 Cor. xi. 23.

⁴ Page 102.

Should we be at a loss, amid these undogmatic and untechnical writings, to distinguish fundamentals, to know precisely the salient points of the body of the faith once delivered to the saints? The Creed, duly testified and sanctioned by the Church, as containing the great record of the Apostles' oral teaching, supplies the deficiency, and sets forth "the word," "the way," "the faith," in a connected and dogmatic shape.

And fourthly, and most importantly, the body of doctrine thus apostolically developed, was sufficient for the salvation of men. Those whom the Apostles baptized and taught, they always spoke of as unquestionably in possession of the full Christian privileges. They are sealed to the day of redemption⁵. They are light in the Lord⁶. They are washed, they are sanctified, they are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God⁷. They are come to the heavenly Jerusalem⁸. They believe to the saving of their souls⁹.

Such then was the development of Christian doctrine which we call Apostolical; and we may pause a moment before going on to consider what we have called ecclesiastical developments, to remark that herein is a full, complete, and sufficient system established for the purpose of carrying out the design of God, in the salvation of

⁵ Eph. iv. 30.

⁶ Ib. v. 8.

⁷ 1 Cor. vi. 11.

⁸ Heb. xii. 22.

⁹ Ib. x. 39.

mankind. Whatever more may be needful in order to identify, guard, vindicate, save from misconstruction, combine, apply this doctrine, nothing further can possibly be needful in the way of new doctrine. The faith once delivered to the saints, as it saved them, so would undoubtedly suffice to save all mankind even to the day of judgment. No new objects of worship, no new principles of duty, no new exhibitions of truth, can be conceived to be introduced afterwards, except on one of two equally inadmissible hypotheses, the imperfection of the explicit faith of the Churches founded by the Apostles, or the design of God by farther revelation, to make the Christian system not final.

In examining the ecclesiastical developments, that is, those further decisions which were made in the Church, and acknowledged as duly and rightly made by universal adoption and acceptance in the Church, after the death of the first inspired teachers of the faith, we may first regard them (as was done in the case of the Apostolical developments),

1. In respect of their *nature*.

If the settlement of questions relating to the authenticity of books, or other writings, professing to be Apostolical, be rightly called a development, it is a development which belongs to this first head, and is one which plainly falls within the province of the remaining Church.

The separate Churches to which Epistles were written, "had those very authentic letters recited among them, sounding the voice and representing the face of each of the Apostolic writers¹." And the Gospels, which were the records of the acts and words certainly believed in the Church, had their own separate evidence of being written by men whom the Church knew to be "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," and divinely inspired to record what they had "seen and heard." Of the validity of all such separate evidence, it was the Church's province to judge; and when at last the canon was established in the fourth century, she sanctioned by her authority the consenting voice of her own tradition of a matter of fact. In so doing, however, she no more claimed authority over the writings, or exercised a power of decreeing new articles of faith, than any person in common life who authenticates a document becomes by so doing lord of the document, or authoritative over its contents.

2. The remaining Church possesses, most unquestionably, the practical power of applying the Christian institution, with its doctrines, and all other things belonging to it, to the various emergent circumstances of countries and times. There are, no doubt, many points, much more various and complicated than can be stated, in which the alterations which have taken place in society and

¹ Tertull. de Præscrip. Her. c. xxxvi.

government, in refinement of life and manners, and in the tone of thought and mind of mankind, make adaptations, and alterations, and, if it please any person to call them so, developments of the practical parts of Christianity necessary, as the Church grows older. Thus, no doubt, the entirely new state of things produced in the Church by the sudden transition from a state of habitual persecution to one of acknowledgment and predominance, by the conversion of Constantine, as it opened new circumstances of difficulty and danger, and new opportunities of usefulness and good, so necessitated new practical adaptations of the Divine institution of Christianity, to meet and direct them. And so, if it is said, that "when the stream of the world was turned into the Church," monasticism naturally grew up, and was adequately and authoritatively sanctioned by the then Church, we may well acknowledge that such an institution was natural, and we may well believe that it was both wisely, and with adequate authority established, and yet it would not follow but that, upon abuse of the institution, or the cessation of the need of it, the same authority which established it, might again disallow it, either universally, for the whole Church, or in separate national Churches, for themselves. In all such practical cases, the decision of the Thirty-fourth Article appears to be most just and clear, that traditions and ceremonies (by which we may

understand all practical directions for the application of the Christian institution to the various circumstances of the world,) need not be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners. Nor is the proviso added to this decision less unquestionably just and necessary, "so that nothing be ordained against God's word." Adaptations, or applications like these, must not add to, nor contravene, nor otherwise supersede or alter, the original revelation. It is a necessary province of the living Church to *apply* the already given revelation, with its essential institution, to the varying occasions of the world; but application does, by the very force of the term, imply that the original revelation, with its own proper institution, is scrupulously, exactly, and faithfully (that is, without essential change or addition) brought to bear upon those new occasions.

3. Let us then consider what power of development in doctrine, strictly so called, the post-Apostolic Church possesses. Granted that she is the proper authority to settle the authenticity of Christian writings, and to decree such practical applications of the Christian institution, as the alterations of society, and the state of the world may render necessary; how far can she alter, amend, or develope, the body of the doctrines which the Apostles left behind in their writings,

and in the record of their oral teaching, the Apostles' Creed?

First, it is surely *impossible* to conceive that such developments, whatever, and however great they may be found to be, can have any further scope, intention, or purpose, than to *defend*. The Christian doctrine, the engrafted word, was already able to save men's souls. What should it do more? What other purpose has God declared in sending a revelation on earth, containing a body of Divine doctrine, than this,—to rescue man from the bondage of sin and Satan, to enable him to be born and grow in grace, and the knowledge and love of God, to give him the means of glorifying God by bearing much fruit, to make him a joint-heir with Christ of the kingdom of heaven? Then, surely, it is beyond a question, that the powers of development of this body of doctrine, which the Church, after the death of the original inspired teachers, possesses, must be expected to be confined to *defensive* developments;—developments, if they are to be so called, which shall effect that no injury be done to the original revelation,—no injury either by addition, or subtraction, or yet by corruption, which shall cause the whole unadulterated revelation of God to be applied to the salvation of every succeeding generation of Christian people, as the original revelation was applied to the salvation of those whom

the Apostles themselves converted ; developments strictly, absolutely, and exclusively *defensive*.

And as, *à priori*, developments ecclesiastical could not be conceived to be likely to be other than defensive, so, *à posteriori*, it is clear, that the ecclesiastical developments of the later Creeds are strictly of this kind. They *identify*, and they *combine* ; and both identification and combination are strictly defensive processes. The Nicene Creed, in those parts of it in which it differs from the Apostles' Creed, *identifies* the Apostolic doctrine. It identifies it, because it had been departed from, and in those points in which it had been departed from. Heretics not only *precede* such defensive decisions, but they also choose the ground of them. The Church must follow to make good, and secure whatever points they have selected to assail. Heresy attempts to make a breach in the original revelation, not by express denial or unbelief of statements, unquestionably contained within it, but by means of new theories, by subtle distinctions, by evasions, by trying, as it were, *to turn the flank*, rather than assault the main strength of the truth ; and the Church at that challenge, cannot choose but identify, develope, if it be so called by any, what is already her own. For she is possessed, not of a mere form of sound words, which, however wisely chosen, might admit of all manner of evasions, and of being explained

away, or nullified by theories, but of a real body of truth, which has, in itself, an aspect or front in every possible direction, but whose various aspects and fronts are unseen and unidentified, till the lurid light of heresy, *ab extrâ*, has exhibited the strength and completeness of its own essential defences.

Thus is preceding heresy a necessary condition of a due, defensive development of Christian doctrine in the way of *identification*. And so, when the being and nature of our blessed Lord came to be the subject on which the spirit of heresy indulged in various imaginations and theories, and those imaginations and theories trenched so far upon the real vital body of the truth which the Church possessed, as to deny, by ultimate implication, the Divinity of the Son, she met and overthrew them in the Nicene Creed. In it she identified, for the purpose of defence, that which she had implicitly held throughout. "Ἐγὼ νομίζουσα, she recognised her own, she came to exactness of speech, because heretics had made bad use of her former simpler, and less exact expressions. The union and equality of the Father and the Son, which she always knew and held to be *true* and *perfect*, had been exhibited as untrue and imperfect by means of distinctions of "relations," of "will," &c., and therefore must she penetrate to the bottom of these distinctions, and assert the truth and perfectness of the union and

equality, in terms which should make these distinctions impossible. Her duty of defence was to be discharged, not by making new doctrines to serve as exterior lines, or redoubts to guard her original tenets, but by re-adjusting the logical terms in which her original tenets were expressed. She must go deeper in philosophical expression, she must admit into her creed the term of "substance," she must re-state her fundamental truth, in the technical phrase which would make it to be not only the old Catholic truth, but also that truth protestant against error.

Thus was her development of the doctrine of the Son of God in the Nicene Creed, in purpose *defensive*, in direction *negative*, or *protesting*, in manner of execution *logical*. She re-adjusted her terms by the introduction of more and more philosophical expressions, and she did so in order to contradict and banish the insidious distinctions and evasions of heresy, that thereby she might defend and preserve in its integrity (neither less nor greater than she had received it) the engrafted word, able to save men's souls, with which she was entrusted.

The development of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost in the Council of Constantinople, is a second case of precisely the same kind. It had the same necessary conditions. It was preceded by heresy. It turned upon the exact choice of expressions. It did not in any degree overstep

the explicit teaching of the Apostles, as recorded in the Canonical Scriptures.

The case of the Athanasian Creed is so far different from the Nicene, as that it is to be regarded as an instance, not so much of identification (though it is that also in some degree) as of *combination*. Now combination appears to be as strictly within the defensive province of the living Church as identification. It is not, indeed, so directly controversial, nor need it be immediately preceded by an express heresy. It ensues upon several identifications. Each identification has, as it were, scattered its own immediate enemies, and then, if I may so express myself, the separate bands of God's army concentrate themselves into a mighty host of defenders of their inherited truth. They have not, nor ever had, designs of conquest, or extension of empire; enough for them if they can hand down unimpaired that which they themselves received. But with as little justice could an aggressive, invading, ambitious conqueror defend himself and his armies by the example of a patriot predecessor who had summoned his native troops to repel a foreign host landed on his shores, as the aggressive and invading developments of the Roman Catholic Church can find adequate precedent in the logical, identifying, combining, defensive developments of the ancient Creeds.

The Athanasian Creed plumbed still further than the Nicene the depth of heresy, by the use

of philosophical terms, such as those of "Person" and "Trinity;" but in the way of doctrinal development it did nothing more than combine into a connected statement the decisions which had been separately made before.

It is much to be observed, that these ancient ecclesiastical developments of doctrine, contained in the two later creeds, are confined to a single subject,—the nature of the Godhead. I have endeavoured to show, in the following discourses, that the summary of truth, as far as it was conveyed in words to the Apostles by the Lord, after His resurrection, was contained in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. How far this view (the view of many divines both of ancient and modern times) may be approved, I cannot say; but it certainly seems to coincide remarkably with the actual course of the historical developments of doctrine subsequently made in the Church. The doctrines of the Son and of the Holy Ghost being fully settled, and the separate portions of the complex doctrine having been combined into the full statement of "One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity," the work of doctrinal development seemed to be done. The Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was saved from open assault or insidious evasion, and thenceforth the universal Church knows no Creeds. Her work of development in doctrine in Creeds was finished. The

saving Name was vindicated, and thenceforth to be applied, as from the first, so to the end, to the salvation of all mankind.

Thus much then respecting the *nature* of ecclesiastical developments. They may consist of decisions respecting writings; practical applications of the Christian institution, as delivered by the Apostles to the new circumstances of the world, within the limits of its own true, essential principles; and defensive doctrinal decrees, identifying or combining the already believed truth, in the way of re-adjustment of expression, and for the overthrow of previous heresy.

2. Such then seeming to be the *nature* of ecclesiastical developments of the Christian system, what is the *authority* on which they rest?

Simply, on the authority of the Church.

Is it meant, on the authority of the Church in necessary communication with the See of Rome? I answer confidently, that St. Polycarp² had never

² Be it observed, that Mr. Newman's expressions, "St. Polycarp of Smyrna betakes himself to the Bishop of Rome on the question of Easter," give not only an inadequate but a distinctly unfair impression of the fact as recorded by St. Irenæus: καὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπιδημήσαντος ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ἀνίκητου, καὶ περὶ ἄλλων τινῶν μικρὰ σχόντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐνθὺς εἰρήνευσαν, περὶ τούτου τοῦ κεφαλαίου μὴ φιλεριστήσαντες εἰς ἑαυτούς. Οὔτε γὰρ ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὸν Πολύκαρπον πείσαι ἐδύνατο μὴ τηρεῖν, ἅτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων οἷς συνδιέτριψεν, αἰεττηρηκότα, οὔτε μὴν ὁ Πολύκαρπος τὸν Ἀνίκητον ἔπεισε τηρεῖν,

heard of any such necessity, though the disciple and friend of St. John the Apostle, nor Origen, nor Tertullian, nor Polycrates, nor Firmilian, nor St. Cyprian; and that although, in the following centuries, passages are to be found in the writings of many Fathers, which may bear such an interpretation, yet that St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, when duly interpreted, bear equal witness against the same necessity.

Where then is the Church, if it be not thus tied to a single see, and whence is its authority?

The Church is in all the world; and its authority is in the presence of the Lord. The essential Church is there, wheresoever two or three are duly gathered into the Sacred Name. The universal Church comprehends all these portions, though they be scattered on the earth, and even, if it so be, to their own great loss and diminution of blessing and grace, be disunited externally, and refuse mutual communion and the interchange of Christian offices of love.

How then shall the voice of the Church be known and recognised, if she be thus vast in size, thus uncompacted into a single monarchy under one see, thus incapable of speaking through the lips of any single ruler?

The rule of Vincentius of Lerins is the formula

λέγοντα τὴν συνήθειαν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πρεσβυτέρων ὀφείλειν κατέχειν.—Euseb. v. 24. iv. 11. of Massuet's note on the passage in St. Irenæus.

of her voice. *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.* Whatever can allege this amount of consent, has the universal voice, and so the plenary authority of the diffused Church of Christ.

This "majestic evidence," as it has been well called, can only be alleged in its full array of strength in favour of certain great outlines of doctrine, the great Apostolical developments, that is to say, the doctrines of the Creed. These are the only matters of faith, affirmatively developed, and necessary for salvation, which can adduce such support of every age, and such total absence of any adverse or contradictory teaching as to come to us with what may be rightly regarded as the absolute unanimity of the Church, her full and plenary consent as to the truth of which she is the ground and pillar.

Can then the canon of Vincentius be applied directly to the ecclesiastical developments, as I have called them, of the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds, that is, to those portions of the two later Creeds which are not contained in the Apostles' Creed? Let us consider.

If it was rightly said above, that heresy must precede a due ecclesiastical identification of doctrine, then surely till that heresy has appeared, the particular identification necessitated by it will not have appeared; *i. e.* if the Arian heresy caused and necessitated the use of the phrase "of one substance," then, till the Arian heresy appeared,

that phrase could not have been used, or if used, must have been so casually, and not in the exact and definite way in which it is used in the Nicene Creed. Again, if combination of doctrines naturally (though not necessarily) ensues upon various separate identifications, then it is probable that the complex and combined doctrine of the Athanasian Creed will not be found stated with all its parts complete in the writers of an earlier period.

To say, therefore, that "what we need is a sufficient number of Ante-Nicene statements, each distinctly anticipating the Athanasian Creed," as Mr. Newman says in his twelfth page, seems unreasonable on the face of it. If the Arian heresy *brought out*, so to speak, *into light*, the "unity of substance," how could the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, comprising the unity of substance, and the distinction of persons, be looked for before the days of Arius?

Not to say that such a demand altogether overlooks that which it is my main purpose to establish, the difference between affirmative and negative developments; between new doctrines imposed and old doctrines identified, and combined; between doctrines aggressive and doctrines defensive.

How then, to repeat the question, can the Canon of Vincentius be applied to the case of each due defensive development of the post-Apos-

tolie Church? Differently, I apprehend, before the decision and after it.

Before the decision there must be implicit consent; after the decision there must be explicit. Before the decision there must be that amount of substantial, equivalent, real, material agreement, which shall reasonably show that the identifying decree pronounces nothing else than the Church has all along meant, though she has never been called upon for that particular manner of statement of it before. After the decision, there must be the recognising, accepting, approving consent of Christendom, ratifying the decree, and establishing the fact, that the council which passed it was a faithful and true exponent of the mind of the universal Church in so doing. For we attribute no infallibility to councils; nor are any signs capable of being stated, before a council has met and passed its decrees, by which it shall be certain beforehand that its decisions will be right and true. The question is, in each case, whether it has or has not been a faithful exponent of the mind of the Church; and that question can only be settled subsequently to the decrees being passed, and gradually, and often slowly. If a council have spoken the Church's mind, then the authority on which the decree rests is the authority of the Church, not of the council. If it have not, then it is the council which is devoid of

authority, deceivable, and deceived, and not the Church.

But does, then, this manner of applying the Canon of Vincentius to the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds involve the admission of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and so of the whole body of those awfully connected developments which Mr. Newman has drawn out in his 154th page? Mr. Newman thinks so.

“It is irresistible,” he says, “against Protestantism, and in one sense it is irresistible against Rome also, but in the same sense it is irresistible against England. It strikes at Rome through England. It admits of being interpreted in two ways; if it be narrowed for the purpose of disproving the catholicity of the Creed of Pope Pius, it becomes also an objection to the Athanasian; and if it be relaxed to admit the doctrines retained by the English Church, it no longer excludes certain doctrines of Rome which that Church denies. It cannot at once condemn St. Thomas and St. Bernard, and defend St. Athanasius and St. Gregory Nazianzen³.”

I am very far from thinking, that the distinctions which I have taken are the best, or the truest, still less the only ones which can be made to evade the force of this assertion of Mr. New-

³ Page 9.

man's, and vindicating the ancient and universal Creeds, at the same time to disown the later and particular creed of the Roman Catholic Church. But I feel quite convinced that they are sufficient for the purpose; that in truth there is essential difference between the two cases, a difference so essential and so great, that the former developments are due, legitimate, and authoritative, while the latter ones, whereinsoever they add new matters of faith to the primitive Creed, are undue, presumptuous, and usurping. The former developments vindicated the Apostolic Creed, the latter ones altered it. The former developments proceeded upon the assumption of the completeness of the Apostolic Faith. The latter ones have no place nor intelligible meaning unless upon the hypothesis of its incompleteness. The former developments are grounded on the belief that God has, once, in the end of the world, made a revelation of Himself and His will for the salvation of the world. The latter ones suppose continual accessions of revealed truth.

Take, for example, the development of the doctrine respecting the blessed Virgin. When Anastasius and Nestorius distinctly denied, and Dorotheus anathematized the use of the title Θεοτόκος, we hold that it was strictly in the province of the Church to defend, as St. Cyril of Alexandria did by the allegation of Holy Scripture, and nine great ancient Fathers, a designa-

tion of high importance to the integrity of the doctrine of the Incarnation. But the Church defended it, not as a novelty, not as a good new name, not as a discovery, not as a development of new truth, involving relations, and so duties, unknown before, but as her ever-known, continual possession of truth now decreed and identified, because not till now denied.

But how should the duties, how the "cultus," how should these have been unknown if they were really a part of the office of Christian worship and doctrine? Doctrines may be implicit, may be unidentified, may be comparatively unseen till denied. But how can *practices* be implicit? If the blessed Virgin were worshipped in the Primitive Church, where are her ancient Liturgies, where the prayers that were paid her? If she were not, how could it become a necessary part of Christian devotion to worship her in later years? If she were truly an object of worship, how was she not worshipped by the Apostles; worshipped from the day of Pentecost? Why are the traces of her worship not to be found in the Acts of the Apostles, in the Epistles of St. Paul, or the very late writings of St. John? If she were not worshipped at first, how could she rightly be so afterwards?

But in Mr. Newman's view of this development it bears a very different aspect. "There was in the first ages no public and ecclesiastical recogni-

tion of the place which St. Mary holds in the economy of grace : this was reserved for the fifth century, as the definition of our Lord's proper divinity had been the work of the fourth⁴." And in another place he says, " Here" (that is, in the opening of the second part of Bishop Butler's Analogy) " is a development of doctrine into worship : in like manner the doctrine of the beatification of the Saints has been developed into their *cultus* ; of the Θεοτόκος, or Mother of God, into *hyperdulia* ; and of the real Presence into adoration of the Host⁵." Here, then, we are distinctly taught that the " public and ecclesiastical recognition" of the doctrine of the Θεοτόκος introduced a new thing, a worship unknown and unpaid before. This can only have been because the *doctrine* was unknown before (because, by the adopted argument of Bishop Butler, the duty of religious worship immediately arises out of the knowledge of the relations) ; and therefore it will follow, that according to this view, the Council of Ephesus *discovered* the doctrine, instead of pronouncing it (as we know they did) to be the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and their predecessors in the Church. He therefore distinctly claims to the Church the right of adding to the primitive faith.

It is unfortunate for the parallel which he

⁴ Page 407.

⁵ P. 50.

draws between the doctrine developed at Nicaea and that at Ephesus, that the worship morally obligatory upon man because of the doctrine of the Son of God had been paid from the day of Pentecost, whereas that which after some centuries grounded itself upon the doctrine of the blessed Virgin, was totally unknown to the primitive ages.

It is observable, too, that Mr. Newman speaks of doctrines being implicit in two different senses; sometimes they are to be understood as doctrines *held all along*, but unidentified⁶. Then comes heresy, and necessitates the true, legitimate, defensive development of identification. But at other times he speaks, as in the case of the doctrine of Ephesus, as if the development were a *discovery* of something unknown, and of new relations, on the ground of which there arise new and unknown duties of homage and worship. Indeed I believe, that his argument altogether consists of a confusion of these two senses: that his premises are in the first of them, and his conclusions in the second.

But surely the claim of developments like this involves, as a necessary consequence, the imperfection of the faith of the Apostles and first Fathers, and the denial of honour and worship, during hundreds of years, to one to whom, by the

⁶ Page 96.

supposition, it was really due. And if, on the contrary, the faith of the Apostles and first Fathers were really not imperfect, but perfect and sufficient for salvation, and if the objects of worship made known by the revelation of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, were really those to whom alone worship was due, then how can the conclusion be avoided, that the worship paid to the blessed Virgin is an offence against the first commandment, and the authority which enjoins it a presumptuous and usurping authority?

Take again the instance of the supremacy of the pope, as the supposed successor of St. Peter, and inheritor thereby of privileges and superiorities which it is beyond denial that St. Peter never possessed himself. What possible common nature is there between this case of supposed development, and the identifying, combining developments of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds? Unheard of by St. John and St. Paul, unmentioned by any father of the three first centuries, disowned by St. Polycarp, Polycrates, Firmilian, and St. Cyprian, how can this power have grown up, a new thing, a confessedly new thing, except by usurpation?

And what says Mr. Newman himself about it? He speaks of it as a power of which there were but scanty notices in the ante-Nicene Church. He says that "a Pope would not arise but in pro-

portion as the Church was consolidated⁷;" that his power was at first "necessarily dormant⁸;" that just as "the see of Canterbury has become the natural centre of the operations of the English Church, as her prospects have opened, and her communion extended⁹," so "no Church can do without its pope;" and "we see before our eyes the centralizing process by which the see of St. Peter became the head of Christendom;" "Christianity developed, as we have incidentally seen, in the form, first of a catholic, then of a papal Church¹."

Is this really argument? Can Mr. Newman really mean, that the see of Canterbury has a divine right of government, and *pro tanto* infallibility, as the canonical superior of the sees of Calcutta and New Zealand? Can he really mean that the episcopal power of other bishops having been in ante-Nicene times complete, did afterwards become incomplete and derivative from Rome, as by degrees a natural process of centralization caused the bishop of that see to gain, rightly or wrongly, an authority over them? An ordinary person would have supposed that this account of the rise of the popedom was written to prove it not to be divine; to prove it to be the growth of human passions, and ordinary human

⁷ Page 145.

⁸ P. 169.

⁹ P. 171.

¹ P. 319.

events. But is it conceivable that a man should venture on such a portentous *reductio ad absurdum* as this,—the popedom is divine; for if it is not divine, it is an usurpation, and that being an absurdity in terms, the point is proved, and it is divine? And who could be prepared for the further step,—being divine, it is of course infallible? “The common sense of mankind feels that the very idea of revelation implies a present informant and guide, and that an infallible one² ;” “the absolute need of a spiritual supremacy is at present the strongest of arguments for its supply³ ;” “Christianity being both social and dogmatic, and intended for all ages, must, humanly speaking, have an infallible expounder⁴ :” “in proportion as the cases multiply in which we are obliged to trust to her decision, do we approach in fact to the belief that she is infallible⁵ .”

And so the authority and the infallibility of the popedom depend upon the supposed *à priori* necessity for them, and the fact of their being claimed! The Scriptures, the early Church, the completeness of early Christianity, go for nothing. An “hypothesis,” “for argument’s sake,” “novel,” discovered in the nineteenth century, and a claim set up in the seventh, are together sufficient to prove the point.

How can any person, then, possibly suppose

² Page 125.

³ P. 127.

⁴ P. 128.

⁵ P. 161.

that the developments of Christianity made in the Creeds of Nicæa, and St. Athanasius, give the smallest support of precedent or analogy to such baseless and extraordinary claims as these? *They* identified and combined the doctrines already held, and held from the first, by the universal Church: *these* nullify primitive apostolically descended authorities, claim for a process of late-appearing centralization a divine sanction, and proceed to endow the local see thus elevated to a height not only unknown before, but actually denounced by a former pope⁶ as unchristian and unholy, with the sovereign and divine attribute of infallibility!

There is absolutely no likeness whatever between the cases. Identifying and combining developments of already possessed truth, are absolutely dissimilar to aggressive ones of new

⁶ Gregory the Great most vehemently inveighed against it, calling the name he strove for (*i. e.* that of universal bishop) a foolish, frivolous, proud, new, profane, pestiferous, superstitious, perverse, wicked, yea, a blasphemous name, a name which he discoursing of breaks forth into this expression: "But I confidently affirm, that whosoever calls himself, or desires to be called, an universal priest or bishop, is in his pride the forerunner of Antichrist, because he proudly prefers himself before others; a name which, as he saith, none of his predecessors in the Bishopric of Rome would assume unto themselves nor accept of from others."—v. Bp. Beveridge on the 37th Article, where all the passages are quoted at length from S. Gregory's Epistles.

doctrine, involving usages and worship before unheard of; and the claim of Church authority, exercised by independent bishops in all the world, is entirely destructive of the subsequent claim of a developed monarchy, in which the bishop of Rome is represented as the single bishop of the Church, the king of kings, Christ on the earth.

It may be observed in conclusion, that the very peculiar and extraordinary nature of Mr. Newman's theory seems to throw a still greater shadow of mystery over the many secessions to the Roman Catholic Church which we are lamenting, than lay upon them before.

It is as inconceivable that other minds have been swayed to take the same step, on the same argumentative grounds, as it is that the authorities of the Roman Church should sanction and approve those argumentative grounds.

The book is an idiosyncrasy. It contains Mr. Newman's intellectual confessions; but those confessions cannot conceivably depict the state of other minds, or at least not of many besides his own. As well might you attempt to pursue the exact track of a bird through the air, or through a wood, as to find other minds to reach Rome through the same devious intellectual course which Mr. Newman has traversed. Earnestly convinced, a few years since, that the English Church held a true, independent, Catholic posi-

tion, he has been distressed and shaken by the "fertility of thought," the many theories, the "more hopeful position of infidelity" in these days. He has sighed for an infallible guide; he has felt the absolute need of a living governor, from whose lips he might receive the full detailed rule of faith and practice, without doubt or question. He has been disposed to hope that the absolute necessity which he felt of such a spiritual supremacy formed a good argument to prove that it was actually given. And then a passage or phrase of M. Guizot has fallen as a spark upon this prepared state of mind and feeling, and produced this melancholy explosion. No matter if the very theory itself is unknown to the Romish controversialists. The theory itself may be applied to heal its own defects. Implicit tenets may well have been defended by implicit arguments.

But where shall there be found another mind which has known all this experience, and traversed all this course? a mind, which, having originally been attached to the low, or evangelical view of doctrine, was afterwards so lucidly and learnedly convinced of the soundness of the Anglican theory; a mind so distressed and agitated in its intellectual depths by the aggression of infidel dangers; a mind so yearning for a position of spiritual slavery, as the only intellectual dry land out of the flood of unbelief; a mind ready to take up a hint from a modern philosopher, and spin it into a bridge to

pass the chasm that separates popery from primitive Christianity; a mind so stored with learning, able to press to its purpose so vast a variety of illustrative matter, and to urge an argument with so lucid and forcible a logic; a mind capable of reading history all of a sudden with new eyes, and representing facts and statements, distantly relevant to its point, in the very light which it has itself recognised and described as uncandid and untrue before?

And if this be so, then what is that other secret, unexplained cause which has led so many others—friends, colleagues, pupils, alas! many of us do most sorrowfully recognise among their number,—to take this bold, this fearfully bold and dangerous step, and cut themselves off from the unity of the Church in which they were baptized and bred?

I believe it to be, in many cases, a genuine yearning after holiness; a genuine desire to be good, to be devoted, to be self-denying; not an intellectual, but a moral and devotional craving, which has led to this melancholy consequence. *They* have no sense of infidel pressure; *they* have no deep intellectual struggles which must find a bottom in papal infallibility, or be lost in the ocean of scepticism. *They* were living in peace of mind, and endeavouring to make their heavenly calling and election sure, in the state of life to which God had called them, till the report

of greater helps to holiness in the Roman Communion, and the example of one man whose life had exhibited the picture of sacred devotion, led them to forsake all they knew,—the Church of their baptism, the hopes, the thoughts, the lessons, the principles of their youth, and take this desperate plunge.

Alas! for them, then, for they have been deceived; and, alas! for those, if there be any, who, in the same true, but unchastened love of God and holiness, shall yet follow their steps! They have left a position in which God placed them; in which they had duties, and helps, and sacred hopes of an eternal inheritance; in which, if there were corruptions of practice around them, and imperfections in the full carrying out of the primitive institution of the Church, yet these things might have tried their simple dutifulness of heart, have tested their patience, have given them scope for being instruments of great blessing to the Church of their baptism. But they have chosen otherwise. They have fretted¹ themselves into impatience and undutifulness. They have plunged desperately for what they will not find. They have condemned the English Church without sufficiently deliberate trial; they have taken it for granted, without the possibility of trial,

¹ Fret not thyself, else shalt thou be moved to do evil.—
Ps. xxxvii. 8.

that in Rome they shall find holiness, perfection, and peace.

But who shall secure them against further doubts? Who shall block up the access of all those same repinings of spirit, and intellectual and moral distresses of mind, to which they have so far yielded? When they find that human frailty pursues them even in their desperate flight, that the practical corruptions of Rome are not less shocking than the practical imperfections of England, when they find themselves surrounded by creature-worship, bound to pay respect to lying wonders, such as the holy coat of Trêves, and the liquefaction of St. Januarius's blood, involved in the long series of inconsistencies, usurpations, and corruptions, to which the infallibility of Rome stands pledged; when they find, that in order to relieve their faith from the difficulties which it was not manly enough to face at home, they have been burthened with the thousand times greater weight of the Romish doctrine of every successive age, and that in order to quicken their devotion, they have exchanged the sobriety of primitive prayers for the blasphemous corruptions of the Litany of Bonaventure, where will they then fly for comfort, or what is the next and last stage in the development of such unhappy restlessness and impatience of spirit?

PREFACE

TO THE

FIRST EDITION.

IN submitting these Discourses to the press, I am not without some uneasiness, that they may seem, at the first sight, to lie open to one of the heaviest charges that can be brought against Christian doctrine, that of Novelty. I trust, however, most earnestly, that any apparent novelty is confined to the manner of the argument, and that the doctrine will be found to be, in every point, accordant with the Holy Catholic Truth of God, as taught in the Church of England.

The *principles* upon which the view taken in these Sermons depends, are, I believe, very commonly, nay, universally, acknowledged among theologians. It is allowed, as indeed it cannot be denied, that the Crucifixion and Resurrection of our Lord must needs have taken place as events, before the Church, in its full constitution

and condition of privilege, could be founded. It is allowed, both as a fact, and as a consequence of the former position, that the teaching of our Lord before the Crucifixion is mostly (at least that part of it which refers to the Church) of a prospective kind, not intended to take effect in Institutions and Powers until after the events had taken place. It is often shown in separate instances, that particular sayings of our Lord, subsequent to His Resurrection, were the fulfilments, or, if I may so call them, the *enactments* of things promised in His earlier teaching; or, what is the same thing, that words spoken in the earlier teaching of Christ waited for the Resurrection before they gained their full force and meaning. So it is usual to regard the power imparted to the Apostles by the Breath of Christ, as recorded in the twentieth chapter of St. John, as fulfilling the promises of the sixteenth and eighteenth chapters of St. Matthew. So we are taught that the Institution of Holy Baptism was reserved till after the Resurrection, that it might be understood that the grace of Regeneration had been won in the Resurrection.

All, then, that I have done is to adopt the principle assumed in these and other similar instances, and apply it throughout. If there be this essential difference between the Sayings of our Lord before and after the Resurrection, then, no doubt, it is important to trace it as far as we can.

If the Resurrection be the event of such signal importance in our Lord's history, that the Institution of Holy Baptism, and the gift of the remitting and retaining of sins, owe their particular force, as immediate and practical enactments, to the fact that the words were spoken after it had taken place, then it is surely interesting to inquire whether the other sayings which were spoken after the Resurrection may not have equally great and important bearings, in their separate subjects, for the same reason.

If this be granted, then it does not seem to be too bold to observe, that the sayings of these great days, when so regarded, do, in a remarkable way, fall in with one another, and form something like a complete whole. Though spoken, more or less, as occasions seemed to lead to them, some to one Apostle, some to all—now to convince the faithless, now to check the loving,—they nevertheless do present the outlines or lineaments of something like a complete system.

This system is, indeed, no other than the Church system; which *requires* no other proof or support than the fact, that it was established by the holy Apostles, and has from them descended, with unbroken constitution, to the Church of God in every age. But it seems to me to be both interesting and important, *if it be true*, to be able to trace this system to something like a specific foundation in clear and unquestionable words of

Holy Writ. It is a great thing, if it be not altogether imaginary, to be able to point, as it were, to the original document, in which the outlines of the Constitution and Powers of the Church were laid down, not (as it would seem) without something of systematic completeness, by our holy Lord Himself.

It seems to me that such a view affords a compact and available answer for the satisfaction of those who, bred within the Church, but unaccustomed to hear her claims highly stated, (whereby they are so unfortunate as not to feel the real weight of the *traditional* argument,) desire in good faith to know the grounds on which we assert that the Divine provision for the salvation of mankind in Christ is the planting of them by Holy Baptism into the Church; that the power of so doing, and of pronouncing absolution of sin, is entrusted to the Apostles only, and those who derive from the Apostles; and that, therefore, men must, by the ministry of God's priests, be placed within the Church, and continue in dutiful communion with her during their lives, if they wish to inherit the covenanted blessings.

It is true that these Sayings of our Lord may be and constantly are urged in argument to this effect, independently of any such view as that taken in these Discourses; but then, they are urged merely as independent texts, capable of being balanced by other texts, occurring in any

part of Holy Scripture, and thereby are shorn of all the peculiar force and cogency which are seen to belong to them, when the circumstances in which they were spoken are fully remembered.

And this consideration suggests another not unimportant consequence of such a view as is here taken. It is not uncommon in theological discussion, to hear one side appeal to any and every part of Holy Scripture, whether of the Old or New Testament, claiming to apply directly to the Church of Christ, to persons before or after baptism, to penitents or obedient disciples, without restriction of sense or consideration of circumstances, the actual words spoken to Patriarchs, to Jews under the Law, or to disciples before the Crucifixion; and to hear their adversaries simply protest against such a confusion, or put in a caution against the dangerous effects of it, without suggesting a rule by which the true analogous application of various parts of Holy Scripture is to be made: by which sort of arguments we run the risk of abusing the authority of the older Scriptures as applied to the Church on the one hand, or of losing it altogether on the other. If, therefore, these Sayings of our Lord do, in any degree, answer to the account here given of them, so as to be in any true sense "outlines of the kingdom of heaven," they will, to the same extent, serve for a rule of this kind. We shall know that whatever was said in the older Scriptures is to be

applied to the Church in such a manner as to fall within, or at least to be consistent with, these great principles; that the whole subject, for instance, however largely or fully spoken of in Prophecy, of God's presence on earth, must, as a matter relating to the Church, be so interpreted as to fall within and be consistent with the great Sayings of the perpetual Presence of Christ in the Church, and of the Holy Ghost in Christian people; that the whole topic of forgiveness of sins, however largely illustrated by God's earlier dealings with mankind, or proclaimed or prophesied in earlier writings, is to be seen *through* (or, at least, to be regarded not inconsistently with) the two great Sayings whereby the Lord instituted Holy Baptism to be the means of immediate, and the covenant of future, pardon, and breathed the Holy Spirit upon His Apostles for the remitting and retaining of sins; that all the promises of divine instruction and guidance into truth, whether given in older times, or by our holy Lord, find their fulfilment in the Sacred Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as the summary revelation of doctrine, and the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost as the gift of light and understanding. The older Scriptures will be, as far as regards the Church, summed up into these great Sayings; whilst the later Apostolic writings, usages, and

institutions, will supply the genuine and inspired commentary upon these Sayings themselves.

Above all, if this view be not entirely false and unfounded, how strongly would it seem to exhibit the melancholy error of those who endeavour to strike, as it were, for themselves a religion and a hope, as sparks, out of the multiform Scriptures of God ; who, careless of succession or inheritance, forgetful of the manner in which promise and privilege, blessing, comfort, life, joy, and glory, are conveyed to mankind in and through the Apostolic company, claim to read, interpret, and apply to themselves, whoever they may be, without stint or question, every word of Holy Writ, whensoever it was written, and to whomsoever it was addressed !

It is necessary to observe, that in the following Discourses, the Sayings of our Lord in these Forty Days are arranged, not chronologically, but as the subjects of them seemed to admit of being most naturally and easily connected together.

CONTENTS.

DISCOURSE I.

PAGE

SAYINGS OF THE FORTY DAYS 1

DISCOURSE II.

THE ROYALTY, DELEGATION, AND PRESENCE 30

DISCOURSE III.

THE COMMISSIONS 96

DISCOURSE IV.

THE SACRED NAME 193

DISCOURSE V.

THE PRIVILEGES OF THE BAPTIZED. 231

APPENDIX 263

DISCOURSE I.

*Δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὄπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς, καὶ λέγων τὰ
περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. Act. SS. Apost. i. 3.*

THE great events upon which the whole system of the Christian religion rests, are the Crucifixion and Resurrection of our Lord. From the very fall of man, every thing of the nature of revelation of truth, or divine institution, bore reference to them. With a view to them the whole course of the world, in respect of God's divine government, was arranged and ordered. The patriarchal and Jewish dispensations; the prophecies, whether written or spoken, permitted among heathen nations, or imparted to the chosen people; the types, whether scattered over the face of external nature, or exhibited in the history of men; the knowledge which God gave, and the ignorance which He winked at; all the parts and portions of God's world, and His dealings with men, were framed and fashioned so as to be, in their respective

Christianity founded on the Crucifixion and Resurrection.

degrees, modes of preparing the way for the great events of the history of our Lord Jesus Christ¹. These great events (prepared by the Incarnation, and sacredly completed by the Ascension) are the Crucifixion and the Resurrection from the dead. To these events all things led; for these events all things waited². Until these events had happened in the country of Judea, and at a particular point of time in the duration of the world, the very foundation-stones of the Gospel were not laid. The need of redemption had indeed existed long. The promise had been long given. The beginnings of the divine scheme of restoration had been long preparing. Example of life, and much preliminary doctrine had been delivered, first by prophets, and afterwards by the holy Son of God Himself; but until the sacrifice of the Cross began, and the resurrection from the dead completed the great victory over the evil spirits, and the final reconciliation of God with man, Christianity, properly speaking, had no existence. In these events it was established, and on these it depends.

The conquest over sin and death being thus achieved, our Lord had only now, it might seem, to rise to His Father's right hand, in order to resume the glory which He had before the worlds. Leaving behind Him upon the earth as much

¹ Acts xvii. 30.

² Rom. viii. 22.

evidence of the fact of his glorious resurrection as might suffice to confirm the faith of his disciples, He had now, it might seem, only to go up on high, leading captivity captive, and to receive and give to men those good gifts³ of the Holy Spirit, the promise of the Father, whereby the Lord God should dwell for ever amid His re-founded Church, making each member of it a temple of the Holy Ghost, that the whole edifice together might be a temple of the Lord⁴.

But before He actually ascended, He passed forty days upon the earth; seen occasionally, yet not constantly accompanied by His Apostles; His glorified body no longer subject to the same laws as those of common men; performing miracles, and holding discourses, until the objects of this tarrying upon the earth being accomplished, "He led them out as far as Bethany, and he lifted up his hands and blessed them; and it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven⁵."

Yet our Lord remained forty days on the earth.

One object, it cannot be doubted, of this gracious delay of our Lord upon the earth, was to establish, by ample testimony⁶, the fact of His Resurrection. His glorified body was indeed not

1st, To give proof of His resurrection.

³ St. Matt. vii. 11, compared with St. Luke xi. 13.

⁴ Compare 1 Cor. vi. 19, with 1 Cor. iii. 16. 2 Cor. vi. 16.

⁵ St. Luke xxiv. 50.

⁶ Se reddidit oculis intuentium, manibus contrectandum, ædificans fidem, exhibendo veritatem; quoniam parum fuit

made visible to any but “to witnesses chosen before of God⁷ ;” but in the course of these holy days, besides other⁸ appearances, He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve, after that He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; after that He was seen of James, then of all the Apostles. For this⁹ cause Apostles were permitted to doubt, and disciples to be slow of heart, that their hesitation and delay in believing might lay more surely the foundations of our faith. And the fact which they had thus fully known, they boldly and continually asserted, so that the preaching of the Gospel in the first few chapters

humanæ fragilitati et infirmæ trepidationi tam magnum miraculum uno die exhibere, et inde subtrahere, conversatus est cum eis in terrâ quadraginta diebus, &c.—S. August., Serm. ccxlv. de Asc. Dom., vol. v. p. 1079.

⁷ Acts x. 41. 1 Cor. xv. 5.

⁸ *Invenimus itaque apud quatuor Evangelistas decies commemoratum Dominum visum esse ab hominibus post resurrectionem. Semel, ad monumentum mulieribus. Iterum, eisdem regredientibus à monumento in itinere. Tertio, Petro. Quarto, duobus euntibus in castellum. Quinto, pluribus in Jerusalem, ubi non erat Thomas. Sexto, ubi eum vidit Thomas. Septimo, ad mare Tiberiadis. Octavo, in monte Galilææ, secundum Matthæum. Nono, quod dicit Marcus, novissimè recumbentibus. Decimo, in ipso die non jam in terrâ, sed elevatum in nube, cum in cœlum ascenderat.—S. Aug. de Consensu Evang. iii. 84.*

⁹ *Ut dum a Domino in hoc spatium mora præsentiae corporalis extenditur, fides resurrectionis documentis necessariis muniretur. Gratius agamus divinæ dispensationi, et sancto-*

of the Acts of the Apostles, is little else than a witnessing of the resurrection.

But besides this great object, it cannot be doubted also that the sayings of our Lord, uttered during these great days, are themselves also of signal and peculiar importance. They were spoken in His glorified body—spoken, as it were, more immediately from heaven. He seems, if we may say so with reverence, to have delayed His ascension in order to speak them. They are the first and great sayings of His new power given unto Him both in heaven and earth. They are, as St. Luke sums them up in the opening of the Acts of the Apostles, “the things of the kingdom of God¹.” They are, in general subject, manner, and circumstances, strikingly unlike to any sayings which He had ever uttered before.

For it is to be much observed, that the teaching of our blessed Lord before the crucifixion, in so far forth as it respects the Church, and its privileges, powers, and blessings, is altogether of a prospective or anticipatory kind. His moral teaching is indeed of immediate, because of essential and eternal force. But even this portion of His doctrine, it may be confidently said, is never found alone. It is never found unaccompanied

^{2ndly, to}
speak τὰ
περὶ τῆς
βασιλείας
τοῦ Θεοῦ.

The teaching of the Gospels prospective.

I. The moral teaching.

rum Patrum necessariæ tarditati. Dubitatum est ab illis, ne dubitaretur à nobis.—S. Leo, Serm. de Asc. Dom., vol. i. p. 190.

¹ Acts i. 3.

with some reference to the Gospel, and Gospel motives, and so to the events on which the Gospel was to be founded. Thus the duty of humility is urged by our Lord on the ground of His own example, and the hope of becoming the greatest in the kingdom of heaven; that of forgiveness on the ground of our own hope of forgiveness in the judgment; that of watchfulness on the ground of the assured return of Him who was not yet gone away². And thus, even in the Sermon on the Mount, which may be taken as the chief instance of moral teaching to be found in the Evangelists, the form of the precepts, the motives by which men are urged to comply with them, and the words in which they are delivered, are all plainly prospective. They belong to other times than those in which they were spoken, and new circumstances. They presuppose an altered state of things, the state of things which was afterwards brought about by the Crucifixion and Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord³. What, for instance, are the blessings of the possession of the kingdom of heaven promised to the poor in spirit, the comfort of the mourners, the inheritance of the earth by the meek, the fulness of righteousness of those who hunger and thirst for it, the mercy to the merciful, the sight of God to the

² St. Matt. xviii. 1; xi. 29; xviii. 24; xxiv. 42.

³ St. Matt. v. 2—10.

pure, the estate of children of God to the peace-makers, the possession of the kingdom of heaven of those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, but blessings which belong and are peculiar to the full establishment and rich storehouse of Christ's Church? What, again, is the altar, what the gift, who the brother, who the Judge, who the officer, what the prison, what the uttermost farthing ¹, of the Christian exposition of the Sixth Commandment, but the Christian altar, the offer-torial gift, the brother in Christ, the Judge of quick and dead, the angel of the Judgment, the chains and darkness, the ten thousand talents of the overwhelming debt of sin, made known to us in the full revelation of Christ's Church? Or how could men call on their Father which is in heaven, except as being children of God by being made members of Christ? or how could they receive the good things of the Holy Spirit in answer to prayer, until such time as the Holy Ghost was given, after Jesus was glorified ²?

And if this be true of such parts of our Lord's teaching as might be regarded almost as a republication of the natural law of eternal Morality, it is much more strikingly true of the vast body of His teaching, as contained in His parables and doctrinal discourses.

Of the parables, it is plain that they are, with-^{11. The Parables.}

¹ St. Matt. v. 23—26. ² Ibid. vi. 9. 11. Cf. St. Luke xi. 13.

out exception, to be interpreted prospectively. This is clear, not only because our Lord, when speaking of His own teaching in parables, says of them that at first they were intentionally dark and obscure, having voice and signification only for those who had spiritual understanding, but also plainly declares that this secret method of instruction was only intended to be temporary. "Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel, or under a bed, and not to be set on a candlestick? For there is nothing hid which shall not be manifested; neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad⁶." So that we should be justified in saying, that the very object of the temporary concealment of truth under the guise of parables was that after a time it should be the better known.

It is also obvious to remark, that each separate parable is professedly a likeness or illustration of "the Kingdom of Heaven," the Church of Christ. They do not indeed illustrate the kingdom always exactly in the same sense; for some of them refer to the militant, some to the triumphant kingdom; some to the kingdom in its ruler, some in its subjects; some to the kingdom in all its subjects together, some in its subjects separately; some to the kingdom as comprising its subjects; some to the kingdom as possessed (that is, the rights and

⁶ St. Mark iv. 21.

blessings of it) by its separate subjects. Still in all alike, the one thing illustrated is the Kingdom of God, the Church. The various parables are so many mirrors or looking-glasses, each giving a true image, in anticipation, of some part or portion of the mystery of the kingdom hitherto unestablished. All together render a full and exact likeness of all the kingdom; of its condition on earth; the objects of its establishment; its King, His absence and return; its subjects, their variety, their duties, their helps, their privileges, their hopes, and their end.

In the doctrinal Discourses, the prospective character of our Lord's personal teaching comes out with equal clearness. This will be seen from a slight inspection of the greater Discourses as recorded by St. John. III. The Discourses.

The first of these Discourses is contained in chapter iii. 3—21. The greater part of this discourse, referring to Holy Baptism and the Crucifixion, plainly belongs to later times; and the dangers of unbelief spoken of in the latter verses, though partly incurred already, were, no doubt, more fully applicable to the days in which the Crucifixion had actually taken place, and the New Birth of Water and the Holy Ghost was given.

The second Discourse (St. John iv. 7—38) is upon the gift of the Holy Ghost, spiritual worship, and the reward of preachers; all which subjects belong, without question, to the times which suc-

ceed to the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the great Pentecost.

The third Discourse (St. John v. 17—47), opening with the words, “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,” has for its principal subject the identity of operation of the Son with the Father, and the consequent equality of the Son, in honour and life-giving power, with the Father, as testified by St. John the Baptist, by the Father’s works, and by the Old Testament Scriptures. In this Discourse, our blessed Lord partially reveals the doctrine of His own Divinity, to be afterwards more fully declared, and refers to those particular acts of His power, the resurrection of the dead, and the universal judgment, to be afterwards revealed, and believed in the Church.

The fourth Discourse (St. John vi. 26—63) belongs altogether to the subject of the Holy Communion not yet instituted, and refers expressly to the Ascension, as the time at which the hardness of the sayings contained in it should receive their true spiritual solution.

The fifth Discourse (St. John viii. 12—58), upon Himself as the light of the world, and His Divine Sonship, points equally clearly to the Ascension as the time when all these words would be established and certain, “When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am He.”

The sixth Discourse (St. John ix. 39; x. 38),

rising, apparently, out of the unbelief and hard-heartedness of the Pharisees in the case of the man who had been born blind, exhibits, under the image of sheep, sheepfold, and shepherd, the Church of Christ, the laying down of His own life, and the calling in of the Gentiles.

The seventh Discourse (St. John xii. 23—36; 44—50) is a solemn anticipation of His approaching death and resurrection, with the blessing of those who should receive, and the judgment of those who should refuse to believe in His words.

The eighth Discourse (St. John xiii. 12; xvii. 26) is wholly occupied with His own approaching departure, and the state and prospects of His Church, after He, in the flesh, should be gone away.

In like manner it is probable that all the events IV. The Acts. and acts of our Lord's holy life are to be understood as having, besides their immediate meaning, prospective reference of important kinds to the Church to be founded afterwards. Thus His sacred Baptism, besides any other mysterious meanings which it may have had, did, as we know since the Resurrection, hallow for ever "the flood Jordan ⁷ and all other waters to the mystical washing away of sin" in the Church. His mysterious temptation, immediately (*εὐθὺς*) following on His baptism ⁸, besides attesting His true

⁷ Baptismal Service, 1549.

⁸ Dr. Mill's five Sermons, particularly pp. 36—51.

humanity, (a doctrine neither doubted nor appreciated till He was declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead,) also exhibited to the Church the great exemplar of resistance to spiritual evil in the baptized. His⁹ washing of His Apostles' feet, besides many other lessons with which that sacred act was charged, signified the perpetual remission of daily sins of infirmity to those who had once been fully washed in holy Baptism.

His Transfiguration¹, besides exhibiting His

⁹ Homo in sancto quidem baptismo totus abluitur, non præter pedes, sed totus omnino: verumtamen cum in rebus humanis postea vivitur, utique terra calcatur. Ipsi igitur humani affectus, sine quibus in hâc mortalitate non vivitur, quasi pedes sunt, ubi ex humanis rebus afficimur, et sic afficimur, ut si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos decipiamus et veritas in nobis non sit. Quotidie igitur pedes lavat nobis qui interpellat pro nobis: et quotidie nos opus habere ut pedes lavemus, id est, vias spiritualium gressuum dirigamus, in ipsâ oratione Dominicâ confitemur, cum dicimus, Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris. Si enim confiteamur, sicut scriptum est, peccata nostra, profecto ille qui lavit pedes discipulorum suorum fidelis est et justus qui dimittat nobis peccata, et mundet nos ab omni iniquitate, id est, usque ad pedes quibus conversamur in terrâ. —S. Aug. Tractat. lvi. et lvii. in S. Johan. Ev. c. 13. (vol. iii. p. 657.)

¹ Such as He is to be in the time of judgment, such was He now seen of the Apostles. (S. Jerome.) The Transfiguration, which is the sacrament of the second regeneration. (Gloss. ap Anselm.) Aurea Catena, Oxf. 1841. S. Augustine, interpreting more minutely, says: "Quod illi ergo ad terram ceci-

own glory, wherewith He shall return in judgment, showed forth the glorified² estate of those who are by degrees attaining the second regeneration, and so shall be Christ's at His coming.

The Miracles, in the same way, of our Lord, V. The
Miracles. have, for the most part, such clear and universally acknowledged reference to the times of the Church, that we should certainly understand them very inadequately if we were not to read them according to it. Such is the repeated miracle of the draught of fishes, referring to the bringing in of disciples into the Church, that great net cast into the sea (which instance illustrates well the way in which miracles and parables have a joint doctrinal scope, and throw light on one another); the equally repeated miracle of the loaves and fishes (which equally illustrates, when compared with St. John vi., the connexion of miracles and discourses); and the various miracles of healing and raising the dead; whether they be regarded as signs of Divine Power never to depart from the Church, as answers to prayer intended for the

derunt, hoc significaverunt, quod morimur;—quando vero eos Dominus erexit, Resurrectionem significavit. Post resurrectionem, ut quid tibi lex? ut quid tibi Prophetæ? Ideo non apparet Elias, non apparet Moyses. Remanet tibi In Principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum.”—S. Aug. S. lxxx. de verb. Evang. Matt. xvii. (Vol. v. p. 426.)

² Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 18, μεταμορφούμεθα, with St. Mark ix. 2.

perpetual encouragement of Christians praying, as tokens of absolving power exercised by the Son of Man, or as direct types of the restoration from spiritual sickness and death, and the coming resurrection of souls and bodies to be given in the Church.

We may, therefore, confidently assign this character, in general, to our Lord's teaching, whether delivered in precept or parable, miracle or significant act, before the Crucifixion. It was not so properly the actual preaching of the kingdom, as the preaching of the approach of the kingdom. It was not so properly the instituting³ of the Christian Church, as the preliminary, and often obscure and difficult announcement of the events on which that Church was to be founded; of a death to be undergone, a triumph to be achieved, powers to be given, institutions to be established, a Comforter to be sent. To such extent does this anticipatory character belong to our Lord's teaching, that even the mere expressions sometimes

³ The passages, St. Matt. xi. 12, 13; xii. 28. St. Luke xvi. 16, may seem to bear against this conclusion; but cf. St. Matt. iv. 17, as explaining the sense in which the kingdom of God was preached. *Until John* may probably mean till the *beginning* of St. John's preaching; for ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία is a different preaching from that of the Law and the Prophets. St. John Baptist was certainly not in the kingdom: St. Matt. xi. 11. Besides, the scribes still sat in Moses' seat, and had a right to the obedience of the people: St. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3.

partake of it; witness the phrase “taking⁴ up one’s cross,” in the sense of following the example of our Lord’s sufferings, used repeatedly before the Crucifixion⁵.

But the case was altered when, having yielded to the death upon the cross, and by yielding conquered the powers of sin and death, He stood before them in His glorified body, having received, in some manner in which He had not received it before, “all power in heaven and in earth.” The kingdom of God, so long declared to be at hand, was now come. What had before been promised, was now to be given; that which was said in prediction and anticipation before, was now to be imparted in fact and reality. The candle⁶ which hitherto had been, as it were, under a bushel or a bed, was now to be set upon its candlestick, to give light to all who were to be received into the Lord’s refounded temple. Even yet, the fulness of light and power was to be withheld for a few days, until the full coming of the feast of Pentecost should bring the full effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles: but in these sacred forty days

The teaching of the forty days present, immediate, and conveying powers.

⁴ Vide Grotium in S. Matt. x. 38. Metaphoricè: calamitates ob doctrinæ Christianæ professionem inflictæ, non sine respectu ad mortem Christi, quam in cruce veritatis defensor subiit. Schleusner, in voce.

⁵ St. Matt. x. 38; xvi. 24. St. Mark viii. 34. St. Luke ix. 23.

⁶ Cf. Kuinoel in S. Joan. xvi. 22, 23.

the words were spoken, the powers conveyed, the promises ratified, the commission given, the delegation completed, the visible ⁷ Church founded.

This teaching contains the written charter of the Church.

It is thus that in the opening of the Acts, St. Luke sums up the precious discourses of these great forty days, "telling them the things of the kingdom of God⁸." This description comprises all He uttered. The written sayings are few, not very various, some recorded by one; and some by another of the Evangelists; but altogether they contain that which the Lord saw fit to speak, and the Holy Ghost to record, as "the things of the kingdom." Spoken as no other words were ever spoken, in His royalty and glory,—spoken to convey, and in the very form of expression obviously conveying direct, immediate, actual commissions and powers, they form *the charter of the kingdom*,—of the kingdom which was to grow as a great tree from a little seed, which was as a net to inclose for a time both bad and good, which was, as leaven, to affect, alter, and elevate by degrees the whole character and course of the world.

The relation of these sayings to other Scripture.

1. Earlier.

Regarded thus as the great outlines of the kingdom, these great sayings are immediately seen to stand in an important relation, both to the earlier and later Scriptures. As respects the former, each one of them gives, as it were, the sketch and

⁷ Bp. Pearson on the Creed, Art. ix. (vol. i. pp. 506—512.)

⁸ Acts i. 3.

general form of one portion of the kingdom, which is supplied in its full detail, and, if I may so speak, *articulated* by means of many a dark anticipatory discourse of Christ, which could have been but little understood at the time when it was spoken, as well as by many a passage of the prophets, uttered in other times, and addressed primarily to other persons, but having undeniable reference to the times of the kingdom of Christ. Thus these sayings, illustrating and receiving illustration from the whole mass of earlier Scriptures, furnish something like a rule by which we may ascertain the applicability, or at least adjust the manner and degree of the application of these writings and discourses to the case of Christians in the Church. And in like manner, the conduct and language of ^{2.} Later. the inspired Apostles, as recorded in the Acts and Epistles, furnish the true commentary of the Spirit upon these sayings. Given to the Apostles, with the gift of the Holy Ghost to supply the wisdom and power requisite to carry them out into operation, we must needs look to see how, and with what institutions, manner of teaching, claims of authority, &c., the Apostles, under the Holy Spirit, executed them. Thus the structure of the infant Church and the later Scriptures will be the true practical inspired commentary upon these sacred sayings, as they will themselves furnish the outlines within which to arrange, and the rule by

which to interpret, the earlier language of Holy Scripture respecting the Church.

Sayings of
the great
forty days.

The words of our Lord during these forty days, as recorded by St. Matthew, are as follows:—
“And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail! And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me⁹.” “Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen¹.”

The following words are recorded by St. Mark: “Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world,

⁹ St. Matt. xxviii. 9, 10.

¹ Ibid. xxviii. 16—20.

and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover².”

In St. Luke we read of His appearing to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus; when “He said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk and are sad?” And after that they had explained the causes of their sorrow, “He said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself.” And after they had returned to Jerusalem, and stated these things to the eleven, “Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts

² St. Mark xvi. 14—18.

arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them. And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high³.”

The sayings of our Lord recorded by St. John are longer and more numerous. “And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw

³ St. Luke xxiv. 36—49.

Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master. Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God. Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her. Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained⁴.”

⁴ St. John xx. 14—23.

“And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith He to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed ⁵.”

The next sayings are recorded by St. John in the twenty-first chapter. “So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep. Verily, verily, I

⁵ St. John xx. 26—29.

say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God. And when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, Follow me. Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee? Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me⁶."

These, then, are the sayings of the great forty days, the things of the kingdom of God. In the Gospels they are, as we have seen, variously recorded, one evangelist supplying one saying, and one another, and occasionally two or more evangelists furnishing different portions of what may probably have been said at one time, or somewhat different versions of what may possibly have been the same words. They are also mingled up with acts, situations, and persons, all of which, no doubt, being delivered to us by the Holy Ghost, have some important bearing upon truth and practice

⁶ St. John xxi. 15- 22.

Thus the holy Resurrection blessing, "Peace be unto you ⁷," itself anticipated in our Lord's prospective directions to His Apostles in former days, and adopted in all the Church as her sacred inheritance of Christian salutation, and inter-communication of love,—what is this but one of the first outpourings of mercy from the Prince of Peace upon His people, to be afterwards diffused and dispersed by the Apostolic blessing of "grace and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ," to the separate Churches? So, too, we cannot doubt, that the expositions of the prophecies made to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, and to the whole company of the Apostles after their return to Jerusalem, though only recorded in summary, not only confirmed the faith of the Apostles at the time, but also furnished them with the true model and example of prophetic exposition, showing them how "the Scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven bringeth forth, like an householder, out of his treasure things old and new ⁸." In like manner, the prophecies of St. Peter's death, and the tarrying of St. John, besides their direct bearing upon the immediate fortunes of the Church in the person of those who "seemed to be pillars," may not

⁷ St. Luke xxiv. 36. St. John xx. 19, 21. Cf. St. Matt. x. 12. St. Luke x. 5.

⁸ St. Matt. xiii. 52.

improbably be understood to bear wider and more lasting reference to the Church, to the dignity of these great Apostles⁹, (whose thrones, with those of their brethren, should be established in the Regeneration,) to the greatness of martyrdom, and various other points of high ecclesiastical concern and importance.

These words and acts, however, although they may thus have great and various meanings belonging to the Church, the kingdom of God, are, in their manner of statement, indirect, obscure, and uncertain. They are sayings, no doubt, of the great forty days, but, if I may so call them, secondary sayings; not indeed to be neglected or undervalued in respect of their own proper and separate importance, but distinguishable in point of clearness, directness, and certainty, from the primary sayings of the same time. These great primary sayings, as they stand out amongst the discourses of these sacred days, seem to admit of being classified as follows:

1st. Our Lord's own Royalty¹: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Summary
of the Say-
ings.

2ndly. The commission of the Apostles²: "Go ye therefore;" "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

3rdly. His own perpetual Presence³: "And lo,

⁹ Gal. ii. 9. St. Matt. xx. 23; xix. 28. St. Luke xxii. 30.

¹ Disc. II. p. 30.

² Ibid. p. 46.

³ Ibid. p. 46.

I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.”

4thly. That He should not be touched⁴ till after His Ascension: “Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father.”

5thly. The tradition of holy Baptism⁵, with the law of obedience: “Make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.”

6thly. The Holy Ghost to remit⁶ and retain sins: “He breathed on them and said, Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.”

7thly. The Pastoral Commission⁷, addressed directly to St. Peter, and made to rest upon love: “Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? Feed my lambs. Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Feed my sheep. Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Feed my sheep.”

8thly. The privileges of the baptized and faithful. 1. Salvation⁸: “He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.” 2. Miraculous powers⁹: “And these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall

⁴ Disc. II. p. 81.

⁵ Disc. III. p. 100. Disc. IV.

⁶ Disc. III. p. 124.

⁷ Disc. III. p. 134.

⁸ Disc. V. p. 230.

⁹ Ibid. p. 247.

speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." 3. The blessedness of them that believe ¹ without seeing: "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

9thly. The immediate promise of the Holy Ghost: "And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you."

Such, then, are the principal "things of the kingdom of God," which the Lord is recorded to have uttered during the great forty days in which He delayed His ascension into heaven. There probably were many other sayings, as well as deeds and signs, communicated to the Apostles during the same sacred period². But these are written that we may believe, and believing, have eternal life; these, whatever may have been the others, the Holy Ghost has chosen to record in writing, for the perpetual use and edification of the Church. If there were others, the traces of them will, no doubt, be found in the later teaching and institutions of the Apostles; but of these there can be no doubt: they are the Lord's own written, sacred words; words which, whatever be the true meaning in which they are respectively to be understood, cannot but be at the very foun-

There were probably others: these *alone* are written.

¹ Disc. V. p. 249.

² Cf. St. John xx. 30; xxi. 24.

dation of the constitution and privileges of the Christian Church.

Of these separate sayings, some short examination will be made in the following Discourses. Each will be found to open a large field of Scriptural investigation. If the account now given of their place in the Christian scheme be at all a just one, each will be found to be, as it were, a principle of the kingdom; to be, if we may so term it, the actual enactment of that which had been often spoken of, with various degrees of clearness and obscurity, before. They do not, indeed, supersede the earlier Scriptures. All, in their respective places, exhibit the manifold wisdom of God, dividing at different times, and to different persons, severally as He would. But in a certain sense, they stand before them. They lead them; they throw light upon them; they enable us to read them rightly, and arrange them truly in their application to the Church. Though all, no doubt, speak the mind of the Spirit, and are full of the truth of God, yet if, out of so many and so various sayings, a question can arise as to the relative meaning and importance of any of them, these, it can hardly be doubted, are they by which the darker, earlier, prospective sayings are to be interpreted.

And therefore they are of high and sacred value, and require to be most carefully and reve-

rently considered. They contain within them the germ of every thing most precious to Christians in knowledge, privilege, and comfort. Unless men can trace a personal claim to have a share in them, and the institutions founded on them, it is difficult to say where they can look for well-founded peace or hope. Feeling themselves, as baptized and dutiful Churchmen may, rightful inheritors of them by a title of clear and unquestionable descent, they may look on them as their written charter of privilege, the documentary evidence of their Christian citizenship, with all its blessings of present acceptance, strength, and peace, and future welcome, recognition, and eternal joy.

DISCOURSE II.

Μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον· ὅτι εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν
δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν.—S. Luc. xii. 32.

I. The
royalty of
Christ.

THE first of the sayings of the great forty days, is that which asserts the royalty of our blessed Lord Himself. It is the first in place, for it occurs as the first in the first of the Evangelists, and it is the first also in its own proper order and meaning; for from the Royalty of Christ the existence of the Church, with all her powers, privileges, and hopes, is directly derived. As a King, He founded His kingdom; as a King, He commissioned His ministers; as a King, He laid out the limits and constitution of His kingdom, according to His own will.

1. Given at
the Resur-
rection.

Let it, then, be first observed, that this royalty is first fully given in the Resurrection: “And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth ¹.”

¹ St. Matt. xxviii. 18.

Was He not, then, it may be asked, a king before? Was He not a king, when He said to Pilate, “Thou sayest that I am a king²?” Was *He* not a king who was one with the Father from the beginning, who made all things, so that “without him was not any thing made that was made³?” Doubtless He was in these senses a king, as He was the Lord God omnipotent, who reigneth from all eternity. But⁴ His Royalty as *Christ*, His kingly estate as that sacred Person, who being from the beginning in the form of God took upon Him the form of a servant⁵, and was made in the likeness of man; this more peculiar power and

² St. John xviii. 37.

³ St. John i. 3.

⁴ Συνελόντι οὖν φᾶναι, οὕτω νόει τὸ ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία. εἰ μὲν ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου λεγόμενον ἐκλάβοις, ὅτι ἐδόθη μοι ἡ πᾶσα ἐξουσία, καθὼ καὶ ἀκοιτες καὶ ἐκόντες νῦν ἐπιγινώσκουσί με Θεόν, οἱ πρόην κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀκουσίον ὑποταγῆς τρόπον δουλεύοντές μοι· εἰ δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως λεγόμενον, οὕτω νόει· ὅτι ἐγὼ ἡ πρόην κατὰ κριτος φύσις, κατὰ δὲ τὴν πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀσύγχυτον ἔνωσιν Θεὸς οὖσα ἔλαβον τὴν ἐξουσίαν κατὰ πάντων· ὥστε προσκυνεῖσθαι ὑπ’ ἀγγέλων ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς δοξάζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν περᾶτων πάντων.

Εἰς τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν οὖν, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὴν θεότητα, ταῦτα νοεῖν δεῖ.—S. Basil. adv. Eunom.

“Constat quod Christus, qui ab æterno habebat regnum mundi, ut Dei Filius, executionem accepit ex resurrectione, quasi dicat, Jam sum in possessione. De istâ habetur Daniel vii. 26. Judicium sedebit, ut auferatur potentia, &c.”—Thom. Aq. in S. Matt. xxviii. 18.

⁵ Phil. ii. 6, 7.

dignity of kingship (though inchoate from the moment when first the Son of God took flesh, and gleaming through the veil of humiliation with which His face was covered in His ministry, in many a word and deed of authority and power), was only then established, when by yielding He had conquered, by dying He had risen, by sufferings⁶ He had been made perfect. As He had submitted to be born in the flesh as a little child, and to pass, as an ordinary man, through the gradual stages of growth and stature, and even of wisdom and favour with God, so too did He bear to attain by degrees to higher eminences of office and dignity, even in respect of the sacred unction. The prophetic office He had exercised, in great part, while going in and out among His disciples in His three years' ministry. His sacred Priesthood He had then chiefly exhibited, when He laid down His life for the sheep. His eternal Royalty⁷ is established at the Resurrection.

2. Predicted in the Old Testament.

This sacred royalty of our blessed Lord, to be thus afterwards given, is the continual topic of the ancient prophetic Scriptures. There is no other subject which is to be found pervading them in nearly the same abundance or variety of statement.

⁶ Heb. ii. 10; v. 8, 9.

⁷ "In hâc tertiâ dignitate Matthæus librum finit, cum, ut annotavimus, primùm de prophetico, deinde de sacerdotali ejus officio egisset."—Grotius in Matt. xxviii. 18.

The Psalms of David, for example, are replete with predictions of the greatness, power, and majesty of the Redeemer's kingdom. It is difficult among so many Psalms to cite the most striking passages of these prophecies. It may be sufficient to refer to those Psalms in which the subject is most prominently brought forward, and in which the extent⁸, the eternal duration⁹, the holiness¹, the awful power², the merciful judgment³, the Divinity⁴, the mightiness and glory⁵, the worship⁶, the righteousness and awfulness⁷, the eternal Priestliness⁸, and the wisdom and goodness⁹, of the kingdom, and of the Messiah as the predicted King, are celebrated in the loftiest and most varied strains.

In like manner the book of the prophet Isaiah is replete with predictions of the kingdom of Christ. Some of these passages are short and striking, and in their obvious meaning speak expressly to the point. Such is that great prophecy of the ninth chapter: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase

⁸ Ps. ii.⁹ Ps. xxi. xlv. cxlv.¹ Ps. xlv.² Ps. xlvi.³ Ps. lxxii. cxlv.⁴ Ps. lxxxix.⁵ Ps. xciii.⁶ Ps. xcvi.⁷ Ps. xcvi. xcix.⁸ Ps. cx.⁹ Ps. cxlv. cxlvii.

of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever¹⁰." Such is that verse of the 24th chapter: "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously¹¹." Such is that prophecy of the 32nd chapter: "Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment¹." Such are those of the 52nd and 55th chapters: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!" "Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people²." But besides these, and others which might be quoted like them, the whole book is full of the same subject in a less direct and obvious form. The kingdom is often described, without express mention of the king. (chaps. xi. xii. xxxv. xl. xlix. lx. lxi. &c.)

¹⁰ Isa. ix. 6, 7.

¹¹ Ibid. xxiv. 23.

¹ Ibid. xxxii. 1.

² Ibid. lii. 7; lv. 3, 4.

The king is typified under the likeness of Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah. (xxii. 20—25.) Prophecies³ which in their first and directest meaning seem to refer to other subjects, yet run up at last to this, the great and universal object of all the prophet's inspirations. We should not speak beyond the truth if we should say that the kingdom of the Messiah is, more or less directly, present in all the Evangelical Prophecies with which this wonderful book abounds.

The prophecies of the same kind in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel are less numerous, but equally forcible. "In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith he

³ Vitring. in *Isaïam*, cap. xxii. (Vol. i. p. 659.)

Prophetiæ hujus generis eum in modum accipiendæ sunt, ut in magnâ latitudine complectantur œconomiam status populi Dei post reditum ex exilio, quæ perficeretur in œconomiâ Ecclesiæ N. T.—Non sane hoc sensu acsi Messias mox post reditum ex exilio expectandus esset, sed quod Deus hoc tempore inciperet suâ gratiâ statum ecclesiæ eo modo componere ut manifestè præpararetur ad œconomiam spiritualem à Messiâ instituendam—donec tandem illucesceret Tempus Gratiae, quo Filius Dei, abolitis aliis omnibus Potestatibus, regimen ecclesiæ ipse et solus capesseret, ipse se ecclesiæ suæ immediatè uniret,—ipse agnosceretur esse unicus populi sui Rex, Pontifex Unicus, solus Doctor, Legislato, Judex, &c.—Vitringa in cap. xxviii. 5.

shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness. For thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel ⁴.”

“And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all. . . . And David my servant shall be king over them; and they shall all have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them ⁵.”

The prophet Daniel ⁶ saw in vision the actual investiture of the kingdom. “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 ⁷.”

Great are also the prophecies of Micah to the same effect: “But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. . . . And he shall stand and feed in the name of the

⁴ Jer. xxxiii. 15—17; xxiii. 5.

⁵ Ezek. xxxvii. 22. 24.

⁶ Dan. vii. 13, 14.

⁷ Vide Appendix, passage from St. Cyprian.

Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God; and they shall abide: for now shall he be great unto the ends of the earth ⁸." And of Zechariah: "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the Temple of the Lord. Even he shall build the Temple of the Lord: and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both ⁹."

Besides written predictions, we also know that the throne of David himself, and its assured succession for ever in his house, are to be understood as a type and assurance of the establishment of the throne of his Divine Son. As such it is often spoken of by the Prophets. These are "the sure ¹ mercies" of David, the assured and certain fulfilment, by the Resurrection from the dead, of the promise of an eternal kingdom in his house to be established in his Son.

Such, in general, were the prophecies of the Old Testament respecting the kingdom of the Messias, to be founded at some future time upon the earth. Indeed, so fully do the ancient Scriptures speak of the kingdom of Christ, its extent, power, and eternity, that they say but little in comparison of the humiliation and suffering by

⁸ Micah v. 2. 4.

⁹ Zech. vi. 12, 13.

¹ Acts xiii. 34. Isa. lv. 3.

which it was to be preceded. Yet there are not wanting passages in which the two subjects are closely connected, according to those words of our Lord Himself on the road to Emmaus: "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory²?" Witness the sayings of that great Evangelical Prophecy, the second Psalm: "The kings of the earth stood up, and their rulers took counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed³:" for in truth, against the anointed Jesus both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, to do whatsoever the hand and counsel of God determined before to be done. And yet did God, who sitteth in heaven, laugh their designs to scorn, and set His king, that day begotten in the Resurrection, upon His holy hill of Sion⁴. In like manner, the two passages of all the Old Testament which speak most fully of the humiliation of Christ (the 22nd Psalm and the 53rd chap. of Isaiah), both end with the announcement of His glory. "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong⁵." "The kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the governor among the people⁶."

² St. Luke xxiv. 25, 26.

³ Ps. ii. cf. Acts iv. 27.

⁵ Isa. liii. 12.

⁴ Acts xiii. 33.

⁶ Ps. xxii. 28.

In like manner, when the Baptist came to be the forerunner of Christ, the announcement which he made was of the immediate approach of a kingdom: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand ⁷;" and when he made his public recognition of Christ, he said, "This is he of whom I spake ⁸;" the king, that is, whose kingdom it had been the great object of his commission to announce and prepare. So, too, when the Lord Himself came, He also preached the approach of the kingdom. "The kingdom of heaven" also was that which He unfolded and explained in all His parables; and to the kingdom of heaven His disciples were taught to look continually forward in their prayers and anticipations, even though they mistook the nature of it. His kingdom was not yet ⁹ of this world, when just before His final submission He replied to Pilate ¹, asking Him if He were a king.

And then ², having thus lived the due time

⁷ St. Matt. iii. 2.

⁸ St. John i. 15.

⁹ I have followed Bp. Pearson in using this expression, "was not yet of this world," as though after the Resurrection the kingdom *became* of this world. I confess, however, that the repeated use of the words *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου* in the 17th chap. of St. John, verses 14—16, inclines me to believe that our Lord means rather to say, that His kingdom is not derived from the world, nor of the world's kind, but opposite and antagonist to the world.

¹ St. John xviii. 36.

² The third office belonging to the Messiah was the regal, as

3. Anticipated in the Gospels.

upon the earth, and exhibited in His life many signs of His divine nature and majesty, He submitted at length to the painful and ignominious death upon the cross. Therein He yielded once to the power of Satan, and received upon Himself the punishment due to our sins. But having thus submitted, He was, after three days, greatly exalted. After three days' sojourn in the heart of

appeareth by the most ancient tradition of the Jews, and by the express predictions of the Prophets. The solemn inauguration into this office was at His ascension into Heaven, and His session at the right hand of God: not but that He was by right a king before, but the full and public execution was deferred till then, when God raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion.—Bp. Pearson on the Creed, Art. ii.

This dominion, thus given unto Christ in His human nature, was a direct and plenary power over all things; but this was not actually given Him at once, but part while He lived on earth, part after His death and resurrection. For to this end Christ both died, rose, and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and living. After His resurrection He said to His disciples, “All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth,” &c.—Ibid. p. 241.

Christ was born king of the Jews; and the conjunction of His human nature with His divine in the union of His person, was a sufficient unction to the regal office; yet as the Son of Man he exercised no such dominion, professing that His *kingdom was not of this world*; but after that He rose from the dead, then as it were in Hebron with His own tribe, He tells the Apostles, “*All power is given unto Him*,” and by virtue thereof gives them injunctions.—Ibid. Art. vi. p. 422.

the earth, He was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, and thereby declared to be the Son of God with power. Then His long-predicted kingdom was established. It was founded in Zion. It was the due succession and antitype of the throne of David. The Priest was upon His throne. All power was given unto Him in heaven and in earth. The kingdom was set up in righteousness, power, and majesty. It began to go forth from Zion, to the furthest parts of the earth; and it was established to endure unto the end of the world.

And thus, in the later Scriptures, we find the Apostles, in terms hardly less glowing and forcible than those of the ancient prophets, celebrating the kingdom of the Messiah, now established for ever in heaven and earth. As before, too, the glory of the kingdom is represented as following immediately after, and as won by the humiliation and suffering of the Lord. Such is that great passage of the Epistle to the Philippians: “ And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ

4. Recognized in the Epistles.

is Lord, to the glory of God the Father ³.” Such are those sayings of St. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, and in his first Epistle: “The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins ⁴.” “Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ ⁵.” “Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him ⁶.” So St. Paul writes to the Hebrews: “Who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God ⁷.” To the Ephesians: “His mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come ⁸.” And to Timothy: “Until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath

³ Phil. ii. 8—11.

⁴ Acts v. 30, 31

⁵ Ibid. ii. 36.

⁶ 1 Pet. iii. 22.

⁷ Heb. xii. 2.

⁸ Eph. i. 20, 21.

immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, or can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen⁹." And such is that glorious ascription of royal praise and worship in the Book of the Revelation of St. John: "I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying, with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever¹. Amen."

There is one² passage, indeed, in the first

⁹ 1 Tim. vi. 14—16.

¹ Rev. v. 11—13.

² The regal power of Christ, as a branch of the Mediatorship, is to continue till all those enemies be subdued. When all the enemies of Christ shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into His kingdom, when those which refused Him to rule over them shall be slain, that is, when the whole office of the Mediator shall be completed and fulfilled, then every branch of the execution shall cease. Now, though the Mediatorship of Christ be then resigned, because the end thereof will then be performed, though the regal office, as part of that Mediatorship, be also resigned with the

Epistle to the Corinthians, which seems to speak of the kingdom of Christ coming to an end. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. . . . And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." This passage, however, is to be interpreted, not of the eternal kingdom of the Messiah, of which, according to ancient prophecy,

whole, yet we must not think that Christ shall cease to be a king, or lose any of the power and honour which before He had. The dominion which He hath was given Him as a reward for what He suffered; and certainly the reward shall not cease when the work is done. He hath promised to make us kings and priests, which honour we expect in heaven, believing we shall *reign with Him* for ever, and therefore for ever must believe Him king.—Bp. Pearson on the Creed, Art. vi. p. 428; Art. ii. p. 242. Vide the notes on these passages.

Μὴ τοίνυν, φησὶν, ἀκούσας ὅτι πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν, καὶ ἐξουσίαν καταργήσῃ, φοβηθῆς ὅτι ἀτονήσῃ, καὶ οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ ταῦτα. ποιήσῃ γὰρ πάντα, βασιλεύων καὶ ἐιοικῶν τὸν πόλεμον, ἕως οὗ ὑποτάξῃ πάντας. Ὁρᾷς ὅτι τὸ, ἄχρῃς, οὐ πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν τοῦ, μετὰ ταῦτα, κέῖται· ἀλλὰ δι' ἣν εἶρηται αἰτίαν· κρατεῖ γὰρ, φησὶν, αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ οὐκ ἀτονεῖ ἕως οὗ πάντα κατορθώσῃ· μεθ' ὃ δὲ κατορθώσῃ, πολλῶ μᾶλλον· τῆς γὰρ βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.—Theophylact. Comm. in 1 Ep. ad Cor. cap. xv.; v. S. Chrysost. in loco.

and the words of the angel to the Blessed Virgin Mary, "there shall be no end," but of that present condition or estate of the Church, which is economical, as aiming at a particular end; militant, as being occupied in battling against the spirits of evil; and protective of His people, still exposed to risk and danger of loss, and still needing the ever-present help of grace to make good their inheritance. When these objects are attained,—the enemies subdued under Christ's footstool; His own finally and for ever rescued; Death, the last enemy, destroyed,—thus much of the Royalty, the conquering and terrible Royalty, shall cease, and God be owned to be the Eternal King, the acknowledged Lord, the source and aim of all in all. "For his kingdom lasteth, and groweth not faint until he hath accomplished all things; and when he hath accomplished all things, then it lasteth much more: for of his kingdom there is no end." In that eternal kingdom, the due and covenanted reward for what He suffered, we believe that we too shall reign with Him, being joint heirs in Him of His everlasting inheritance, Kings and Priests in Him.

Of this royal power, thus given at the Resurrec-^{5. Twofold.}tion from the dead, our Lord makes a twofold division. "All power is given unto me, both in heaven and earth." Of these, the heavenly king-^{i. Heavenly.}dom He exerciseth Himself with undelegated sovereignty, sitting at His Father's right hand,

waiting till all enemies shall be subdued under His feet. Thither He went up in His glorified body at the Ascension; there He was seen of St. Stephen and St. Paul; thence He shall return, in like manner as He was seen to go up, at the Judgment; there He reigneth as king, and offereth for ever His Church's prayers, and the eternal oblation of His own precious sacrifice as Priest.

ii. Earthly. The earthly kingdom, meanwhile, He delegated to His Apostles in that second saying of these great days: "Go ye, therefore." "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you ³." "Even so!" with no visible or declared inferiority of power, commission, or authority: "send I you ⁴," you all, you together, not thee, and thee, and thee singly, but you. "Even so send I you," to occupy My place, to stand as My vicegerents, to speak in My name, to do upon earth that in My behalf which I will assuredly ratify in heaven ⁵.

III. His own perpetual Presence. But are we then, indeed, to speak as if to weak, fallible, and passionate men (even united in one

³ *Κεχειροτόνηκε μὲν ἐν τούτοις ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς τοὺς τῆς οἰκουμένης καθηγητάς τε καὶ διδασκάλους, καὶ τῶν θείων αὐτοῦ μυστηρίων οἰκονόμους.*—S. Cyril. Alex. in S. Joan. (ed. Auber. iv. 1094.)

⁴ S. Clem. Rom. ad Cor. xlii.

⁵ *Glorificatus Dominus resurgendo, commendat ecclesiam; glorificandus ascendendo, commendat ecclesiam; Spiritum Sanctum mittens de cœlis commendat ecclesiam.*—S. August. Serm. cclxv. In die Ascens. Dom.

body, and acting with joint authority and wisdom) were committed powers not less on earth than were given by God to His holy Son? May we not fear lest, while we thus magnify the position and authority of the Church of God, we may unawares be putting her into her Maker's place, and usurping for her prerogatives and powers which belong only to God?

Our Lord, at the very same time that He uttered these sacred words, conveying so great and wonderful powers, added the secret of their greatness: "And, behold, I am with you." It was to be no sanctity or separate authority of their own which they were to exercise. It was not that they were to be the delegates of an absent, but the visible representatives of an invisibly present Lord. He was not to go away altogether, though He left them in the flesh; but He was to be Himself the present, unseen King, even in the long and toilsome days of sorrow and fasting, when the Bridegroom should seem to be taken away from them, and the Church should wait in patience and earnest desire for His re-appearing.

And ⁶ lest, when the inspired Apostles died,

⁶ Nam illis loquebatur, et nos significabat, cum diceret, Ecce ego vobiscum sum, omnibus diebus, usque ad consummationem sæculi. Numquid illi hic futuri erant usque in consummationem sæculi? Item dicit, Non pro his rogo tantum, sed pro

their imperfect and uninspired successors should, in the midst of the strife of worldly tongues, and the abundance of sin, be tempted to doubt whether the mysterious delegation, with all its sacred powers, were continued to them, the Lord goes on to add, "And, behold, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The Apostles, as we know, all soon died; the promise conveyed in these words could not therefore possibly be limited to themselves. They were not to remain on earth till the end of the world. Therefore these words belong to the Apostles as to a perpetual corporation, to themselves and their successors: to themselves in the first place, then to all whom they "added to the Church⁷;" to Titus and Timothy, to Epaphroditus, Clemens, Hermas, Polycarp, Irenæus; to those whom they left behind them in possession of the Christian promises and hopes, to the end of the world. Such a succession of faith and blessing our Lord Himself had acknowledged in the prayer of the seventeenth of St. John⁸, "Neither pray I for his qui credituri sunt per verbum illorum in Me.—S. August. Enarr. in Ps. xlvii.

οὐ μετ' ἐκείνων ἂν μόνον εἶπεν ἔσεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ πάντων τῶν μετ' ἐκείνους πιστευόντων· οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος οἱ ἀπόστολοι μένειν ἔμελλον· ἀλλ' ὡς ἐνὶ σώματι διαλέγεται τοῖς πιστοῖς.—S. Chrysost., Hom. xc. in Matt.

⁷ Acts ii. 47.

⁸ St. John xvii. 20.

these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word;" and St. Peter, in the Acts, speaks of the promise also as inherited by others after the Apostles: "For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off⁹."

The second and third Sayings, then, of the great forty days, are of necessity to be regarded in connexion with each other. The Apostolic company was no otherwise delegated to occupy the place of their Lord, than inasmuch as He was to be ever present with them: the Lord was to be no otherwise ordinarily present upon the earth than as present in His body, that is, the Church.

The predictions of these great doctrines contained in the ancient Scriptures are by no means so numerous or direct as those which prophesy the royalty of our Lord Himself. Nor is this surprising. The Prophets are rather occupied with the great vision of the Kingdom, of its might, majesty, and eternity, than with delivering the stages of its progress, or the details of its administration. In the same manner, our Lord's life, His humiliation, death, and ascension, are rare topics of prophecy, in comparison of His greatness and supreme majesty.

1. Predicted in the Old Testament.

Still there are many passages of the Old Testament which bear unquestionable reference to these great Sayings.

⁹ Acts ii. 39.

i. Prophecies of a Temple.

Such are those repeated prophecies of the new temple of God, which was to take the place of the Jewish temple, the corner-stone of which, rejected of the Jewish builders, and a stone of stumbling, and rock of offence to the Jewish nation, was to be set in Zion. These¹ prophecies are numerous; and among them the following is made the more remarkable, by being spoken in the same words by the Prophets Isaiah and Micah: “And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem².” For the Lord Himself hath identified the new temple with His body: “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it again: but he spake of the temple of his body³.”

ii. The Temple itself a type.

These passages, again, show that the Jewish temple itself is to be regarded as a type and significant likeness of the Christian Church of God. But of that temple it was the most signal

¹ Cf. Ps. cxviii. 22. St. Matt. xxii. 42. Acts iv. 11. Rom. ix. 23. Eph. ii. 20. 1 Pet. ii. 6—8.

² Isa. ii. 2—5. Micah iv. 1—3. ³ St. John ii. 19.

characteristic, that the Most High, “who dwelleth not in temples made with hands,” abode in it in the glory of the Shechinah. The Omnipresent God, incomprehensible by place, yet condescended to “pitch his tent” among men, and exhibit a local presence in the midst of His chosen people. The second temple, the emblem of the lower estate to which long continued sin had reduced the people, lost this precious Presence. During its continuance, the Jewish Church was in the position of a sinner, not yet wholly cast out of the presence of God, not yet wholly lost, but living on with reduced privileges, and more stinted blessings ; — capable indeed of restoration and full recovery, but for the present suffering for former sin, in diminished comfort and help. To this temple the Lord Himself came, making ⁴ its glory greater than that of the former one. And then, when the Jews had destroyed, as they supposed, that which was the true temple, that which the earlier temples of wood and stone had only typified and emblemed, namely, His body, He built it again, in the Resurrection from the dead, a glorious and immortal temple, of which He was Himself the Shechinah, Himself the corner-stone, Himself the God of worship, Himself the sacrifice, Himself the glory, Himself, invisibly but most truly, possibly more ⁵ truly even than when

⁴ Hag. ii. 3—9.

⁵ Nec a Patre descendendo abfuerat, nec a discipulis ascen-

visibly, the present source and fountain of all that could be good or holy in it. Of this new and diviner temple, Apostles and Prophets⁶ are stones of the foundation, and every faithful baptized man a lively stone. Christ's preachers edify, the Holy Ghost binds together, the separate stones are instinct with spiritual life, and all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.

iii. A Presence promised.

With this subject those passages also are connected, which (alluding to the Presence of God in the Jewish Temple) promise another Temple, Tent, or Tabernacle of God to be set up on the earth, as a defence and refuge for His people. Such are those sayings in the Psalms; "In the time of my trouble, he shall hide me in his pavilion; in the secret of his tabernacle shall he hide me." "Thou shalt hide them in the secret of thy presence from the pride of man." "Thou art my hiding-place⁷."

iv. God dwelt in His Spirit among the Jews.

There are also passages, which, not making this direct reference to the *temple*, speak of God dwelling in the chosen nation of the Jews in a manner which remarkably illustrates the doctrine of which

dendo discesserat. Tunc igitur, dilectissimi, Filius hominis, Dei Filius, excellentius sacratiusque innotuit, cum in paternæ majestatis gloriam se recepit: et ineffabili modo cœpit esse divinitate præsentior, qui factus est humanitate longinquior.—S. Leo, Serm. de Ascens. Dom. ii.

⁶ Eph. ii. 20. 1 Pet. ii. 5.

⁷ Ps. xxvii. 5; xxxi. 20; xxxii. 7.

we are treating. In the 29th chapter of Exodus, in which the ceremonies of consecrating the Priests, and the order of the continual burnt-offering are delivered, we read, "And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God: and they shall know that I am the Lord their God, that brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them: I am the Lord their God⁸." This passage, compared with Exod. xxv. 8, and Levit. xxvi. 12, might seem to have exclusive reference to the presence of God in His temple. But when we remember how the Prophet Haggai speaks (and that at the very time when the absence of the visible glory made the temple to be 'in the eyes' of the people 'as nothing' in comparison of the house which they remembered in her first glory.) "Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord; and be strong, O Joshua, son of Josedech, the high priest; and be strong, all ye people of the land: for I am with you, saith the Lord of Hosts: according to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not⁹;" we cannot doubt that besides the visible presence of the Divine Shechinah, the Holy Spirit of God did really dwell in the people of the Jews, so as not to be wholly lost even in the darker times of the

⁸ Exod. xxix. 45, 46.

⁹ Hag. ii. 4, 5.

second temple. This is the gift of the Holy Spirit of which the Prophet Isaiah speaks as belonging to the nation in its wanderings in the wilderness: "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. But they rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them. Then he remembered the days of old, Moses, and his people, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of the sea, with the shepherd of his flock? Where is he that put his Holy Spirit within him¹?"

And this gift, like all other things in the history of that typical nation, prefigured the times of the Church, and the precious gift of the Divine indwelling presence. The Prophet Zechariah thus speaks expressly of it: "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo! I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord. And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me unto thee²." And David in still more precise terms, attaches this peculiar blessing of the Divine Presence, exactly as it is afterwards done by the Lord Himself and

¹ Is. lxiii. 9—11; lix. 21.

² Zech. ii. 10, 11.

His Apostles, to the departure of Christ, making it dependent on the Ascension: "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them ³."

Again, among the many predictions of the kingdom, particularly those of the Prophet Isaiah, ^{v. Other predic-tions.} there are many expressions, which read by the light of the fulfilment in the Gospel, declare the sacred but invisible presence of Christ with His Church. Such is that prophecy of the 24th chapter, "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously;" on which passage the best modern Commentator on Isaiah writes thus: "Postquam enim Regnum Christi Jesu ab ipso fundatum esset inter adversarios ejus ⁴ et post ipsum in cœlos evectum, sedem capessivit montem Tsionis et Hierosolymam, sub Regimine Apostolorum, Doctorumque et Rectorum Ecclesiæ, qui, ipsis Apostolis non exceptis, *πρεσβύτεροι* Seniores dicebantur ⁵ a Christo Jesu in consilium suum veluti adsciti, tanquam per quos Ecclesiam suam, quæ Regnum ejus est, ordinaret et gubernaret ⁶," &c. Such, again, are the expressions of many of the later chapters, as of the

³ Ps. lxxviii. 18.

⁴ Ps. cx. 2.

⁵ 1 Pet. v. 1.

⁶ Vitringa in Isaiam, c. xxiv. (vol. ii. p. 24.)

60th⁷: "The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Thy sun shall no more go down; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself: for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended. Thy people also shall be all righteous⁸: they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified⁹." So again, in the 54th chapter¹, "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear, break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord. Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations: spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes. For thou shalt break forth on thy right hand, and on thy left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited. Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed: neither be thou confounded; for thou shalt not be put to shame: for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. For thy Maker is thine husband²; the Lord of Hosts

⁷ Compare with the 21st and 22nd Revelations.

⁸ Cf. 1 St. Pet. ii. 5. 9.

⁹ Is. lx. 19—21.

¹ Is. liv. 1—5.

² Cf. Col. v. 23—32.

is his name; and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall he be called.”

The doctrine thus darkly shadowed in ancient type and prophecy was abundantly stated, in anticipation, by our Lord in the Gospels. The passages to this effect are too numerous to be quoted. It will suffice to notice a few of the most prominent of them.

First, then, we may observe that the greater part of the parables which we have already referred to generally as giving descriptions of the kingdom of Heaven, describe it specifically as a kingdom whose king is in some manner absent from it. This is the case particularly with the parables of the king taking account with his servants³, the labourers in the vineyard⁴, the householder which planted a vineyard and went into a far country⁵, the ten virgins⁶, the man travelling into a far country⁷ who called his own servants and delivered unto them his goods, the lord returning from the wedding⁸, and the parable of the talents. In these, as in other parables, the king is described as already having rightful authority, but as being also about to receive a kingdom; as being absent, but about to return; represented by authorities whom he has left behind him, but apt to be forgotten, and his laws neglected in his

2. Anticipated in the Gospels.

³ St. Matt. xviii.

⁴ Ibid. xx.

⁵ Ibid. xxi. 33.

⁶ Ibid. xxv. 1.

⁷ Ibid. xxv. 14.

⁸ St. Luke xii. 37.

absence. His subjects and servants are described as left for a time to enjoy or trade with what is of right His, and are taught to watch for his sudden return to take account with them, and to punish or reward them according to their faithfulness.

The following passages are among the most express anticipations of the doctrine of those two great Sayings of the Forty Days contained in the Gospels.

St. Matt. x. 1—42. This chapter contains the mission of the twelve Apostles during our Lord's life. It is clear⁹, however, to any person reading it, that the directions and predictions of it are by no means confined to that mission, but belong also, and principally, to the days in which the Apostles should have their fuller mission after the Lord's ascension. In this chapter, then, we read that the substance of the Apostles' preaching was to be the approach of the kingdom, and such other sayings of Christ, as whispered by Him in darkness in their ears, should by them be preached publicly and taught in the light; that they were to be empowered to perform miracles; that their authority should be so high, that any city refusing

⁹ This commission extended beyond the brief period of its first imperfect exercise, as is apparent from many of the directions then given to them by our Lord, directions which would not have any scope or place until the great work of redemption should have been accomplished.—Bp. of Exeter's Ordination Sermon, 1843, p. 1.

their words, refused the words of Christ Himself present in them, and so should be in a worse condition in the judgment than Sodom and Gomorrah; that they should be liable to persecution by the heathen authorities and by their own kinsmen, and to the hatred of all mankind; but that the Holy Spirit of God should speak for them in their defence, and that salvation was assured to them if they endured to the end; that the Son of Man, absent during the main of their preaching, should come before they had gone through the cities of Israel. Here then we plainly read the anticipation of these great doctrines; the absence of Christ visible, the high commission of the Apostles to speak and teach in His place, His presence in them, so that neglect of them was neglect of Him, and the certainty of His return.

St. Matt. xi. 11. "Verily I say unto thee, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater (prophet, St. Luke vii. 28,) than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he¹." It would seem as if these words bore re-

¹ Modern commentators commonly interpret this passage to signify that the least of the *Apostles* (so Dr. Hammond), or the least *minister* (so Bp. Hall, Grotius, &c.), is greater than the Baptist. The principal ancient commentators (S. August., S. Chrysost., Theophylact, &c.) suppose the contrast to be between St. John the Baptist and our Lord, who was younger in years, μικρότερος. But see the excellent commentary of Maldonatus on the verse.

ference to the greatness of the gift which should be shared even by the smallest of those admitted into the kingdom of heaven, that is, the indwelling Presence of the Holy Ghost, and therein the Communion of the Holy Son, present at once and absent in the Church.

St. Matt. xvi. 13—20. In this passage it is plain that a kingdom is foretold, the keys of which ² being of right Christ's, are to be delivered in His absence to the authoritative custody of others.

St. Matt. xviii. 15—20. The first four verses of this passage contain the same doctrine as the place last quoted, namely, that the Church was awhile to be put, in the apparent absence of its real king, under the authoritative government of the Apostles. The next two verses anticipate these doctrines in a very remarkable way. They teach us that the mysterious and invisible Presence of Christ is truly there wherever two or three persons have been duly gathered into the name of Christ, and that the right of praying, and the promise of an answer to prayers follow upon this presence. If the preceding four verses, then, are clear as to the delegation of the Church to occupy the place of Christ, these are not less so as to the continued presence of Him, whose place the Church is to occupy.

² Cf. Isa. xxii. 22. Rev. iii. 7.

St. Matt. xix. 27, 28. The "regeneration" of this passage³ no doubt refers to both those events which are called, in various parts of the New Testament, by the kindred names of "regeneration" and "resurrection:" the one, the regeneration of souls, purchased by the regeneration or resurrection of Christ⁴, and begun at the baptism of the three thousand on the great Pentecost; the other, the regeneration of bodies, also won at the resurrection⁵, to take effect at the return of the Son of Man in judgment⁶. Therefore it declares the delegated royalty of the Apostles, which in the first stage of the kingdom is to be exercised without the visible presence of the True King, but afterwards is to be continued in heaven in the actual sight of Him who shall reign gloriously among His ancients.

St. Luke x. 1—22. In this chapter our Lord sends out His seventy disciples. There are many points in which this commission is similar to that given to the Twelve in the tenth of St. Matthew. It is further observable, that the power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and exemption from the power of the enemy, is promised to them after their return, and therefore plainly belongs to

³ Cf. Tit. iii. 5, the only other place where the word *παλιγγενεσία* occurs in the New Testament.

⁴ Cf. Acts xiii. 33.

⁵ Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 20.

⁶ Cf. 2 Cor. v. 1—10.

something further than their mission by two and two as recorded in the beginning of the chapter.

St. Luke xii. 1—12. In this passage, as in St. Matt. x., the Lord forewarns His Apostles of coming sufferings, of the temptation of denying Him before men (He, no doubt, being absent), and the Holy Ghost inspiring them with whatever was necessary for their defence.

St. Luke xii. 32—40. Here the Lord expressly promises the kingdom to His little flock; but adds, that they are to preserve the attitude of servants waiting for a lord returning from a wedding; for that the Son of Man cometh in an hour that they think not.

In the discourse of the seventeenth of St. Luke, the Lord seems to refer to the same subject; when replying to the Pharisees, which demanded when the kingdom of God should come, He answered and said, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, Lo, there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you."

St. Luke xxii. 24—34. In this signal passage, the Lord, at the very time that He is reproving the Apostles for striving among themselves which of them should be accounted the greatest, adds, "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table, in my kingdom, and sit on

thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." There is hardly any passage in the Scriptures, in which the high and glorious estate of the Church, the personal feebleness and insufficiency of those who are called its pillars, and the true secret of its strength and glory, are more strikingly exhibited than in these verses.

St. John x. 1—18. In these words there is a slight embarrassment in the interpretation, owing to the "shepherd" in the first verses signifying the Apostle, or Apostolical minister of Christ, and in the eleventh verse our Lord Himself. How consistent this apparent obscurity is with the great Sayings of the forty days, will become clear when we reach a subsequent Discourse⁷. At present it is sufficient to observe, that in this passage our Lord speaks of Himself as about to lay down His life for the sheep of which He is the true Shepherd, and as designing to bring other sheep into His one fold; but whilst He is alone the good Shepherd, and the door of the fold, others also are spoken of as being true shepherds, in their degree, of those sheep for whom the good Shepherd has laid down His life, as admitted by the porter, and as listened to by the sheep, whom they call by their names, and who know their voice.

In the twelfth chapter of St. John, our Lord,

⁷ Cf. p. 138.

in answer to Andrew and Philip, used these words: "The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit;" which solemn saying signifies, as we well know, that He was Himself about to die, but that by dying, and being buried, He should give life to many others, as the single corn sown produces much fruit in the field.

As we draw towards the close of the Gospel of St. John, the discourses of our Lord begin to bear more and more decidedly and constantly upon the subjects of these great Sayings; His own approaching departure, the delegation of the Apostles to occupy His place, and His own mysterious presence with them in all the world. "Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of the world unto the Father; and having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end."

In the thirteenth chapter He speaks of His own going away, and of the disciples being known as His by their love to one another, and says solemnly, as often before, that He will still be with them. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me."

With the fourteenth chapter the same subjects

begin to occupy the whole discourse. He declares that He is going away; but to prepare a place for them; that He will return again, and take them to Himself. In answer to Thomas, He says, that "He is the way, the truth, and the life," so that none can come to the Father but by Him; and in answer to Philip, that whosoever hath seen Him hath seen the Father. And having thus declared His own greatness, His love for them, His approaching departure, and His return, He goes on to promise the Comforter, (that Holy Ghost whose very title, ἄλλον παράκλητον, cf. I John iii. 1, reminds us of His identity of operation with Himself,) whom they should "know, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." He then adds, in terms most remarkable as bearing on our present subject, "I will not leave you orphans; I will come unto you: yet a little while and the world seeth me no more, but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him." Herein He promises to be present with His Apostles even in His apparent absence; present invisibly indeed to the world, but to themselves so assuredly and unequivocally, that they might be said to *see* Him; present, not only to their assurance, as if to their

sight, but to give them life, a life like His own life. *At that day*, (that is, in that great day of the Regeneration, that great day of the Church, dawning at the Resurrection, reaching its noon at the Ascension, and then shedding perpetual rains of grace, from the early rain of the great Pentecost to the latter rain of the latest ages of the world,) they should know that His presence with themselves was after the manner of His presence and union with the Father. On the inquiry of Judas, not Iscariot, as to the manner of His manifesting Himself to the Church and not to the world, He further declares the indwelling of the Father and the Son, by the Holy Ghost, in those who love Him, and keep His words; and speaking as expressly as possible of a state of things shortly to exist, but hitherto not existing, adds, "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you." "And now I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye might believe."

The fifteenth chapter opens with what is, perhaps, the clearest exposition of the Church, its condition of union with Christ, and strength and faculty of good works depending upon that union, which is to be found in Holy Scripture. The Lord then proceeds to speak of the Apostles' commission, their privilege of prayer, their duty of love, their prospect of persecution, and the presence of the Comforter with them, by whose in-

spiration they should offer to the world their testimony of Himself.

In the sixteenth chapter He enlarges on these solemn subjects still more fully. He warns them of their approaching sufferings, and adds: "These things have I told you, that when the time comes, ye may remember that I told you of them. And these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you. But now I go away to him that sent me." In the seventh verse He says, more mysteriously and solemnly than before, that the Presence thus often promised to them could not take place until He had Himself gone away from them; and after explaining the office of the Holy Spirit as the Teacher of the Church, adds of His own mysterious Presence: "A little while and ye shall not see me; and again a little while and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father." And, "Ye now therefore have sorrow: but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." Then, repeating more strongly than before the promise of the privilege of prayer which they were to obtain *in that day*, He adds, speaking plainly and in no proverb, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go unto the Father."

In the seventeenth chapter, the holy Lord offers a sacred prayer to the Father for those blessings which have been the subject of the previous dis-

course. He speaks of His own hour of glorification as come. He speaks of a power given to Him over all flesh, whereby He should give life, the life of knowing the only true God, and Jesus Christ sent by Him, to all whom God had given Him. He speaks of God's Name manifested to those chosen men, for whom He prays, and in whom He desires to be glorified. He is Himself no more in the world, but they are in the world. He prays for them that they may be one; and He speaks these words in the world, that they may have His joy, the joy of His love, help, and presence, fulfilled, that is, entirely possessed, in themselves. As He is Himself sent by the Father into the world, so has He sent them. And then He prays "for them also which shall believe on him through their word;" that as is the union between the Father and the Son, so may be the unity of the Church through all succeeding times. He speaks of their unity, as being a sign to the world of His mission. He speaks of having given them His glory, with a view to their unity; and prays that they (proceeding thus from glory to glory, from the glory of the Church militant to the glory of the Church triumphant) may be with Him where He is, and behold His glory which the Father has given Him.

Thus this solemn discourse, the last and longest held by our Lord upon the earth, appears to be entirely a sacred anticipation of these two great

Sayings of the Forty Days. In it our holy Lord repeatedly warns His Apostles of His own departure, and of His presence even after His departure: a presence so true, that they might be said to see Him; a presence imparting life and glory. The manner of this presence should be the coming of the other Comforter; but this could not be until He in the flesh had departed. He speaks of His Apostles as sent, even as He was Himself sent by the Father, into the world, to be instructed, inspired, comforted by the Holy Ghost: to succeed to His own glory, to Himself no more in the world, to teach others to believe: to be united with each other, and with Himself, even as He is one with the Father.

The great truths, then, which these various sayings of the holy Lord, uttered during the time of His ministry, had thus foreshown and anticipated, were at last solemnly promulgated, and the powers belonging to them imparted, when after the Resurrection from the dead, now clothed in His immortal and glorious Royalty, He said to the company of the Apostles, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you;" "and behold, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Herein He gave to the Church of the Apostles the kingdom promised in St. Luke xii. 32, xxii. 29; gave to it His own glory, as declared in St. John xvii. 22, the similar commission to that which He had Himself received of the

Father, as promised in the eighteenth verse of the same chapter; appointed thrones of judgment over the tribes of Israel, according to St. Luke xxii. 30. St. Matt. xix. 28; left behind Him the keys of His kingdom for binding and loosing, according to St. Matt. xvi. 16; xviii. 18. Again, herein He authoritatively declared that presence of Himself by the Holy Ghost, never to be withdrawn from the Church, which in St. Matt. xviii. 20, He had promised to belong to two or three duly gathered in His name; which He had often declared ⁸ would render the neglect of His teachers, or His poor and afflicted people, or His children, the neglect of Himself; which would make His people to be fruit-bearing branches in Himself, the Vine ⁹, and cause the kingdom (the kingdom of His glory, set up in the Regeneration ¹) to be within them, according to St. Luke xvii. 21, which would supply them with words for their defence against persecuting kings ², with all truth ³, all instruction, all memory of Christ's words, all comfort, and all peace ⁴.

3. Recognized in the Epistles.

When we turn to the Apostolical Epistles, in order to learn from them in what manner the in-

⁸ St. Matt. x. 40; xviii. 5; xxv. 40. St. Luke ix. 48; x. 16. St. John xiii. 20.

⁹ St. John xv. 1.

¹ St. Matt. xix. 28.

² St. Luke xii. 12; xxi. 15. St. Matt. x. 19. St. Mark xiii. 11.

³ St. John xvi. 13.

⁴ Ibid. xiv. 18. 26, 27.

spired Apostles, to whom these great Sayings were spoken, understood and acted upon them, and thence to derive the true inspired commentary upon them, we find a certain number of clear unequivocal passages, in which the doctrines of the delegation of the Church to occupy the Lord's place upon the earth, and His perpetual Presence even during the time of His apparent absence, are plainly taught. But more forcible by far than any of these passages, is the manner in which these doctrines are continually assumed as being the very principles of the condition of Christ's Church upon the earth; principles not needing express statement (because involved in every claim she made, and in the very fact of her taking the place she took upon the earth), but continually taken for granted, alluded to, and argued on; principles all the more fully testified to in these writings by being so rarely stated in an express and dogmatic way. This indirectness of statement makes it difficult to exhibit the force of the Apostolic confirmation of these doctrines by means of quotation; for not only are the separate passages, in which the doctrines are stated in so many words, rare, and, as it were, casual, but by adducing these alone, or chiefly, we are apt to lose sight of the much greater mass of indirect and less producible evidence which is to be found in the whole structure of these writings, and the

position of the Church in the world as assumed in them.

The nature of this indirect evidence may be illustrated from a hasty survey of one or two Epistles.

i. In the structure of the Epistle to the Romans.

For example, the Epistle to the Romans hardly contains a single passage capable of being quoted with much effect in this argument. Nevertheless, any person opening that Epistle, and attempting to gather from it the state and claims of the Church, will readily see how much these doctrines are assumed, and made, as it were, the basis of argument throughout it.

In the opening of that Epistle, St. Paul speaks of himself as an Apostle, having received grace and apostleship from God, in order to bring all nations to the obedience of the faith of Christ, who by the Resurrection has been declared to be the Son of God with power. He longs to see them, that he may impart to them some spiritual gift; he is debtor to Greeks and to barbarians, to preach to them the Gospel of Christ. He warns them of the day of wrath, the revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds. He preaches a righteousness, promised to Abraham, purchased by Christ, to be given to faith; of which he is an authorized preacher and apostle; in the possession of which righteousness men may exult and be hopeful in

tribulations, conscious of the Holy Ghost given unto them. He argues, that if God gave Christ to die for men while ungodly, much more, having received this reconciliation, they will be saved by His Divine life, begun in the Resurrection. He urges with much force, that in baptism they have all been baptized into His death ⁴, and that they are now partakers of His life, alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord ⁵, and therefore bound to be holy before Him. To those who are in this state, "to them which are in Christ Jesus," there is no condemnation. They are taken out of the world; they "are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in them." "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life, because of righteousness." This indwelling Spirit (whereby Christ also is indwelling) mortifies the deeds of the body, gives filial love, and the assurance of sons, hope, patience, and the gift of prayer.

In this passage, which, extending over the first eight chapters, contains the first and main argument of the Epistle, the Church, now deprived of the visible presence of the Lord, is represented as waiting for His return; meanwhile, Apostles have the duty and burthen of preaching the faith, and

⁴ Cf. Col. ii. 12, 20.

⁵ Cf. Col. iii. 1. St. John v. 26.

bringing the nations into it, and of imparting spiritual gifts: persons admitted into their company by baptism, are admitted into a mysterious participation in the death and life of Christ; into His death by being buried in the water of baptism, and into His life by being raised out of it: they are in Christ, by having the gift of the Spirit.

The same doctrines are taught in the later chapters. The members of the Church "being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." "Christ has received them to the glory of God." St. Paul is "the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God;" and "Christ hath wrought" "mighty signs and wonders" by him, "by the power of the Spirit of God, to make the Gentiles obedient."

ii. Of the Epistle to the Colossians.

In the Epistle to the Colossians also, these doctrines are very fully taught, so as to form the entire basis and groundwork of the Apostle's argument.

St. Paul begins by acknowledging the faith of the Colossians, their love and hope, telling them how he prays for their perfection, and continual increase of strength; and thanks God for having made them and him "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light⁶;" "who hath

⁶ Cf. Acts xxvi. 18.

delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son," "who is the head of the body, the Church." He tells them how Christ hath reconciled them in the body of His flesh through death, and that he himself rejoices to suffer, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in his flesh, for His body's sake, which is the Church; and he professes to preach, and warn, and teach every man, in order to present every man perfect in Christ Jesus, according to His working, working mightily in him.

Then, warning them of the dangers of false philosophy, he teaches them that in Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (*πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς*), and that they in like manner are complete (fully filled) in Him⁷ (*ἔστε πεπληρωμένοι*); that in Him they are spiritually circumcised, and by baptism made partakers of His death and resurrection from the dead. Being then dead, he exhorts them to emancipate themselves from the thralldom of ordinances; and being alive, risen with Christ, their life hid with Christ in God, and Christ their life, he urges them to have their hearts set and fixed on heaven. He urges them to holiness on the ground that Christ is "all and in all," and reminds them that they are called to "the peace of God" "in one body."

⁷ Cf. St. John xvii.

Thus, in this Epistle too, we find it very fully taught, that as God is in Christ, so Christ, absent as He is in the flesh, is in His Church; so that men baptized therein are already admitted to share His Divine life. The Apostle speaks of the Church as a single body, the inheritance of saints, divinely alive with the presence of Christ, and of himself in his zealous preaching as working in the power of Christ, and in his sufferings as bearing part of that which is behind of the sufferings of Christ.

It is not possible that the great doctrines of the sacred delegation of the Church, and the Divine invisible presence of her Lord, could be more fully or emphatically taught than they are by being thus made the basis, groundwork, and substance of an entire Epistle.

iii. In many separate passages.

But besides this universal prevalence of these doctrines in the framework and texture of the Apostolical Epistles, there are also separate passages in which they are strongly and distinctly taught.

Such are those which speak of the Church as the body of Christ, and of separate Christians as the members of that body, Christ Himself, in His Holy Spirit, being the life, and bond of union in them all⁸; the former of which passages is the more remarkable, because in it "Christ⁹," is the

⁸ 1 Cor. xii. 12—30. Eph. iv. 4—16.

⁹ Ergo ipse Dominus Jesus Christus caput et corpus: voluit

name, not of the Head of the body only, but of the whole body.

Such again are those passages in which separate Christians are spoken of as temples of the Holy Ghost, whilst Christians, when together, are said to be the temple of Christ¹.

The following are single passages of importance to the same effect:—

Gal. iii. In this remarkable chapter St. Paul is occupied in proving to the Galatians that the

enim loqui in nobis, qui dignatus est mori pro nobis: membra sua nos fecit,—Apostolus dicit, ut suppleam quæ desunt pressurarum Christi, in carne meâ.—Patitur, inquit, adhuc Christus pressuram, non in carne suâ in quâ ascendit in cœlum, sed in carne meâ quæ adhuc laborat in terrâ. Christus, inquit, pressuram patitur in carne meâ: Vivo enim non jam ego, vivit verò in me Christus. Nisi enim Christus et in membris suis, hoc est, fidelibus suis pressuram ipse pateretur, Saulus in terrâ Christum in cœlo sedentem non persequeretur. Denique apertè hoc exponens quodam loco: Sicut enim corpus unum est, inquit, et membra multa habet, omnia autem membra corporis, cùm sint multa, unum est corpus; ita et Christus. Non ait, Ita et Christus, et corpus; sed, Corpus unum multa membra, ita et Christus. Totum ergo Christus. Et quia totum Christus, ideo caput de cœlo, Saule, inquit, Saule, quid me persequeris? Tenete hoc, et fixum omnino commendate memoriæ, ut agnoscatis Christum caput et corpus, eundemque Christum Verbum Dei unigenitum, æqualem Patri; et inde videatis quantâ gratiâ pertingatis ad Deum, ut ipse voluerit esse nobiscum unus, qui est cum Patre unus.—S. Augustin. Enarr. in Psalm. cxlii. (vol. iv. p. 1590.)

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 19; iii. 16. Cf. 2 Cor. vi. 16. Eph. ii. 21, 22. Heb. iii. 16. 1 St. Pct. ii. 5.

hope of Christians is all derived from the great evangelical promise made to the patriarch Abraham; and that therefore, as Abraham won the promise by faith, so faith is still the condition on which those who claim under his promise will be accepted of God. This, I say, is the main object and drift of the argument of the chapter; but the manner in which the Apostle conducts the argument furnishes a remarkable confirmation of the doctrine which we are now considering. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Thus far then we learn that the promise made to Abraham was to be inherited by one, and one only, that is Christ. Not all Abraham's sons were inheritors. "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father;" "neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children¹;" but one, and one only, was designated to be the heir of the promise.

The argument, after some parenthetical matters, thus continues at verse 27. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ:—for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Christ, then, we are taught, comprises His baptized. He inherits as the sole heir of the promise; but every baptized

¹ St. Matt. iii. 9. Rom. ix. 7.

person having in his baptism "put on Christ," inherits in Christ. As the vine comprises its branches, the body its members, so Christ comprises His baptized. Therefore all Christians are in Christ, sacredly present in them, though absent in the flesh. Therefore in Christ they are all one. Being one in Christ, they are jointly the one heir of Abraham; jointly, in Him, the visible representative of Him; jointly, in Him, they are even called by the sacred Name itself, Christ.

One other passage may be quoted to the same effect:—

1 St. Peter ii. 4—10. Here it is plain that Christians altogether are spoken of as a single body, a temple of Christ, built up with separate spiritual stones, but altogether forming one Divine edifice, replete with the presence of their Lord, in whose acceptableness they may offer acceptable sacrifice, and show forth to the world the praises of Him who hath called them.

These passages may be taken as specimens of the teaching of the Apostles after the Resurrection, in respect of these two great Sayings of the Forty Days. They are not by any means all, they can hardly be called more than some of the principal places in which the same doctrines occur, either distinctly stated, or still more forcibly assumed. But they suffice to show that which it is our present purpose to illustrate, namely, that throughout the later Scriptures, the doctrines of the

Lord's absence in the flesh, but presence in the Spirit, and the consequent delegation of the Church to be as Himself upon the earth, instinct with His life, partaking of His Resurrection, full of His grace, His power in her authority, His holiness in her sanctification, His sufferings in her sufferings, His word in her teaching, are every where supposed and taught. If the Lord touched the heart of those whom He would save, they were "added to the Church²." If the condition of privilege, or blessing of Christians, were ever spoken of, it was as they were "in Christ." It was³ matter of high rejoicing and triumph to be "in Christ." Christians while alive are "in Christ"⁴ "who is their life;" when dead, they sleep "in Jesus," and "them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him⁵." "In Christ," Christians are already partakers⁶ of glory. "In Christ" they are risen from the dead⁷; they sit with Him in heavenly places, their citizenship⁸ is in heaven; they are "come unto mount Zion⁹, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the

² Acts ii. 47.³ 2 Cor. ii. 14. Phil. ii. 1; iv. 4.⁴ Col. iii. 4.⁵ 1 Thess. iv. 14.

⁶ Cf. Col. i. 27. 2 Cor. iii. 8. 18; iv. 4. Rom. viii. 30, on which last passage St. Chrysostom writes, *ἐδικαίωσε διὰ τῆς τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας—ἐδόξασε διὰ τῆς χάριτος, διὰ τῆς νόθεσις*.—Hom. in Rom. So too Theophylact.

⁷ Col. iii. 1. Eph. ii. 6.⁸ Phil. iii. 20.⁹ Heb. xii. 22.

general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in Heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.”

There is another Saying of the great Forty Days which properly belongs to this part of the subject, as attaching the peculiar blessing of the Presence of Christ in His Church to His Ascension in the flesh. “Jesus saith unto Mary, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father¹.”

Whatever may be the true explanation to be given of the difference made by our Lord between Mary, as stated in this passage, and St. Thomas, the Apostles, and the women, coming from the sepulchre,—for Mary was forbidden to touch the Lord, while the others were either permitted² or commanded to do so,—thus much seems clear and undeniable, that the touching which Mary desired might not be till the Ascension. And thus far interpreters, both ancient and modern, would seem to be agreed. Whether the loving Mary was more honoured and privileged in the refusal (as would seem to be the opinion of S. Augustine), or less so (according to the interpretation of S. Cyril³

IV. No touching till after the Ascension.

¹ St. John xx. 17.

² St. Matt. xxviii. 9. St. John xx. 27. Cf. 1 St. John i. 1.

³ S. Cyril. Alex. Comm. in Joan. Evang. lib. xii. (vol. iv. p. 1084. ed. Auber.)

of Alexandria), than the others in the permission which they received, may perhaps be doubtful; but at least it is clear, that her peculiar touch of loving faith could not take place *yet*; that that particular nearness of Christ to His people here represented in the phrase of touching Him, needed, for some mysterious reason, His Ascension in the flesh to be passed first, before it could take place.

Herein, then, is the doctrine, which, detached ⁴ from the particular case and character of Mary, who herein stood in the place of the Church, seems to fill up the great doctrine of Christ's Presence in the Church. It could not be until, in the flesh, He had ascended to the Father.

How immediately, upon reading this mysterious saying, we are reminded of those dark words uttered in our Lord's last discourse! "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you ⁵." It is as though He had said to Mary, "Touch me not, for I am not yet gone away from you; but when I go

⁴ Prorsus quod audivit Maria, audiat Ecclesia cujus figuram Maria gerebat.—Tangamus omnes si credamus.—Quando ergo credunt, Maria tangit Christum. S. Aug. Serm. in dieb. Pasch. cexlv.

⁵ St. John xvi. 7.

away, I will send the Comforter to you, and then thou shalt touch me.”

And such, there is no doubt, is the general import of the doctrine conveyed in this passage. That doctrine had been already sufficiently indicated both by ancient prophecy and evangelical anticipation: by ancient prophecy, when, as already quoted, David exclaimed, “Thou art gone up on high, thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men, yea, even for thine enemies, that the Lord God might dwell among them⁶ ;” showing that it was upon the Lord’s “going up on high,” ascending, that is, into heaven, that the gift of the Presence of the Lord God in the Church should depend; by evangelical anticipation, when the Evangelist, commenting upon our Lord’s words spoken at the Feast of Tabernacles, says, “This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified⁷ .”

1. Predicted in the Old Testament.

2. Anticipated in the Gospels.

It is true that this passage, like the one above quoted from the sixteenth of St. John, speaks, in terms, of the coming of the Holy Ghost, and not of the Presence of the Lord Himself as dependent upon the Ascension.

But the mysterious question which here opens upon us it is impossible to fathom; how, that is,

⁶ Ps. lxxviii. 18.

⁷ St. John vii. 39.

the sacred local Presences, if I may venture to speak so, of the Second and Third Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity are dependent, and how independent of one another. Suffice it to say, that the Sacred Presence of Christ is by the Holy Spirit, so that if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His⁸. Suffice it to say, that the Lord Himself, in the great discourse in St. John, exhibits, but does not explain, the same difficulty; for He says, not only that unless He departs, the Comforter will not come to the Church, but also that He will not leave⁹ them orphans, but will come Himself to them; and that if any man love Him, the Father will love him, and the Father and the Son will come to him, and make their abode with him.

Thus much only (as has been indicated in the earlier part of this discourse) the Scriptures seem to unfold respecting these two sacred Presences: that the Holy Ghost dwells in the hearts of separate baptized Christians, that Christ dwells in the community of the Church; that the bodies of Christians are, one by one, temples of the Holy Ghost, but that all together are the temple of Christ; that each Christian is a separate stone, instinct with the Holy Spirit, but that all together make up Christ's temple; that where several have been duly gathered into the Sacred Name (not

⁸ Rom. viii. 9.⁹ St. John xvi. 7; xiv. 18.

without the water and the renewing of the Holy Ghost), there is Christ in the midst of them.

This doctrine of the necessity of the Ascension of Christ in the flesh, as preparatory to the full imparting to mankind of the precious blessings of His Presence in the Church, is to be found taught, more or less obscurely, in other parts of the New Testament. For instance, in the discourse of the sixteenth of St. John, and in immediate connexion with the remarkable saying lately quoted of the necessity of His own departure in order that the Holy Spirit might come to the Church, He uses these striking and somewhat obscure words respecting the office of the Holy Spirit as the Teacher of the world. "And when he is come, he will reprove (ἐλέγξει) the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not in me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged¹." Here are plainly three doctrines, and three reasons for them. The doctrines, if they stood alone, would not seem to be difficult to understand; it is the reasons which are attached to them which give them their apparent difficulty.

It seems hardly possible to doubt that the three doctrines, Sin, Righteousness, and Judgment, are consecutive, and connected with one

¹ St. John xvi. 8—11.

another. However easy or difficult it may prove to interpret the reasons of the Holy Ghost, the three doctrines themselves, when regarded alone, seem to form so plain and intelligible a series as to require to be interpreted connectedly. When so regarded, they appear to comprise the history of man from his fall to his glory. Sin, then, in this view, is human sin, the sin of mankind; righteousness is the state or condition of being restored out of sin, in Christ; judgment is the final retribution, in which God will reward those who, in Christ, obey His law, and punish those who are impenitent. This, I say, would seem to be the natural manner, according to the usual mode of expression in the Holy Scriptures, of interpreting the three subjects of Sin, Righteousness, and Judgment, when found occurring in series. Nor should we doubt that this was the true and almost necessary interpretation of them, unless some other difficulty arose to stand in the way of it.

In like manner to these three, which are the doctrines of the Holy Spirit, seem to answer the three Reasons of the Spirit. These three Reasons appear to be, the visible manifestation of Christ in the flesh, the mysterious manifestation of Christ to His Church in the Spirit, and His resurrection from the dead. "Because they believe not in Christ;" this can hardly mean any thing else than that the world *saw* Christ, and did not believe

Him. It does not seem to be any wresting of the words to refer them to His coming in the flesh. "Because I go to the Father, and ye see me no more;" these words, no doubt, refer to His absence, and inasmuch as His absence is also His presence, the very token and symbol of His mysterious presence, then to His mysterious presence also. "Because the prince of this world is judged." The prince of the world is, no doubt, judged, and cast out in the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ².

The Holy Ghost, then, should convince mankind of its sin; and His great and comprehensive proof of sin should be, that they believe not in Christ. This is precisely what we are taught in other places. "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloke for their sin³." "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil⁴." Thus sin should be the first great topic of the Holy Spirit's teaching of the world;—sin, proved, exhibited, and completed in the unbelief with which the Lord was received in His first,

² Cf. St. John xii. 31, 32.

³ Ibid. xv. 22.

⁴ Ibid. iii. 18, 19.

that is, His earthly and visible, manifestation in the flesh amongst men.

The second topic, if we may so speak, of the Holy Ghost, should be Righteousness, human righteousness in Christ, the forgiven and beloved condition of men restored in Christ; and this doctrine He should teach on the ground of Christ's having gone to the Father, and His disciples seeing Him no more. The departure of Christ in the flesh should be the proof and evidence of human righteousness. Connecting this saying, then, with the immediately preceding words, "that it was expedient for them that he should go away, for if he went not away, the Comforter would not come to them," we perceive how and why His departure in the flesh became the proof and evidence of human righteousness. On His departure depended the coming of the Holy Ghost. On His departure depended the receiving and the giving of those good gifts of the Holy Ghost to man, whereby the Lord God should dwell in the Church. On His departure depended His mysterious presence¹. And in that mysterious presence by the Holy Ghost, men placed "in

¹ Compare particularly the 10th and 16th verses of this chapter, "because I go to the Father and ye see me no more;" "And ye shall see me, because I go to the Father." Thus because He went to His Father, they should both see Him, and not see Him. They should not see Him in the flesh, but they should see Him in the Spirit.

Christ," members of the vital Body, grafts of the living Vine, having faith in Him whom they believe though they see Him not, should in Him, who is their righteousness, be righteous.

The third topic of the Holy Ghost as Teacher of the world, should be Judgment, Judgment to come; the righteous and final doom of the just and unjust; and of this doctrine the full and unanswerable proof should be the victory over the devil, achieved in the death and resurrection of Christ. For the prince of this world was judged or condemned when Christ, by raising Himself from the dead, "spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them⁵;" and this victory over the evil spirits, thus won in the resurrection, is the proof which the Holy Ghost should give of judgment to come. This is entirely correspondent with the words of St. Paul at Athens: "He hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead⁶."

Exactly accordant with the doctrine of this passage is that difficult verse of the Epistle to the Romans, "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification⁷." Here the expressions "was delivered," and "was raised

⁵ Col. ii. 15.⁶ Acts xvii. 31.⁷ Rom. iv. 25.

again," seem to be intended to comprise all the last great acts of the Lord in a short summary, and to be equivalent to "His humiliation," and "His exaltation." So that the passage altogether may be understood as attributing to the humiliation of Christ, the bearing of the sins of men, according to numberless other passages of Holy Writ; and to the exaltation of Christ, that justification or righteousness of man which in the former passage was attributed specifically to His departure.

i. The
touch of
Faith.

Whereinsoever then man may touch Christ, present mysteriously and ineffably by the Spirit in His Church, the Ascension needed to be past first before he could touch Him really. Is it by faith^s, the faith which believes without seeing,

^s *Quid est ergo, Noli me tangere? Tactus fidem significat. Tangendo enim acceditur ad eum qui tangitur. Mulierem illam videte quæ fluxum sanguinis patiebatur. Dixit in corde suo, Sanabor si tetigero fimbriam vestimenti ejus: accessit, et tetigit, sanata est. Quid est, accessit et tetigit? Propinquavit et credidit.—S. August. Serm. cexliv. (vol. v. p. 1018.)*

Fide tangimus Christum: et melius est manu non tangere, et fide tangere, quam manu palpare, et fide non tangere. Non magnum fuit manu Christum tangere. Judæi tetigerunt quando comprehenderunt, tetigerunt quando ligaverunt, tetigerunt quando suspenderunt: tetigerunt, et malè tangendo, quod tetigerunt perdiderunt. Tangendo fide, O Ecclesia Catholica, fides te salvam fecit. Tu tantum fide tange, id est, fideliter accede, et firmiter crede. Si Christum tantummodo hominem putaveris in terrâ, tetigisti. Si Christum Deum credideris æqualem Patri, tunc tetigisti quando ascendit ad

which realizes things hoped for, and gives evidence to things not seen? Faith hath indeed a blessed faculty of touch, an inward, secret, heart touch; as we learn from that remarkable narrative, which three of the evangelists record, of the miracle performed on the way to the house of Jairus⁹. The multitude thronged upon Christ, and pressed Him, but only one poor sick woman touched Him. The rest seemed to touch Him, they surrounded, crowded, held Him; but theirs was outward, bodily, untrue touching. The woman only touched in faith,—that touch which would reach to heaven; and so He turned and said, to the surprise of the Apostles who saw the throng and press, “Somebody hath touched me!” So the Church, typified in the faithful woman, touches her ascended Lord, touches in faith; believes and touches; touches and receives the blessing of the Divine touch, the cleansing, the restoration, the life, the making whole of whatever disease she laboured¹ with.

Is it by love²? Mary Magdalene loved much, ii. The touch of Love.

Patrem.—S. August. Serm. cexlviii. In dieb. Pasch. (vol. v. p. 1023.) S. Leo, Serm. de Asc. Dom. ii. (p. 295, vol. i.)

⁹ St. Luke viii. 43. St. Matt. ix. 20. St. Mark v. 30.

¹ St. Luke vii. 47.

² Post Resurrectionem, et devictæ gloriæ mortis,—fidelis feminae, ex dilectione, non ex curiositate, nec ex incredulitate Thomæ tangere eum aggressa, Ne, inquit, contigeris Me, &c. —Tertull. adv. Praxeam, p. 515.

and she might not touch Him unascended. St. Thomas believed not, and he, for his own conviction, and that of mankind, was bid to reach hither his finger and behold his Lord's hands, and to reach hither his hand, and thrust it into His side³: the Apostles, too, who were terrified and affrighted, and thought that they had seen a spirit⁴, were desired to handle Him and see, for that a spirit hath not flesh and bones as they saw Him have: these, for various purposes of mercy and compassion, might touch, but the touch of a true loving heart might not be while He remained in the flesh. And so the Church, the Spouse of Christ, loveth Him much. Not having seen, she loveth; and therein being made partaker of the true touch of her Divine Lord, rejoiceth with joy unspeakable, and full of glory.

But, as has been observed above, the blessed Presence of Christ is not so much an individual as a collective privilege: it belongs not so properly to separate Christians as to the Church; it adheres not so peculiarly, if one may so speak, to persons as to communities; it is promised not to single hearts, or isolated acts of worship, but to exercises of joint prayer, to duly gathered congregations, to offices of communion and united devotion.

And amongst these, most eminently and peculiarly to the Holy Communion of the Body and

iii. The touch of the holy Eucharist.

³ St. John xx. 27.

⁴ St. Luke xxiv. 39.

Blood of Christ. In that Divine feast, the Body and Blood ⁵ of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in communion. In no other ordinance is the blessed Presence so nigh, so assured, and so awful. And it is most remarkable, that among the (not many) passages which, in the whole Scriptures, attach the mysterious Presence of Christ in His Church to the Ascension, there is one, and that among the most signal of them, which particularly combines the sacred Presence in the Eucharist with the same event. For when the disciples, after the great Communion discourse recorded in the sixth of St. John, said, “This is a hard saying: who can hear

⁵ Christ Himself touched upon this point (in the sixth chapter, at the 62nd verse) when at Capernaum they stumbled at the speech of eating His flesh. “What,” saith He, “find you this strange now? How will you find it then, when you shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before? How, then? and yet, then you must eat, or else there is no life in you.” So it is a plain item to her, that there may be a sensual touching of Him here; but that is not it: not the right; it avails little. It was her error, this: she was all for the *corporeal presence*; for the *touch* with the fingers. So were His *disciples*, all of them too much addicted to it, from which they were now to be weaned; that if they had before known Christ, or touched Him after the flesh, yet now from henceforth they were to do so no more, but to learn a new *touch*, to *touch* Him, being now *ascended*. Such a *touching* there is, or else His reason holds not; and best *touching* Him so, better far than this of hers, she was so eager on.—Bishop Andrewes, Sermon. xv. of the Resurrection (apud finem).

it? When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you? If, then, ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life ⁶.” Herein He points directly to the Ascension, as “that day” in which they should no longer find the saying hard in which they had been taught the vital need of eating His flesh, and drinking His blood. Thus even the spiritual food of the Body and Blood of Christ, the very aliment of the union which is betwixt Christ and His Church, waited for the ascension of the flesh, before it was fully offered to the sacred touch of the faithful in communion. Then, indeed, the Church should touch; touch and be touched; touch the true body and blood of her ascended Lord, to strengthen her indwelling grace, to confirm her unity in the Lord, to be assured of grace and good-will of God, to receive cleansing, holiness, and immortality both of body and soul. The feast, indeed, was instituted, and eleven had partaken of it, while the Sacrifice ⁷ was in the midst;

⁶ St. John vi. 60—63.

⁷ τῇ πέμπτῃ ἑσπέρας ἐποίησε τὸ δεῖπνον ὁ Κύριος, καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἔλεγε, Λάβετε, φάγετε τὸ σῶμά μου· ὥστε ἐπεὶ ἔξουσίαν ἔχει ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ θεῖναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, ἔηλον ὅτι ἐκ τότε ἀπέσφαξεν ἑαυτὸν, ἀφ’ οὗ διείδον τοῖς οικείοις μαθηταῖς

but thenceforth He drank ^s no more of that fruit of the vine, till He drank it new with them in His Father's kingdom.

τὸ σῶμα· οὐδέεις γὰρ ἐσθίει τι, εἰὰν μὴ πρότερον ἐσφαγμένον εἴη.—Theophylact. Comm. in S. Matt. c. xxviii.

^s St. Matt. xxvi. 39.

DISCOURSE III.

Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος καὶ φρόνιμος, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ δίδόναι ἐν καιρῷ τὸ σιτομέτριον; Luke xii. 42.

Some of
the Sayings
acknow-
ledge go-
vernors in
the Church.

THE Sayings of our Lord which we have hitherto considered, fulfilling many predictions and promises of former times, first announced His own eternal Royalty, and then put His Church, represented in the Apostles, into His own place upon the earth. With her, and in her, He promised to be ever present; and the completion of this holy delegation by the fulfilment of His promised presence, was to take place when He had ascended in the flesh to heaven.

Thus far the sacred commission, office, and delegation, seem to have been entrusted to the whole Church as one body in Christ. All the faithful, baptized into one body, and having drunk of one Spirit, constitute that single Vine, that single Spouse, that single Church, which altogether, each member discharging its own separate duty and ministry, is sent into the world by

Christ, even as He was sent by the Father. As one in Christ, the Church is the heir of Abraham's promise. As one in Christ, she is royal, priestly, and prophetic. As one, she has the indwelling Presence, the truth, the grace, the hope, and the salvation. As one, she is the Temple of the living God¹, from within which sacred enclosure, "what prayer or supplication soever be made by any man, or by all his people, God will hear in heaven his dwelling place, and forgive, and do, and give to every man according to his ways²."

But though in the Apostles the whole Church was thus completely represented in all its estates and degrees, so that the humblest of lay Christians, in his own single person, truly and unquestionably inherits many of the great blessings and privileges pronounced upon the Apostolic Company alone, we nevertheless perceive, on a very cursory survey of the remaining Sayings of the great Forty Days, that some of them are spoken to the Apostles as governors, teachers, pastors of the Church, and belong to them and their successors in these capacities to the end of the world.

This distinction is fully recognized in the anticipatory discourses of Christ which have been already noticed. In the twelfth chapter of St. Luke, of which we have already cited the passage

¹ 2 Cor. vi. 16.

² 1 Kings viii. 38, 39.

from ver. 32 to ver. 40, as containing a very signal promise of the kingdom to the Church, St. Peter is recorded to have asked, exactly to our present point, “ Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even unto all ³ ?” Our Lord, in His reply, not denying, perhaps affirming, the application of His recently uttered words “ unto all,” that is, to the whole Church, thus confirms the particular application of them to the Apostles themselves. “ Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season ? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath. But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming ; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink and to be drunken ; the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.” Stewards, therefore, there are, who are rulers over God’s household, having authority over their fellow-servants, appointed to give them their respective portions of “ meat in due season,” who are charged with a separate responsibility, and encouraged with a higher reward.

³ St. Luke xii. 41.

Perhaps the truest way of regarding these sacred Sayings in this respect, is to look upon them all as having this double application. In this view they do refer "to all," and yet they do refer also, more especially, to the Apostles; that is, they may be taken as said to the Apostles, partly as the representatives, and partly as the rulers of the Church, or, more exactly, as the representatives, and therefore the rulers of the Church. It is in this manner that St. Augustine says, that "it is confessed that the strong things which are said to St. Peter are said to him, inasmuch as he bears the figure of the Church⁴;" and, interpreting the passage in which our Lord breathes on the Apostles and imparts to them the power of absolution, alleges that "the Apostles bore the character of the Church, and so these things were said to them as if they were said to the Church; so that it is the peace of the Church which forgiveth sins⁵." Thus it is because the Church is royal, that the Apostles rule on thrones; because the Church is priestly, that the Apostles absolve; because the Church is prophetic, that the Apostles are the teachers of the world. The gift which is diffused in all is concentrated in them. It is in all, because it inheres essentially in the Body of Christ, which all together are; it is in them, because they have the

⁴ S. Augustin. Enarr. in Ps. cviii. (4. 1215.)

⁵ S. Augustin. de Bapt. adv. Donat. lib. iii. c. xviii. (9. 117.)

separate duty of ordained shepherds, and overseers of the flock. As Christ is both the Head and the Body, both the Door and the Shepherd, both the Sacrifice and the God of the Sacrifice; so are His people, too, kings and subjects, priests and penitents, trusted with the oracles of God and disciples; so are His Apostles and their successors sheep as well as shepherds, sinners and subjects as well as guides and comforters of their brethren.

V. The
Baptismal
Commis-
sion.

However, there are three of the Sayings of these great days which do most clearly impart authority *within* the Church. The first of these is thus recorded by St. Matthew: "Make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ⁶." And again by St. Mark: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature ⁷." And it is thus referred to in the words recorded by St. Luke: "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem ⁸."

When we combine these Sayings into one, we find that the Apostles were directed to go forth to all the world, to all nations, to every creature;

⁶ St. Matt. xxviii. 19.

⁷ St. Mark xvi. 15.

⁸ St. Luke xxiv. 46.

to preach to them the Gospel, the glad tidings of repentance and remission of sins, and to make disciples of them. This was to be done by baptizing, or dipping them in water, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them at the same time to observe all the Christian laws of righteousness delivered by our Lord to His disciples while remaining on the earth.

The great Baptismal Commission! comprising the tradition of Christian doctrine, the charge to enlarge the kingdom of heaven, the rule for saving souls, the mode of making others believe through their word, the secret of becoming fishers of men!

On this mighty subject, containing as it does so much and various matter of the deepest interest and consequence, it is impossible to enter fully. One portion of it, the peculiar form of Holy Baptism, into "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," regarded as containing the tradition of Christian doctrine and the essential being of the Church, will be treated in the ensuing discourse.

The remaining part of this great Saying may be considered, 1. As conveying authority to teach all nations the truth of God, and His gracious forgiveness in Christ; and, 2. As containing the institution of Holy Baptism, by means of which that gracious forgiveness, and all other sacred

privileges of the membership of Christ's Church, are imparted; and, 3. As enacting the law of obedience to the moral commandments of Christ.

1. A commission to teach all nations predicted in the Old Testament and anticipated in the Gospels.

Of these three points, the first (that is, the universality of the offer of blessing in Christ) needs but small illustration. For it is quite clear, upon the face of the ancient Scriptures, that it had throughout been the declared design of God that no portion of mankind should be excluded from participating in the mercy which He would bring to pass in Christ. Such a purpose was indicated in the original promise given to console our first parents at the fall. Such a purpose was expressly declared in the great evangelical promise made to Abraham⁹ (and repeated to Isaac and Jacob), that in his seed all nations and families of the earth—seed as numberless as the dust of the earth, or the stars of heaven, or the sand of the sea-shore,—should be blessed.

The Psalms¹ are full to the same point, and declare in numberless places the spreading of the Messiah's kingdom over the whole earth. The same is the case with the prophets², who abundantly predict the flowing in of all nations, the conversion of the abundance of the sea, and the coming in of the forces of the Gentiles to Christ

⁹ Gen. xii. 3; xviii. 18; xxii. 18; xxvi. 4; xxviii. 14.

¹ Ps. ii. 8; xxii. 27, 28; lii. 8, &c.

² Is. lx. ; xlix., &c.

in His Church. The Lord also spoke of the "other sheep"³ which He had, which were not of the Jewish fold, and how He must bring them too, and they should hear His voice, so that there should be one fold, and one shepherd.

The universality, therefore, of the mission of the Apostles, was plainly in accordance with the whole stream of ancient prophecy, and of the promises of the Church delivered by our Lord in His life.

The earlier Scriptures also give abundant promise that in the fulness of time, a full and free forgiveness of sins should form a principal part of the blessings prepared for the world. This point, like the last, is almost too obvious and common upon every page of the ancient prophetic writings to admit of being completely exhibited by quotations. The Psalms and the Prophets are full of it. Every denunciation of woe and judgment ends in hope and mercy; every declaration of mercy to a sinful and guilty people takes the form of forgiveness and remission of sins. So the prophet Isaiah writes, in one out of numberless other passages to the same effect: "Therefore will the Lord wait, that he may be gracious unto you, and therefore will he be exalted, that he may have mercy upon you; for the Lord is a God of judgment: blessed are all they that wait

2. A commission to give all nations forgiveness of sins with water.
i. Predicted in the Old Testament.

³ St. John x. 16.

for him. For the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem: thou shalt weep no more. He will be very gracious unto thee at the voice of thy cry: when he shall hear it, he shall answer it ⁴." So the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel ⁵ tell us of the new and everlasting covenant which God will make with Israel and Judah, the covenant of His law in their inward parts, written in their hearts, when He should be their God, and they should be His people; when He would forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more; when He should be pacified toward them for all that they had done.

They, also, speaking of this coming forgiveness, repeatedly connect it with the mention of a washing, a making clean by water, a sprinkling. "In that day, there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and uncleanness ⁶." "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes ⁷." "O Jerusalem, wash thine heart from wickedness, that thou mayest be saved ⁸." "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new

⁴ Isa. xxx. 18, 19.

⁵ Jer. xxxii. 30. Ezek. xvi. 60.

⁶ Zech. xiii. 1.

⁷ Isa. i. 16. ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, LXX.

⁸ Jer. iv. 14.

spirit will I put within you. And I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them⁹.”

The ancient history had also contained more than one most signal type of this deliverance by water, which God designed to bring to pass in Christ for mankind. The first of these was the deliverance of Noah and his family in the ark, “wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water; the like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth now save us¹.” For the flood was “the baptism of the world, whereby its former iniquity was purged²,” and “the little ship exhibited a figure of the Church, which in the sea (that is, in the world) is tossed about by the waves (that is, by persecutions and trials).” “For as the waters of the flood drowned the ungodly, as a heap of filthiness washed them away, them and their sin together as one being inseparable; and upon the same waters the ark floating preserved Noah; thus the waters of baptism are intended as a deluge to drown sin, and save the believer, who by faith is separated both from the world and from his sin : so it sinks, and he is saved³.”

Another most eminent type of the deliverance

⁹ Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27.

¹ 1 St. Pet. iii. 20.

² Tertullian de Baptismo, c. 8.

³ Abp. Leighton on St. Peter, vol. ii. p. 256.

of the Church from sin in baptism was the passage of the Red Sea, and as such it is spoken of by St. Paul in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians⁴. "Who is wise," says St. Basil, "and will understand these things? As the sea is, typically, baptism, separating the Israelites from the power of Pharaoh, so this laver separates men from the tyranny of the devil. The sea killed the enemy in itself, and in baptism also our enmity against God dies. The people issued from the sea uninjured, and we come up from the water as living from dead, having been saved by the grace of Him that called us⁵." And St. Augustine, "That people is freed from the Egyptians by Moses; this people is freed from their former life of sins by our Lord Jesus Christ. That people passed through the Red Sea; this through baptism. In the Red Sea die all the enemies of that people; all our sins die in baptism⁶."

Such, indeed, was the fulness and clearness of the ancient Scripture and typical history in respect of the promise, that the peculiar blessing of the Gospel was to be imparted by means of water and washing, that the Pharisees, when they received the answer of John the Baptist to the enquiries which they had made of him, asked in surprise, "Why baptizest thou then, if thou be

⁴ 1 Cor. x. 1, 2.

⁵ St. Basil de Sp. S. c. xiv.

⁶ St. August. Enarr. in Psalm. lxxii. (vol. iv. p. 756.)

not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet ⁷?" plainly showing by this question, that if any one of these three persons had baptized, he would only have acted as the predictions of the earlier Scriptures had led them to expect.

These same good tidings, repentance for the remission of sins, was the matter of the Baptist's teaching, as it was also of the early teaching of the Lord Himself; and the water baptism administered to the people by John in the Jordan, the baptism of present repentance unto a coming remission, was the last of all those prophecies and types of the deliverance about to be given by Christ in His Church by means of water⁸.

The baptism of our Lord in the river Jordan was no longer a type, it was rather the significant institution, the preliminary and still unexplained consecration of the rite of Holy Baptism. "For this cause," says St. Clement of Alexandria, "He submitted to be baptized⁹, that He might sanctify all water to those who receive regeneration." "Why was the perfect baptized? It was necessary, He says, to fulfil the human precept¹. Well, I say so too. Did He then, together with the baptism by John, become perfect? Certainly. Did He then learn nothing from him? No. Is He then perfected by the

⁷ St. John i. 25.

⁸ St. Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17. St. Mark i. 4.

⁹ S. Clem. Alex. Fragm. sec. 7.

¹ ἐπάγγελμα.

ii. Anticipated in the Gospels.

bath only, and sanctified by the descent of the Spirit? It is so. This same thing then happens to us also, of whom the Lord has been made the model. Baptized, we are enlightened; enlightened, we are made sons; made sons, we are perfected; perfected, we are made immortal. ‘I have said,’ it says, ‘ye are gods, and all sons of the highest.’ So this work is often called ‘the gift,’ ‘the enlightening,’ ‘the perfection,’ ‘the bath.’” “Jordan had more need to come to Him, than He to Jordan. ‘Lavit aquas Ipse, non aquæ Ipsum.’ The waters were baptized by Him; they baptized Him not. He went into them, (ut aquæ nos purgaturæ prius per Ipsum purgarentur,—it is Epiphanius,) that they which should cleanse us might by Him first be cleansed. It is certain. So He received no cleanness, no virtue; but virtue He gave to Jordan, to the waters, to the Sacrament itself³.” “Christ, who is our Creator and Redeemer in the new birth, opened the fountain, and hallowed the stream. Christ, who is our life, went down into the waters of baptism, and we who descend thither find the effects of life⁴.”

With the commencement of our Lord’s own teaching, the anticipation of this great doctrine of deliverance by water becomes more particular,

² S. Clem. Alex. Pædag. c. vi.

³ Bp. Andrewes, Serm. viii. On the Holy Ghost.

⁴ Bp. Taylor, Life of Christ, vol. ii. p. 235.

and points more exactly to the nature of the blessing about to be given. The Baptist had begun, in some degree, to exhibit it, when he repeatedly contrasted his own baptism with that of his Lord. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear. He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire⁵." But the full statement was made, in anticipation and promise of the coming blessing, by the Lord Himself, in the first discourse He is recorded to have spoken in His ministry, the discourse of His first Passover, addressed to Nicodemus.

In that discourse, the reference of which to the subject of Holy Baptism is attested by the unanimous voice of Catholic antiquity⁶, the Lord no longer speaks only of a "forgiveness" by means of water, but unfolding more exactly the nature of the blessing about to be given, speaks of a new birth, to be given by water and the Holy Ghost. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God⁷." "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "Forgiveness of sins" is comprised within,

⁵ St. Matt. iii. 11. St. Mark i. 8, &c. Acts i. 5; xi. 16.

⁶ Vide this point proved beyond possibility of question in Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism, pp. 29—41, 2nd edit.

⁷ St. John iii. 35.

and is a property of this sacred new birth of the Holy Ghost, for man receives “remission of sins by spiritual regeneration⁸ ;” and water is, according to the earlier prophecies, still the external instrument and means whereby this precious gift is conveyed to man. This further revelation of the nature of the gift about to be given, throws light, retrospectively, on expressions of the older Scriptures like those quoted above from the prophet Ezekiel. “I will sprinkle clean water upon you : . . . a new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you. And I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh⁹ .”

Won then by the death of the cross, and assured by the Resurrection from the dead¹, in this great

⁸ Collect in the Baptismal Service. ⁹ Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27.

¹ Ad cuius rei confirmationem plurimùm valet, quod ipse Dominus Jesus Christus posteaquam resurrexit a mortuis, discipulis suis, in quibus omnes Ecclesiarum Præsules docebantur, et formam et potestatem tradidit baptizandi, dicens, Euntes docete, &c. De quo utique eos etiam ante passionem posset instruere, nisi propriè voluisset intelligi, regenerationis gratiam ex suâ resurrectione cœpisse.—S. Leo, Ep. xvi. c. iii.

Itaque tingebant discipuli ejus ut ministri, ut Joannes ante præcursor, eodem baptismo Joannis, ne qui alio putet, quia nec extat alius, nisi postea Christi, qui hunc utique à discentibus dari non poterat, utpote nondum adimpletâ gloriâ Domini, nec instructâ efficacîâ lavacri per passionem et resurrectionem ; quia nec mors nostra dissolvi posset nisi Domini passione, nec vita restitui sine resurrectione ipsius.—Tertull. de Bapt. xi.

Saying of the Forty Days, the ancient and repeated prophecies of God's mercy and forgiveness by means of water, receive their full accomplishment. Henceforth, repentance for the remission of sins, the Gospel to all creatures, the discipleship and regeneration of all nations in holy baptism, is authoritatively instituted and proclaimed to the end of the world.

And so do Apostles, and Apostolic men in the later Scriptures, fully bear out, as by a Divine commentary, the meaning set upon this great Saying. From the day of the descent of the Holy Ghost to give the power to those to whom these sacred words had given the right of baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, when these were added unto them ² by baptism about three thousand souls, to this sacred washing is attributed the forgiveness of sin, the partaking of the death and resurrection of Christ, the new birth, the salvation, the sanctification of Christian people. "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord ³." "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and dwellers in all parts of the earth, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For

iii. Recognized in the later Scripture.

² Acts ii. 41.

³ Ibid. xxii. 16.

the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call⁴.” “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death⁵.” “Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him⁶.” “Baptism doth now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ⁷.” “Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word⁸.” “Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water⁹.” “According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost¹.”

Comment.
of S. Au-
gustine on
St. John
i. 32.

Before we leave this part of the subject, it will be well to notice a particular point in the narrative of the baptism of our Lord in the river Jordan, which, as unfolded and explained by St. Augustine, seems to be important in completing the view of the doctrine of Holy Baptism. In St. John's Gospel we read as follows: “And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not; but he that sent me to

⁴ Acts ii. 38, 39.

⁵ Rom. vi. 3, 4.

⁶ Col. ii. 12.

⁷ 1 Pet. iii. 21.

⁸ Eph. v. 26.

⁹ Heb. x. 22.

¹ Tit. iii. 5.

baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost³." What, then, asks St. Augustine, was it that the Baptist did not know? Did he not know Jesus? did he not know Him to be the Lord, to be the Son of God, to be the Christ? did he not know that He was about to baptize with the Holy Ghost? Yes: all these things he assuredly knew; for he had long been teaching the people that the Person who was to come after him should baptize with the Holy Ghost; and he had endeavoured to forbid the baptism of the Lord by saying, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" These things therefore he knew. What then could he yet be ignorant of? The point which he had not known before, and which by the descent of the dove he learned, according to St. Augustine, was this—that Christ should retain in Himself, and not part with, or bestow on others, the original power of baptizing with the Holy Ghost. He, in all the world, whosoever might be the instrument, should alone be the true Baptizer with the Holy Ghost. Being ever present with the Church, He alone should keep the authority, and bestow the grace of Holy Baptism. Apostles, priests, and deacons, might baptize as

³ St. John i. 32.

ministers; but He, in them all, should be for ever the sole and true Baptizer with the Holy Ghost. This was the secret, the lesson, the doctrine which the Baptist learned from the dove. Thus, then, when, in the first instance, the Holy Ghost descended to designate and make our Lord the sole and authoritative Baptizer of the world. He descended in One, and on One. Amid the fullest and clearest manifestation of the Holy Trinity, (the Father in the voice, the Son in the man, the Spirit in the dove,) Christ was declared to be the single and true giver, in all the world, of the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

When, however, the Apostles, already charged to go teach all nations, and baptize them into the sacred Name of the Holy Trinity, received their ministerial "power from above," to enable them to execute this office of baptizing for Christ, the Holy Ghost descended no longer in one, and on one, but in many, and on many. He was no longer in the form of the dove, but divided in tongues, and sat upon the head of each. Thus then the single dove declares that there is one baptism, and one Baptizer; the many tongues declare the multitude and diversity of the ministers. Baptism is one and many: one in Christ, many in the Apostles; one in the source and origin of power, many in the instruments of imparting it; one in the gift, many in the languages,

countries, ages of the world; one in the dove, many in the tongues.

Such is, I believe, a fair representation of St. Augustine's remarkable and most valuable commentary upon this passage: and it admirably illustrates, in the case of Holy Baptism, the case and condition of Christ's Church in respect of all its constitution and privileges. One she is in Christ, many in the Apostles; one in the spring and source of life, power, grace, and salvation, many in those who, succeeding to the Apostles, administer that grace and life in many lands, languages, and ages of the world. The Church knows no single source of power, no single head of authority, no single spring of grace, but Christ,—the one Baptizer with the Holy Ghost, her ever-present life, and strength, and Lord³.

The remaining point, that is, the law of moral obedience delivered to the Apostles in this great Saying, requires no particular illustration either from the earlier or the later Scriptures. The Lord had, in His own teaching, amply sanctioned and enlarged the law of the Decalogue, and had told His disciples, that “except their righteousness should exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, they should in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven⁴ :” and this was the very

iii. A commission to deliver the law of moral obedience.

³ S. August. Tract. in Joh. iv. v. vi. (vol. iii. p. 2. 312—341.)

⁴ St. Matt. v. 20.

end and purpose for which He “gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works⁵.” It is to be observed, that this law of obedience is not a separate and independent law, but one which belongs to, and forms part of, the general commission of Holy Baptism. For Holy Baptism is not merely a means of the forgiveness of our sins, but also a new birth unto righteousness; and “therefore we are buried with Christ by baptism into death; that like as he was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life⁶.”

Provision
made for
the pardon
of post-bap-
tismal sin.

It is not, however, to be supposed that the various declarations of God’s design of mercy and forgiveness of sinners, scattered in such profusion over the books of the Old Testament, all found their final and complete fulfilment in the plenary remission of sins given in the sacred font of holy baptism. To this forgiveness they refer, no doubt, and principally. For this is the one great forgiveness on the earth, which promises and assures the other great forgiveness in the day of Judgment, if men, placed in a state of salvation in baptism, bring forth much fruit in their life, and make, by God’s grace, their calling and election sure⁷. This is the great fountain opened for sin

⁵ Titus ii. 14.

⁶ Rom. vi. 4.

⁷ 2 St. Pet. i. 10.

and uncleanness ⁸, in which Christians are washed, are sanctified, are justified ⁹ in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God. But for those who, early baptized into the one Christian body, have to live many years in the discharge of the duty of members of that body, who having been early grafted into the life-giving vine, live on and long enjoy on earth the spiritual strength and vitality that circulates among the branches, there needeth a further accompanying grace of remission, a rock ¹, as it were, to follow them, which shall relieve, and comfort, and restore them in many fallings off, in many weaknesses, in many human frailties, it may be in many heavier sins and sorrows. And if there were none such—if the plenary grace and forgiveness of baptism were the last and only forgiveness with which God had furnished His Church on earth, then dark indeed, darker than those of Jews or heathens, would be the prospect of baptized Christians living on in the flesh, and sterner the law of the life-giving font than those heavy laws of works under which every mouth was stopped ², and the whole world became guilty in the sight of God. Then, indeed, it were well to die ³ on rising from the laver of

⁸ Zech. xiii. 1.

⁹ 1 Cor. vi. 11.

¹ 1 Cor. x. 4.

² Rom. iii. 19.

³ And without these reserves of the Divine Grace, and after-emanations from the mercy seat, no man could be saved, and the death of Christ would become inconsiderable to most of

regeneration, and to carry, as it were, the pure lustre of the hardly recovered metal at once to heaven, which every touch of the world's air would surely throw back, hopelessly and for ever, into that earthy state from which it had been once and for a moment rescued.

But, praised be God, such is not the condition in which we are left, who have been early baptized into His blessed Church, and have received long ago the initiatory remission wherewith our Christian life began.

1. Access
to the
Father in
Christ.

To each member of the life-giving body there belongs, from the very force of his position in the body, a blessed privilege of drawing near to God in Christ, whereby he may bewail his sins, and receive comfort to his secret soul. As the whole body⁴ is royal, priestly, and prophetic, so do all the separate members of the body share these

His greatest purposes ; for none should have received advantages but newly baptized persons, whose albs of baptism served them also for a winding-sheet.—Bp. Taylor on Repentance, vol. ii. p. 405.

⁴ *Quod autem cum dixisset, In istis secunda mors non habet potestatem, adjunxit atque ait, Sed erunt sacerdotes Dei atque Christi, et regnabunt cum eo mille annos: non utique de solis Episcopis et Presbyteris dictum est, qui propriè jam vocantur in Ecclesiâ Sacerdotes: sed sicut omnes Christianos dicimus propter mysticum Chrisma, sic omnes sacerdotes, quoniam membra sunt unius Sacerdotis. De quibus apostolus Petrus, Plebs, inquit, sancta, regale sacerdotium.—S. August. de Civ. Dei, lib. xx. c. x.*

same glorious titles; so are they, though less than the least in rank, station, ability, or knowledge, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people ⁵, who, in Christ, have access to His Father, and their Father—their Father which is in heaven. It is impossible that we can be wrong in applying to this personal privilege of prayer those many and most affecting words of David in the Spirit, whereby he gave utterance to his own grief and penitence, and gave utterance also, prophetically, to the grief and penitence of the Church in after-times, and of separate penitents in Christ. None can doubt, who reads the fifty-first Psalm, for instance, and remembers that it was written “when Nathan the prophet came unto him ⁶” with the sentence of God’s absolution, and also how it has been adopted, with the other Psalms, by the universal Church of Christ as her expression of religious feeling, that it declares in prophecy, that besides the administration of an external sentence, God will have mercy according to His loving-kindness, and according unto the multitude of His tender mercies will blot out the transgressions ⁷ of those who, in Christ, acknowledge their transgressions, and ever keep their sin before them. This blessed privilege of prayer, too, is repeatedly promised by our

⁵ 1 St. Pet. ii. 9.

⁶ The title of the 51st Psalm, cf. 2 Sam. xii. 1—13.

⁷ Ps. li. 1. 3.

Lord in His own life. It is promised in the command to pray, “ Watch and pray, lest ye enter into temptation;” in the parable spoken “ unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint ⁸ ;” in the gift of a model of prayer, in the very address of that prayer, “ Our Father, which art in heaven” (for He is our Father, as we are members of His beloved Son ; and what *man* is there of us, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?); in the petition, “ Forgive us our trespasses,” of which St. Augustine does not scruple to say that it is, as it were, a daily baptism ⁹ for the forgiveness of daily sins, and which our Lord Himself, by His manner of discoursing on His prayer, seems to put forward as if it were the most special and important petition of all. For as soon as the prayer is given, He goes on to say, “ For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you ; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses ¹ .” It is promised

⁸ St. Luke xviii. 1.

⁹ Sed quoniam victuri sumus in isto sæculo, ubi quis non vivit sine peccato, ideo remissio peccatorum non est in solâ ablutione sacri baptismatis, sed etiam in oratione Dominicâ et quotidianâ, quam post octo dies accepturi estis. In illâ invenietis quasi quotidianum baptisma vestrum, ut agatis Deo gratias, qui donavit hoc munus Ecclesiæ suæ, quod confitemur in Symbolo : ut cum diximus, *Sanctam Ecclesiam*, adjungamus *Remissionem peccatorum*.—Serm. ccxiii. In Tradit. Symboli, viii.

¹ St. Matt. vi. 14.

in several distinct and express sayings: "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you²." "What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." It is still more expressly promised as a privilege of the coming kingdom, as dependent upon the presence of the Lord in the Holy Ghost, and therefore as about to be given "*in that day*," the day of the Church, which fully shone on the world at the great Pentecost. "And whatsoever ye shall ask *in my name*, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son³." "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you." "I have chosen you, and ordained you, that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you." "In that day, ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven; for where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

Thus, then, on the most assured word of God

² St. Matt. vii. 7. St. Mark xi. 24. Cf. St. Matt. xxi. 22. St. Luke xi. 9.

³ St. John xiv. 13; xv. 7. 16; xvi. 23. St. Matt. xviii. 19, 20.

may every baptized man pray; may come in the reverent and sorrowful attitude of an offending child to a merciful Father; may confess, and weep, and ask for pardon, and may feel no doubt but earnestly believe, that He who loves to be called his Father will look on him with a Father's eyes of loving and tender forgiveness.

2. Means
of growth
in grace.

And again: not only the prayers which are directly offered for forgiveness of sin, but every other means also of spiritual help and growth in grace is, in its own proper force and nature, a means of pardon⁴. From the earliest germ of spiritual life within us, when we were first put into the state of grace and received "remission of sins by spiritual regeneration⁵," to the final perfection of the saints, every accession of spiritual growth, as it cannot be unless accompanied by repentance and loathing of our sins, is an accession of favour

⁴ Fifthly: that baptism does not only pardon our sins, but puts us into a state of pardon for the time to come. For baptism is the beginning of the new life, and an admission of us into the evangelical covenant. So that by baptism we are consigned to the mercies of God and the graces of the Gospel; that is, that our pardon be continued, and our piety be a state of repentance—Bp. Taylor, vol. ii. pp. 245—247. 279, 280.

As the habit lessens, so does the guilt; as our virtues are imperfect, so is the pardon; and because our piety may be interrupted, our state is uncertain, till our possibilities of sin are ceased, till our fight is finished, and the victory therefore made sure, because there is no more fight.—Ibid. p. 400.

⁵ Baptismal Service.

and goodwill of God; and favour and goodwill of God are in themselves, to those who are imperfectly holy, forgiveness and pardon. It is not that spiritual indwelling is one gift, and pardon another, except as far as we ourselves make distinctions, or regard the same thing in different points of view. It is, that where God dwelleth, there is holiness; that where He dwelleth more abundantly, there is more holiness. As, in the natural body, the force of indwelling vitality and health, if it be vigorous and increasing, suffices to throw off peccant humours, and to restore the animal functions, not wholly disarranged and morbid, to healthful action, so if, in the soul of man, the Holy Spirit of God be increasingly present, its sins are, by the mere force of Divine presence and favour, forgiven and obliterated. Thus the increase of love, the growth of faith, the strengthening of any Divine virtue, under grace, in the heart of man, is in its degree efficient in bringing him into closer union, nearer likeness, and greater favour with his Lord. But among all the means of grace, there is none so peculiarly powerful to indicate and bring the mercy and forgiving⁶ love of God upon His

⁶ *Manducavi panem meum cum melle meo. Vides quod in hoc pane nulla sit amaritudo, sed omnis suavitas sit? Bibi vinum meum cum lacte meo. Vides hujusmodi esse lætitiā quæ nullius peccati sordibus polluat? Quotiescunque enim bibis, remissionem accipis peccatorum, et inebriaris in spiritu.* —S. Ambros. de Sacram. c. v. c. 3. (p. 376. vol. ii.)

people, as the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. Thereby He particularly assureth us “ of His favour and goodness towards us, and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical Body of His Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and are also heirs through hope of His everlasting kingdom ⁷.” Thereby, according to His own most true promise, men have eternal life ⁸, resurrection, and indwelling of Christ, and how can sin, which God abhorreth, remain unforgiven where these are found?

VI. The Holy Ghost to remit and retain sins.

These, however, are means of forgiveness of sin after baptism, which result from doctrines already considered;—from the efficacy of Holy Baptism, duly administered under the Apostolic commission, planting men into the life-giving body, to which the Presence of the Lord of the Church is promised even unto the end of the world. But our sacred Lord left His Church still more comfort in this respect than is to be derived from these doctrines only. “ And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained ⁹.”

In these sacred words, and by the spirit-giving breath, the Lord conveyed a very great and signal power, which, as we learn from the Gospels, was

⁷ Second prayer of the Post-Communion Service.

⁸ St. John vi. 54. 56.

⁹ St. John xx. 22, 23.

peculiarly His own, as He was the Son of Man. For when certain of the Scribes, taking offence at His saying to the sick of the palsy, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee," said within themselves, "This man blasphemeth:" "who can forgive sins but God alone?" our Lord, not thinking at that time well to announce His Divine right¹⁰ of forgiveness, but in order that they might know that the Son of Man hath power (*ἐξουσίαν*, delegated power) upon the earth (*ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*) to forgive sins, then said to the sick of the palsy, "Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thine house¹." Thus the power of forgiveness on the earth was delegated to Christ as the Son of Man, as that Son of Man to whom the Spirit was given without measure, that Son of Man who was sacredly and for ever united in one Person with the Son of God². This power He now gave to the Apostles, the successors of the Son of Man upon the earth,

¹⁰ The power of remitting sin is originally in God, and in God alone; and in Christ our Saviour, by means of the union of the Godhead and manhood into one Person, by virtue whereof the Son of Man hath power to forgive sins upon earth. This of the Apostles is nothing else but a branch out of His, which He Himself (as man) had here upon earth. For as man He Himself was sent, and was anointed with the Spirit, and proceeded by commission.—Bp. Andrewes, *Of the Power of Absolution*.

¹ St. Matt. ix. 2. St. Luke v. 21.

² Vide Appendix on the Son of Man.

by the gift of the same Holy Ghost, by whom it was in Himself.

This power the Apostles exercised in two principal ways³:—first, by admitting persons, or refusing them admission to Holy Baptism, which is the one great means of immediate, and covenant of future remission; and afterwards, by express and particular absolutions, publicly or privately administered, of post-baptismal sin. Either sort of forgiveness, duly pronounced by them upon the earth as successors of the Son of Man, should be ratified by Himself, the Son of God, in heaven; and thus should He be, on earth mediately, in heaven immediately⁴, the dispenser of those two pardons of which He repeatedly spoke, “the pardon in this world, and in the world to come,”

³ ἀφίᾳσι γεμὴν ἁμαρτίας, ἧτοι κατέχουσιν οἱ πνευματοφόροι κατὰ εὐο τρόπους κατὰ γε διάνοιαν ἐμήν· ἢ γὰρ καλοῦσιν ἐπὶ τὸ βᾶπτισμα,—(ἢ διακωλύουσί τινας) ἢ καὶ καθ' ἕτερον τρόπον ἀφίᾳσι τε καὶ κρατοῦσιν ἁμαρτίας, ἐπιτιμῶντες μὲν ἁμαρτανοῦσι τοῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τέκνοις, μετανοοῦσι δὲ συγγιγνώσκοντες, καθάπερ ἀμέλει ὁ Παῦλος τὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ πορνεύσαντα παρεδίδου μὲν εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῆ· προσίετο δὲ αὐθις, ἵνα μὴ τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῆ.—S. Cyril. Alex. vol. iv. p. 1101.

⁴ Quamvis igitur magnum sit hominibus peccata dimittere, (quis enim potest peccata dimittere nisi solus Deus, qui per eos quoque dimittit quibus dimittendi tribuit potestatem?) &c. —S. Ambros. Exp. Ev. S. Luc. lib. v. (p. 1358, ed. Bened.)

“the loosing on earth, and the loosing in heaven.”

Hardly any prophecies of the Old Testament can be adduced to bear directly on the present point. The Prophets are full on the point of the forgiveness which Christ should offer to His Church; but the manner in which He should exercise this office, whether by any immediate sentence pronounced by Himself from heaven, or through the intervention of authorized ministers, they do not distinguish. There is, however, one passage which ought to be cited in this regard, as being very plainly referred to in one of the most signal passages in which the Lord Himself anticipates His approaching gift to the Church. It occurs in the twenty-second chapter of Isaiah, where Shebna and Eliakim are made respectively the types of the Jewish priesthood and of Christ. “And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will call my servant Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah; and I will clothe him with thy robe, and strengthen him with thy girdle⁵, and I will commit thy

1. Predicted in the Old Testament, and anticipated in the Gospels.

⁵ The commentary of Vitringa upon this passage is so important to the present argument, that I may be pardoned for making a long extract from it.

“Ex quibus inter se collatis certò collegimus, Sebnam—gessisse figuram Procerum et Præfectorum Judææ gentis;—dum interea omnis dignitas, potestas, prærogativa regiminis et imperii (clavis Domus Davidis) in Domo Dei quæ est Ecclesia populi Dei (eâdem figuratâ per Domum Davidis)

government into his hand: and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open⁶." There is no doubt that "the house of David," in this passage, is the Church of

devolveretur in Scheluntem Jacobi cui tradendum erat sceptrum Judæ, hoc est in verum Eliakimum jam ante suscitatum potentiâ Patris, et evectum in cœlos, solenniter inaugurandum præfecturæ Domus Dei eâ potestate et auctoritate, ut abolitâ omni potestate umbratili et typicâ, sub œconomiâ vetere institutâ, in ipsum unum et solum omnis potestas Ecclesiastica transferretur; ipsius judicium et auctoritas in spiritualibus omnis judicii norma esset: omnis sarcina et suppellectilia omnia quæ Domui Dei ornamento aut usui essent, ab Ipso tanquam clavo suspenderentur, h. e. omne officium, dignitas, prærogativa, maxima, minima, ab ipso in Ecclesiâ penderet, &c. (p. 660. ol. i.)

Unde factum, ut claves non tantum figuram gesserint *curæ τῆς οἰκονομίας*, sed et *potestatis* in ordinando gubernandoque statu totius familiæ. Sic Dominus manifestè utitur hoc emblemate, ubi ipse ad Petrum, *Et dabo tibi claves Regni cœlorum*, h. e. post meum in cœlum recessum committam tibi tuisque consortibus, ejusdem Apostolatus (muneris indivisi) prærogativâ insignibus, *οἰκονομίαν* sive *potestatem* summam rerum in Ecclesiâ ordinandarum et constituendarum, meâ vice et loco, per spiritum meum vobiscum ubere mensurâ communicandum. (p. 656.)

Even Grotius, on Is. xxii. 22, says, "Mysticus sensus in Evangelio Matt. xvi. 19." v. Forer. apud Crit. Sacr. and Lowth.

⁶ Is. xxii. 20—22.

Christ, that "the key" signifies all authority of opening and shutting, of admitting and excluding from the Church, and that the prophecy declares that this key shall belong to the foretold Messiah. Nor do commentators doubt that the expressions of this verse are to be interpreted in connexion with Rev. iii. 7, ("And to the angel of the Church in Philadelphia write: These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth,") where that key is spoken of as still belonging to none other than Christ, who still exerciseth the authority attaching to it; and with St. Matthew xvi. 19, where the Lord says to St. Peter, "And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Thus, on comparing these three distant, but much connected passages, it becomes clear that the precise authority signified by "the key of David" belongs to none other than Christ. It was predicted to be only His of old, and, subsequently to the establishment of the Church, it is still revealed to be only His. Meanwhile it is not the less His, because He declared to St. Peter, in anticipation

that He would give it to him and his brethren (tibi, tuisque consortibus, ejusdem Apostolatus, indivisi muneris, prærogativâ insignibus), and after the Resurrection imparted it to them by the Divine Breath, and the words of this sacred Saying.

The words of our Lord, recorded in the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew, are very like to those just quoted from the sixteenth. “Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.”

In this great Saying, then, these mighty promises are fulfilled. What was before spoken of as a thing future, as a power to be given, as an authority at some unspecified time to be bestowed, is here authoritatively and for ever instituted. No longer with any priority, or reservation of superiority for St. Peter, the sacred breath, conveying the heavenly delegation to forgive sins upon the earth, is breathed alike on all. All⁷

⁷ “Ἐχουσι γὰρ ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι καὶ δεσμεῖν, οἱ κατὰ Πέτρον τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς ἀξιοθέντες χάριτος· εἰ γὰρ καὶ πρὸς Πέτρον μόνον εἶρηται τὸ, Δώσω σοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀποστόλοις δέδοται· πότε; ὅτε εἶπεν, ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφιένται· καὶ γὰρ τὸ, δώσω, μέλλοντα χρόνον σημαίνει, τουτέστι, τὸν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν.—Theophylact. Comm. in S. Matt. c. xvi.

From all which three thus compared, the general result is this, that the power of *binding* and *loosing* is a solemn *privilege* or *prerogative* of the Church of Christ, thrice insisted on by our Saviour: first, by way of *prediction*, that He would

alike are put into the sacred place of the Son of Man, and made for Him, because in Him, the dispensers of His audible sentences of condemnation and pardon on the earth, to the end of the world.

Nor did the Apostles hesitate to claim in its ^{2. Recognized in the Epistles.} fulness the power and authority thus given to them. Witness the words of St. Paul, in which he asserts, that in sentence of condemnation or forgiveness he speaks ⁸ in the person and with the power of Christ, that Christ speaketh in him when he doth not spare ⁹, that when he useth sharpness of rebuke, he speaketh according to the power which the Lord hath given him ¹. Witness his delivery of Hymeneus and Alexander ² unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme; and his Apostolic absolution ³, sanctioning the sentence of the local priesthood pronounced upon

confer it, Matt. xvi.; the second, by way of more particular description of the *manner*, and direction for the *end* and *use* of it, Matt. xviii.; and thirdly, by a *preparatory kind of investing them* in this *power*, an initial investing them with this *sacred ghostly authority*, John xx. (immediately before His final departure from the world), which seemeth to have been *thoroughly perfected and completed*, when, after His Ascension, the *Holy Ghost* did visibly *descend* upon those to whom these words were by *Christ* then delivered.—Dr. Hammond, Tract of Binding and Loosing, c. i. Comm. on St. John xx. 23. Cf. Bp. Sparrow's Rationale, on the Absolution.

⁸ 1 Cor. v. 4. 2 Cor. ii. 10.

⁹ 2 Cor. xiii. 3.

¹ 2 Cor. xiii. 10.

² 1 Tim. i. 20.

³ 2 Cor. ii. 10.

the incestuous Corinthian. Witness his injunctions to Titus and Timothy in their respective dioceses “to rebuke sharply⁴,” “to rebuke them that sin before all,” “to reprove and rebuke.”

Ever since this sacred Saying was pronounced, and the holy breath of Christ gave the spirit of power, the Apostles, and their successors⁵ in every age of the Church, have exercised, with more or less of faithfulness, but with no general denial or question of its efficacy, this marvellous privilege of Christian sovereignty and priesthood. By general absolutions, ever accompanying her regular public devotions, and by more particular ones to meet the heavier repentances of deadly or scandalous guilt, by sentences of penance or excommunication in purer days executed, in feebler ones threatened, or regretted in the want of them, the Church has always claimed, even though she has often with sad imperfection neglected to carry out, the system of Divine discipline herein established.

⁴ Tit. i. 13. 1 Tim. v. 20. 2 Tim. iv. 2.

⁵ Qualis vero error sit—hinc intelligi potest, quod soli Petro Christus dixerit, Quæcunque ligaveris, &c.—et iterum in Evangelio quando in solos Apostolos insufflavit Christus dicens, Accipite Spiritum sanctum; si cujus remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi; et si cujus tenueritis, tenebuntur. Potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum Apostolis data est, et Ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt, et Episcopis qui eis ordinatione vicariâ successerunt.—Firmilianus apud S. Cyprian. (Ep. p. 225, ed. Fell.)

That we ourselves, in the English branch of the Church, have lost a great portion of this sacred discipline, is, alas! too evident; and that the loss is a great and melancholy one, none can doubt who knows what the weight of sin is, how grievous and difficult to be borne, the uncertainty of pardon, the comfort and benefit of contrite and humbling confession, or what must needs be the efficacy of so gracious and express an institution of Divine forgiveness when fully used. Our Church herself mourns over her sad deficiency. She laments her want of the godly discipline of primitive times ⁶; and lamenting, does she not bid us, her dutiful and attached children, pray for its restoration among us, and use whatever means our position in life may give us to bring about its re-establishment?

But let us not doubt, even though the lack be great and sore, that the weight of post-baptismal sin may yet be forgiven! forgiven to the comfort of sorrowing penitents, and the restoration of God's goodwill and favour. We will not, indeed, undervalue the gift which we so negligently and imperfectly administer; we will not undervalue the blessed and Divine consolation and means of assured recovery of penitents, which we so lightly and with so much confidence disuse. Yet we have still our blessed means of Divine grace in

⁶ Communion Service.

the Holy Communion. We have still our own separate access to the Father in Christ the well-beloved. We have still the joint prayers and general absolutions of our public services. We have still the offer (oh! that we would think of it more readily, and use it oftener) of the benefit of private absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of conscience. The remaining privileges of the Church may have been withdrawn from us for our sins. It will certainly be by humbly and carefully using those which we possess, that we may hope for their restoration to us.

VII. The
Pastoral
Commis-
sion.

There is another Saying, of very high importance, which properly belongs to this part of the subject, as conveying, without question, power *in* the Church, and therefore belonging to the Apostles as rulers, and not merely as representatives of all their brethren. This is the thrice-repeated charge to St. Peter to feed the flock of Christ. “Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?” (more than these thine ancient occupations, thy nets, thy boat, thy sea? more than these thy brethren love me?) “Feed my lambs. Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Feed my sheep. Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Feed my sheep⁷.” In this affecting commission we do not doubt that a power is given

⁷ St. John xxi. 15—17.

over the flock of Christ; a power in which the sheep of the flock can of course have no share; a power to tend, to feed, to lead forth into pasture, to keep within the fold, to guard from dangers within and without; to check, to teach, to govern. The sheep or lambs of the flock are the ordinary lay members of the Church both old and young. They are called a flock from their tenderness, their defencelessness, their liability to wander, their obedience, and the gentle loving care with which they are regarded by their Shepherd. The pastors, or shepherds, are they who hold under the great Shepherd His delegated power; His undershepherds, who tend by His authority; so that He tends in them, and is obeyed or disobeyed in them.

The old Testament Scriptures are replete with promises and types of the Lord in the character of the good Shepherd, and of His Christian people as His sheep. So numerous, indeed, are the places in which this sort of language is used, as to be quite beyond exhausting by quotation. In the descent of Jacob into Egypt, Joseph was the type of the true Shepherd; for he “nourished his father and his brethren, and all his father’s household, with bread according to their families ⁸,” and to him belongs, in some unexplained way, the name of “the Shepherd.” In the wandering in

^{1.} Predicted in the Old Testament.

⁸ Gen. xlvii. 12; xlv. 10. Cf. xlix. 24. Ps. lxxx. 1.

the wilderness, between the passage of the Red Sea and the reaching of the land of Canaan (a wandering typical of the life of Christians between Baptism and Paradise), God was again His people's Shepherd, and Moses and Aaron His typical under-shepherds. "He made his own people to go forth like sheep, and guided them in the wilderness like a flock⁹." "He led his people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron¹." In the constant government of the chosen nation, He was the Shepherd of Israel, tending by under-shepherds. He sought those who went "astray like lost sheep²;" He made His flock "not want, but made them to lie down in green pastures, and led them forth beside the waters of comfort."

In several passages, again, in which there can be no question that the language used is strictly prophetic, and not metaphorical only, we read of the coming Messiah, that "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young³." In the same way the Prophet Ezekiel, after denouncing the displeasure of God against the neglectful under-shepherds of Israel, goes on to prophesy the coming of a truer and better shepherd. "For thus saith the Lord God: Behold I, even I, will both search my sheep, and seek them out. As a

⁹ Ps. lxxviii. 52.

¹ Ibid. lxxvii. 20.

² Ibid. cxix. 176; xxiii. 2.

³ Is. xl. 2.

shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered ; so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day. And I will bring them out from the people, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them to their own land, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country. I will feed them in a good pasture, and upon the high mountains of Israel shall their fold be : there shall they lie in a good fold, and in a fat pasture shall they feed upon the mountains of Israel. I will feed my flock, and I will cause them to lie down, saith the Lord God. . . . And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David : he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd⁴.” The Prophet Jeremiah speaks of many shepherds. “ And I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding.” “ I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds : and they shall be fruitful and increase. And I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them : and they shall fear no more, nor

⁴ Ezek. xxxiv. 11—23 ; xxxvii. 24.

be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord ⁵.”

2. Anticipated in the Gospels.

In our Lord's own teaching in the Gospels, the parable of the lost sheep ⁶ (introduced in St. Matthew in connexion with the Son of Man being come to save that which was lost) plainly connects itself, in the way of more immediate anticipation, with the language of the passages just cited from the Old Testament.

But by far the most remarkable passage of the Gospels bearing upon this point is the discourse of the tenth chapter of St. John.

This discourse opens, apparently, in connexion with the conversation and miracle of the preceding chapter. The Pharisees, still sitting ⁷ in Moses' seat, asked the Lord if they also were blind; blind, that is, as guides of the people. The Lord answers, that if they were really blind, blind without the means or power of sight, and without professing to see, they would be guiltless; but, claiming to see, pretending to be guides, whilst in reality they were blind leaders of the blind, and so pronouncing, as if authoritatively, against His mission and teaching, their sin remained. He then goes on to distinguish a true guide from a false one; or (introducing with the

⁵ Jer. iii. 15; xxiii. 3, 4.

⁶ St. Matt. xviii. 11, 12. St. Luke xv. 4.

⁷ St. Matt. xxiii. 2.

beginning of the tenth chapter the old scriptural language of a shepherd and sheep), a shepherd from a robber. In the first five verses of the chapter He describes a shepherd ⁸. A shepherd differs from a robber, because he enters into the fold by the door. So entering, he obtains several other marks of his being a true shepherd: the porter opens; the sheep hear his voice; he calls his own sheep by name; he leads them out; he goes before them; the sheep follow him because they know his voice. “*Tecta sunt hæc,*” says St. Augustine, “*plena quæstionibus, gravis sacramentis* ⁹.”

Of whom then does our Lord speak this parable? Of Himself, personally and alone, or of Himself and others? There cannot be a doubt that He speaks, at least in part, of Himself. For, to all appearance, His very purpose is to distinguish His own guidance from the blind guidance of the Pharisees, and to declare that whereas all before Him were thieves and robbers, He is a true guide and a real shepherd. If, then, these verses are to be interpreted of Himself alone, and interpreted by themselves, without reference to what follows, then perhaps (according to St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, and Theophylact ¹),

⁸ *ποιμήν*, not *ὁ ποιμήν*.

⁹ S. August. Tract. in S. Joan.

¹ S. August. Tract. xlv. xlvi. xlvii. in Joh. Ev. Theophyl. S. Chrys. in loco. v. Maldonati Comm. in Joan. c. x.

the Door is the Old Testament, the Porter the Holy Ghost who inspired it, or Moses, (for had they believed Moses, they would have believed Christ²;) and the sheep those true Israelites who received Him, and believed on Him.

But if these verses are to be interpreted with respect to what follows (and indeed their own structure appears to suggest this interpretation), then our Lord is probably not speaking exclusively of Himself, or of the pastoral office as confined to a single holder. To that subject He seems to proceed in the 11th verse. Hitherto He seems rather to be giving the marks of a good shepherd, and the marks appear capable of designating, in a subordinate way, others besides Himself. Any who enter by the Door possess the first great characteristic of a shepherd.

But in the next verse He says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the Door of the sheep."

How³, then, it occurs to ask, can Christ Him-

² St. John v. 46.

³ Numquidnam ipse venit ad semetipsum? An ita est, quia in Evangelio ipse testatur, dicens: *Qui non intrat per ostium in ovile ovium, sed ascendit aliunde, ille fur est et latro? Qui autem intrat per ostium, pastor est ovium.* Et paulò post dicit, *Ego sum ostium.* Atque iterum subjungit, *Ego sum pastor bonus.* Si ergo pastor intrat per ostium, et ipse est ostium, ipse pastor: ipse proculdubiò intrat per semetipsum. Ecce, dum Ezechielis sensum enodare cupimus, de Evangelio etiam quæstionem ligamus. Quærendum nobis itaque est qualiter et ipse intret: et per semetipsum intret. Dominus

self be the Door by which He, singly, and in His own separate Person, hath entered? This also seems capable of a satisfactory answer. Because He entereth of His own authority. As He layeth down His own life, and taketh it again; as He is the Way, as well as the Guide; as He is the author and the finisher, the beginning and end, the source and the perfection of all power and blessing to His people; as He opened the way to Heaven, trod it first, and *became* it to His followers, so He is the door into the fold, by which He Himself entered.

Or again, when Christ entereth in by Himself, the door, the word Christ may stand, as often in other parts of Scripture, for His Church, and specifically for His under-shepherds. This is the interpretation of St. Gregory.

Or if all these verses be, as is above suggested, rightly interpreted of other shepherds, in a subordinate way, besides Himself, then the passage signifies that all who enter by Him⁴, enter duly

enim ac Redemptor noster, cum sanctâ Ecclesiâ quam redemit, secundum carnem una substantia est, Paulo attestante, qui ait, *Adimpleo ea quæ desunt passionum Christi in carne meâ pro corpore ejus, quod est Ecclesia.* Cum ergo electi quique ad vitam perveniunt, quia membra ejus per eam intrant ad eum, ipse per se intrat ad se. Ipse enim in suis membris est qui intrat, ipse caput ad quod intrantia membra perveniunt.—S. Gregor. Magn. Hom. iii. lib. ii. in Ezech. (cf. Hom. i.)

⁴ Καλοὶ καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς· κρεῖσσον δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, ὃς μόνος πεπίστευται τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ

into the fold, and are true and good shepherds. He enters first and chiefly (whether by the door of ancient Scripture, or by Himself, need not for our present purpose be discussed); others by Him, the door.

But in the eleventh verse He adds another most important particular to the pastoral doctrine, "I am *the* good Shepherd." In these words there can be no doubt that He speaks of a single shepherd. Whatever other persons may have of other or derived pastoral powers, He says of Himself, that He is *the* good Shepherd." Others enter by Him, the door; but they only enter by Himself into Himself; for He is both Door and Shepherd; each alone, and each perfectly; the only door, and the only shepherd of original, plenary, un-derived, power, whose own the sheep are, and in whom all the signs of a shepherd do fully and perfectly meet.

There is a further obscurity about these important verses, which it is well to notice, though it does not bear directly on the present argument. In the first verses, entering in by the door is said of shepherds; in the ninth verse it seems rather to be said of the sheep. It is the shepherds who, in the beginning of the passage, are contradistin-

Θεοῦ· αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ οἱ προφῆται, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία· πάντα ταῦτα εἰς ἐνότητα Θεοῦ.—S. Ignat. ad Phil. ix.

guished from thieves and robbers, whereas the going in and out and finding pasture of the later verses appear to belong (according to the expressions so common in the Old Testament) to the sheep of Christ's flock.

On the whole, then, this passage furnishes a remarkable instance of our Lord's frequent manner of teaching in the Gospels. He begins by a statement of a less precise and determinate kind,—a statement which may seem in some cases metaphorical or figurative in expression, in others vague or uncertain in application;—when this statement excites wonder or opposition, He does not withdraw or modify it, but adds some striking, and, as it were, more paradoxical point of doctrine, which identifies, if I may so speak, and particularizes the meaning of the earlier statements. In some cases, as here and in the 6th of St. John, He goes on to add a second particular of the same kind, which has the effect of increasing the apparent paradox, but meanwhile of perfecting the statement of the mystery which He is revealing. There can, therefore, be little doubt of the general doctrine of this signal passage. Christ is the single shepherd, whom ancient prophecy designated, and to whom the sheep of God are committed as His own. Others may enter into a portion of the pastoral office (nay, He also enters) by Himself, the door. Herein are the signs to be found, which distinguish the true shepherds from

the thieves and robbers. And perhaps it may be stated generally, in the way of a rule of interpretation, that those discourses ⁵ of Christ which are formed upon the model above described, are to be doctrinally interpreted in the reverse direction. The statements which He reaches last, are in each case the first principles of the mysterious doctrine.

Some part of the great pastoral office to which He was thus designated by ancient prophecy, and His own Divine words, our Blessed Lord discharged while He remained on the earth in the flesh ; pitying, tending, feeding, loving those who had been as sheep having no shepherd ; and above all, exhibiting that greatest token of the good shepherd, the laying down of His life for the sheep ⁶. But when He had done this, and, having now risen from the grave, was about to ascend where He was before, He left behind Him in the great Saying which we are now considering, the institution of a pastoral succession to the end of the world. Thus, ascended, He feeds His flock. Thus, ascended, He feeds those who having never seen Him in the flesh, “hear his voice” through the voice of His priests ; are called “by name” by the commissioned calling of His priests ; “follow and know Him ⁷,” because they see Him and acknowledge Him in His appointed priests : not

⁵ Cf. St. John iii. 3—5 ; vi. 27. 33. 35. 41. 51. 53.

⁶ St. John x. 11.

⁷ Ibid. x. 3, 4.

relinquishing the care of them to hirelings whose own the sheep are not, but bidding and empowering St. Peter and the rest of the Apostles⁸ to feed and guide them for Him, with Him, and in Him.

And so the inspired Apostles in later times do comment upon this sacred Saying, nothing doubting that though they held under the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls⁹, yet to them also is committed the true pastoral charge of tending the flock of Christ. So speaks St. Peter, the original receiver of the pastoral commission. “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away¹.” And St. Paul, addressing the Ephesian elders, “Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath

⁸ Cum dicitur Petro, ad omnes dicitur, Pasce oves meas.—S. Aug. de Agone Christi, 30 (quoted by Barrow on the Pope’s Supremacy).

⁹ 1 St. Pet. ii. 5.

¹ Ibid. v. 1—4.

made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood ².”

4. Made to rest on love of Christ.

Nor must it be forgotten ³, while we speak of the pastoral commission as thus given by our Lord, that it is made to rest wholly upon the love of Him. Lovest thou me? Lovest thou me more than these? more than these men love me? more than the beloved Apostle? more than thou lovest these things? more than thou lovest the world, its occupations, pleasures, ambitions, distinctions, honours? Then feed my sheep. Then enter into the fold, a shepherd of the sheep, through Me, who am the Door. Feed them which are Mine, and love them because they are Mine. Feed them in Me, and I will feed them in thee. Hast thou true love of Christ, and, for His sake, a heart enlarged ⁴, an heart to live or lay down thy life for the sheep? Then mayest thou not be unfit to receive a portion in that apostolic inheritance which, first given to St. Peter, has from him and his brethren descended to God's priests, by the Holy Ghost, in every age of the Church, to be in thy degree a shepherd of men's souls. The power of the keys had been given as the Divine reward of a divinely implanted faith; the pastoral power is attached as a sacred gift to love ⁵.

² Acts xx. 28. ³ V. Appendix, on the Pastoral Office.

⁴ 2 Cor. vi. 11; vii. 3.

⁵ Origen, Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. lib. v.

This great Saying of the forty days was addressed individually to St. Peter, and as far as the words declare, appears to be said to him alone. The Pastoral Commission not confined to St. Peter.

For whereas the baptismal commission is expressed in the plural, and the power of absolution is conferred by the breath and words of Christ upon the whole body of the Apostles, the words of this Saying are conveyed in the singular number, and appear therefore, at the first sight, to belong to St. Peter alone.

Do they then convey the pastoral power to St. Peter only? or to St. Peter above the other Apostles? or to all the Apostles equally?

This is a most important question: important in itself, as involving some of the great principles of the kingdom of heaven, and important in its consequences, as containing the great point of the difference which severs the west of Christendom; but on the principles of interpretation which we have hitherto pursued, it is not a difficult question.

In order to evade the pressure of the *primá facie* argument of St. Peter's pastoral supremacy, derived from these words, it is sometimes maintained that they are to be explained as words of exhortation merely, not of ordination. It is thought that the Apostolic powers having been fully given in other words and at other times, St. Peter is here only admonished and exhorted by the Lord to the earnest, pastoral exercise of them.

There is, no doubt, much force in this argument ; for if the baptizing and absolving powers were really given to all the Apostles alike, it is difficult to understand how the pastoral ones can be given to St. Peter alone, or above the others. Whatever the precise powers designated by feeding the sheep of Christ may be, they cannot be conceived to exclude those which are unquestionably conveyed in the other Sayings, the making disciples, the baptizing, the teaching, the teaching to obey the precepts of Christ, the forgiving and retaining of sins. Therefore, if the Apostles are equal in the other powers, it seems impossible that they can be unequal in this one : and it is to be observed, that the argument for St. Peter's superiority in this one (the verbal argument) is identical with that which proves their equality with him in the others.

Further weight, however, than this it is difficult to assign to this answer. For not only are the words of our Lord in these sacred days all (as far as their form goes) apparently enacting, and not only hortatory words (and even if this be doubtful, it is at least very bold to pronounce confidently that some are enacting and others not so), but also, these particular words have, not less, perhaps more than others, the appearance of words of ordination. Thrice spoken, and spoken even to grief of St. Peter, they certainly bear a *primâ facie* semblance of conveying powers, and

this *primá facie* semblance, particularly when combined with the general character of the Sayings of these days, seems to be sufficient to put aside what cannot be more than a mere assumption, that while the neighbouring words all convey powers, these only contain an exhortation. Add to which, that an exhortation is itself an ordination, when uttered by One possessed of plenary and original powers.

It cannot, then, be well denied, that the first aspect of these famous words appears to put St. Peter into a position of such eminence amongst his brethren the Apostles, as to suggest the idea that the Pastoral Office belongs, by the Lord's gift, to him alone, and is derived from him to the others.

Why then do we come to the very opposite conclusion, and hold that the Apostles are, in all Apostolical powers whatever, and the Pastoral among the rest, entirely equal and independent of one another?

Let the argument already stated stand for the first answer to this question. They who are equal in power to make disciples, to baptize, to teach obedience, to absolve from sin, and to retain sins, cannot be conceived to be unequal in those other powers, if they be others, or whatever precise ones they are supposed to be, which are conveyed in the pastoral commission.

1. Because the Apostles are equal in other Apostolic powers.

But the real answer to the question asked above

2. From the com-

mentary of
the later
Scriptures.

is this. When we turn to the Apostolic commentary upon these sacred Sayings contained in the later Scriptures, a commentary from which (as has been shown above) we derive the undeniable and inspired record of the meaning in which the Lord spake them, and the holy Apostles, under the Spirit of knowledge and power, understood and administered them, we find a complete and final proof of the equality of the Apostles in all Apostolic powers, and a disproof of any personal superiority of St. Peter, even in any such peculiar powers as may be esteemed specifically pastoral. It is impossible that this argument can be stated too strongly. There is not, from one end to the other of the Apostolical Epistles, a verse or word that can be (I might almost add, that has been) tortured into proving or supporting the pastoral supremacy of St. Peter. There are, meanwhile, many words and passages, and recorded acts, which do most distinctly disprove it. If, then, the relation of the later to the earlier Scriptures, and of both to these great Sayings, described in a former discourse, (wherein the earlier Scriptures are represented to stand as an anticipation of the Church, these great Sayings as the enactment and institution of it, and the later Apostolic writings as the inspired commentary upon the Sayings, and record of the manner in which, under the Holy Spirit, they were acted out,) if this relation be in any degree true and real, and if (as is now asserted)

the supposed pastoral supremacy of St. Peter is not only absolutely unknown to that commentary and record, but directly contradicted by it, it is difficult to conceive that any other considerations can be adduced capable of balancing the weight of an argument in its own nature so final and convincing. And, in fact, every other consideration does only strengthen and confirm the conclusion to which the later Scriptures thus decisively lead us.

For example, in the account of the council of the Church held at Jerusalem, as recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, “the Apostles and Elders” are repeatedly mentioned, without any indication of a supremacy of pastoral power exercised by one among them. St. Peter, indeed, spoke, after there had been much disputing, with the weight that belonged to so eminent an Apostle, and alleged his claim to be heard among them, not on the ground of supremacy of any kind, but as having been the one by whose mouth God had chosen that the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe. Then, after the narrative of St. Paul and St. Barnabas had been heard, and they had held their peace, St. James ⁶ (holding, as ancient tradition uniformly declares, the office of Bishop of Jerusalem) *answered* ⁷, and gave, to all appearance, the *sentence*, in pursuance of

i. as contained in the account of the Council of Jerusalem.

⁶ Acts xv. 19.

⁷ ἀπεκρίθη—διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω.

which the letter was written, in the name of the Apostles, and Elders, and Brethren, to all the Churches. If any person wishes to judge of the weight of this argument, let him imagine a council held in the later ages of the Church, at which the Pope and eleven Bishops should be present, and among them the local Bishop of the city in which the council was held, and consider how far the papal claims would be satisfied by the modest and equal demeanour of St. Peter in the council of Jerusalem.

ii. as exhibited in the complete Apostolic equality of St. Paul.

Again; to take the instance of St. Paul, it is hardly possible that any argument can be fuller, or more satisfactory than that which proves, from the later Scriptures, his full Apostolical equality with St. Peter⁸.

A youthful Pharisee, exceedingly zealous of God, and verily thinking with himself that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, is suddenly, in the midst of a journey of persecution, struck to the earth by the light and voice of God. Blinded by the vision of that Just One whom he had seen, and the voice of whose mouth he had heard, he is led by the hand of them that were with him, and brought into Damascus. There he is restored to sight,

⁸ Nec Paulus inferior Petro—cum primo quoque conferendus, et nulli secundus.—S. Ambros. de Sp. S. ii. 12.

τί γὰρ Πέτρου μεῖζον; τί δὲ Παύλου ἴσον; S. Chrys. t. v. Or. 167 (quoted by Barrow on the Pope's Supr. vii. 64).

and receives holy baptism, for the remission of his sins, from the hands of Ananias; and with it an announcement of his destination to be a witness unto all men of what he had seen and heard. Immediately he confers not with flesh and blood, nor goes up to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before him, but goes into Arabia, and thence returns unto Damascus. After three years spent, apparently at Damascus, in preaching Christ in the synagogues that He is the Son of God, he goes up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abides with him fifteen days, but sees none other of the Apostles save James the bishop, the Lord's brother. In this visit he has wonderful revelations of God in the Temple, and again receives the promise of a mission amongst the Gentiles⁹.

Did St. Paul then, thus converted, baptized, and designated as an Apostle, derive authority, or in any manner hold under or by St. Peter his pastoral office as an Apostle? Nay, we have his own authority for saying, that he was "an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead¹;" and he "was separated from his mother's womb, and God had called him by his grace to reveal his Son in him, that he might preach him among the Gentiles." Or did he, in his visit of fifteen days to Jerusalem to see Peter, receive the

⁹ 2 Cor. xii. 2. Acts xxii. 21.

¹ Gal. i. 1.

pastoral powers of an Apostle, which he then proceeded to exercise in other lands? But not a word to such effect is to be found in any part of the Holy Scriptures. Add to which, that his subsequent words and acts towards St. Peter wholly disprove such a supposition; and that he *did* receive a special outward call to that very Apostolic office to which he had before been designated by the Holy Ghost, but not either mediately or immediately from St. Peter. For as certain prophets² and teachers ministered to the Lord and fasted, at Antioch, the Holy Ghost said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."

The very singularity, and, if it may be so called, uniqueness of this consecration, disproves all idea of authority derived from St. Peter, or subordinate to him. An Apostle is consecrated, not by Apostles, but by Prophets and Teachers. They who have no ordinary commission to ordain even subordinate ministers, much less Apostles, are by a special commission of the Holy Ghost empowered to separate by imposition of hands two men to the Apostolic work and office. Did St. Paul by this commission receive only those other Apostolic powers (whatever they may be) without the Pas-

² Acts xiii. 1, 2.

toral? Nay, but we find him ordaining³ elders in every city, and reminding those whom he has himself ordained, of their pastoral duty of feeding the flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost (no doubt by the imposition of his hands) had made them overseers.

However, fourteen years after his former visit to Jerusalem, after having preached, ordained, and exercised, as far as can be known, every office of the Apostolate, he went up again to Jerusalem; and there he “communicated unto them that Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means he should run, or had run, in vain⁴.” Did St. Paul, then, in this “communication,” made after so long exercise of the Apostolic office, respecting which he expresses himself thus humbly, did he then receive from St. Peter any derivation of power, or authorization of the exercise of it, such as would show that St. Peter was the original and single holder, under Christ, of the pastoral powers? The verses which follow in the second chapter to the Galatians, finally disprove any such supposition. He not only, even then, maintained with much force the Gospel liberty against certain false brethren, but speaks thus of himself in respect of the position in which he stood to St. Peter and the other Apostles. “But

³ Acts xx. 28; xiv. 23.

⁴ Gal. ii. 2.

of those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me. God accepteth no man's person: for they who seemed to be somewhat, in conference added nothing to me. But contrariwise, when they saw that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the Gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter (for he that wrought effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles); and when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision ⁵." Thus his equal Apostleship with St. Peter was expressly recognized ⁶ by St. Peter and the other leading Apostles; and the right hands of fellowship signified their acknowledgment that he was, even as they, one of the equal and duly commissioned Apostolic witnesses of the Lord's resurrection.

Very shortly afterwards appears to have come the visit of St. Peter to Antioch, when, as if to leave on record to the last ages of the Church the true independent Apostolicity of St. Paul, and to fix the limits of St. Peter's personal privileges, the

⁵ Gal. ii. 6—9.

⁶ καὶ δείκνυσιν αὐτοῖς ὁμότιμον ὄντα λοιπὸν, καὶ οὐ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ἀλλὰ τῷ κορυφαίῳ συγκρίνει, δεικνὺς ὅτι τῆς αὐτῆς ἕκαστος ἀπέλαυσεν ἀξίας.—S. Chrysost. Hom. in Gal.

Holy Ghost has written how St. Paul publicly withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews⁷?" This narrative appears to put in the clearest possible light the complete Apostolic equality of these two Apostles. It cannot be that St. Paul was in any point inferior to St. Peter, if he was at liberty to act and judge independently of him, and in the holy confidence of that judgment to rebuke him before all. And what powers that St. Peter had not, can the successor of St. Peter have derived from him? How should not a successor of St. Paul, a Bishop duly consecrated to his office by the successive laying on of Apostolic hands from St. Paul, have like liberty to maintain

⁷ Gal. ii. 11—14. .

the purity of Apostolic Truth? And if the successor of St. Peter, unlike his meek and faithful predecessor, should maintain himself in error, and vindicate a claim of infallible truth and supreme authority which he never inherited, how should not the successor of St. Paul be guiltless, in submitting, with meek regret, and many prayers for peace, even to be driven from his communion?

It is hardly necessary to add further proof from the Epistles of the entire Apostolic equality of St. Paul with St. Peter. If further evidence be needed, it is abundantly supplied in many statements of St. Paul, speaking of himself, and magnifying, not beyond the letter of the sacred warrant, his divine office: "For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles ⁸." "For in nothing am I behind the very chiefest Apostles, though I be nothing ⁹."

iii. as shown
in the in-
dependence
of the
Apostolic
Churches.

But again, the Churches founded by St. Paul, though communicating in prayers, and alms, and all kinds of Christian sympathy and love with other Christian Churches, appear, as far as Scriptural evidence can be brought to bear upon the point, to have been founded, governed, and addressed by this Apostle without the smallest re-

⁸ The metrical arrangement of this important verse may cause it to be the better remembered :

*λογίζομαι γὰρ μηδὲν ὑστερηκέμαι
τῶν ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀποστόλων.*

⁹ 2 Cor. xi. 5 ; xii. 11, 12.

ference to any personal claim of pastoral superiority in St. Peter. It is difficult to establish a negative point of this kind by quotations. But it may be most strongly stated, without fear of contradiction, that whether we examine, from the evidence of the Epistles, the state of the Corinthian, Galatian, Ephesian, Thessalonian, Colossian, or even the Roman Church, in respect of the pastoral and Apostolic authority which they were taught to acknowledge, there is not a word or syllable which can, even in the most indirect way, give countenance to the idea of their owing to St. Peter personally any such submission as would have been due from them, if he could have claimed the pastoral superintendence of Christendom. In the two Epistles to the Corinthians, particularly, and the Epistle to the Galatians, the manner in which St. Paul vindicates his own Apostolic and equal authority completely negatives all thought of their being taught to look, through him, to another Apostle as the depository of pastoral authority¹. "If he be not an Apostle to others²" (the argument is strictly *ad homines*), he is so to them. "They are the seal of his Apostleship in the Lord." If, again, some of them *did* say, "I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of *Cephas*; and I of Christ;" St. Paul rebuked this unchristian spirit by replying, "Who then is

¹ S. Clem. Rom. ad Cor. xlvi.

² 1 Cor. ix. 2.

Paul, and who Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase³." And, then, giving the true account of the building⁴ of the Christian Church, how that "other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ," he adds, "Therefore let no man glory in man. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." The Churches founded by St. Paul are taught by him to look to himself as their Apostle, and through him to Christ. The notion of a further subjection due from them to another See, another Bishop, or another Apostle, is entirely absent from his Epistles. On the contrary, he particularly states that he has striven to preach the Gospel where Christ was not named, "lest he should build on another man's foundation⁵;" that "as a wise master-builder he has laid the foundation⁶;" that he does not "stretch himself beyond his measure," "to boast in another man's line of things made ready to his hand⁷."

Planted by him, then, taught by him, baptized

³ 1 Cor. iii. 5, 6.

⁴ Compare St. Matt. xvi. 16, with 1 Cor. iii. 11, and Eph. ii. 20.

⁵ Rom. xv. 20.

⁶ 1 Cor. iii. 10.

⁷ 2 Cor. x. 14. 16.

under his direction, ruled by him, receiving their several bishops from him, addressed in long written letters by him, which very letters form great part of the commentary of the Spirit upon the powers and constitution of the Church, how should it be conceivable that these Churches owed to St. Peter (earnest, faithful, and loving as he was, yet still the Apostle of the circumcision, and openly rebuked by St. Paul) a subjection unknown to the Apostolic Epistles, and contradicted, directly or indirectly, by many passages in them?

And so, if Churches founded by St. Peter had, in the course of ages, and in consequence of that frailty of man which led St. Peter himself astray at Antioch, become involved in error of faith and practice—an error in which they should persist after remonstrance, and even drive the remonstrants from their communion,—what would have been the duty of the Apostolic Church of Corinth, what of the Apostolic Church of Ephesus, what of the Apostolic Church of Galatia, to which St. Paul addressed those remarkable words—“there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed^s;” —what, but to hope, in all brotherliness of feeling, and earnest sorrow for the

^s Gal. i. 8.

disunion of Christendom, that the guilt of schism did not lie at their door, that they at least had not forfeited the inheritance of Apostolic truth, or the succession of Divine grace, nor yet the enlarged heart and desire of union which belong to Apostolic love?

3. From the manner in which the Gospels speak of the Apostles and the Church.

3. Again; when we look into the Gospels, and examine the passages which speak in anticipation of the Church and its constitution in these respects, it is impossible to deny that there are several which seem to portend some kind of eminency or superiority of St. Peter above the other Apostles. These passages we believe to have their fulfilment in that acknowledged eminency of order which has at all times been accorded to St. Peter; an eminency, wholly disjoined from any superiority of Apostolic powers, or any headship or primacy of authority in the Church, which is exhibited in his having been the Apostle selected of God to baptize the first Gentile convert, in his being confessedly an eminent pillar of the Church, in his being made, at different times, the pattern of Faith and Love to all his brethren, whom, after his own conversion, he should help to strengthen.

There are other passages, however, bearing upon the constitution of the Church, which appear to be incompatible with the idea of any primacy of authority or power to be exercised by one Apostle over his brethren. Such is that passage, already

referred to, from the 29th chapter of St. Matthew :
“And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the Regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel⁹.”
In this passage it is immaterial to the present purpose how the phrase “the Regeneration” is interpreted : whether it signifies the present condition of things, the militant kingdom, in which Regeneration of souls is given in the Church, or the future and glorious kingdom, when the bodies of men shall be raised from the graves, which is more commonly called Resurrection. For in either case, it is the equality of the Apostolic Thrones which it is important to observe. There is One Throne above all, and twelve below it. We do not hear of one of these twelve raised above the others. The twelve thrones are spoken of as equal. The apex of the pyramid of Church authority, if I may use such a figure, is out of sight. Clouds and darkness surround it. It is the Ascended Lord, invisible, but ever present, the single source and summit of all power and blessing. But where human eyes can reach, there is no single summit. Where the cloud begins, we see twelve ; twelve of equal delegated power, to whom certain words are said *in one*, that they

⁹ St. Matt. xix. 28. cf. Rev. xxi. 14. v. Hammond on St. Matt. xvi. 19.

may know that Christ designed them to be all one in Him.

Again, in the signal passage, already more than once referred to, of the 18th of St. Matthew, where the Lord promises to the whole Church the powers which in the 16th chapter had seemed to be promised exclusively to St. Peter, He seems (in pursuance of that method of discourse which has been observed above) to lay down in the concluding verses the *principle* of all those powers and blessings in the Church which He had been speaking of. Not only whatsoever they bound on earth should be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever they loosed on earth should be loosed in heaven, but also any prayer offered by more than one of them, together, upon earth, should be done for them by their Father in Heaven. And why? What is the assigned principle, and, if I may so call it, *secret* of these wonderful powers and privileges? It is this: that “whosoever two or three have been gathered (*συννηγμένοι*) in my name (*εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα*), there am I in the midst of them ¹.” ² Duly gathered into His name, they have the blessing of His presence, and “thereby,” says Bishop Pearson, “they become a Church ².”

¹ St. Matt. xviii. 15—20.

² The latter of these promises giveth not only an assurance of the continuance of the Church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of Christ. *Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ, there He is*

Thus this passage seems to give the essential constitution of a Church of God. It exists, and has its being in the Presence of Christ with men. This Presence is not properly with an individual, who cannot alone be a Church, but with several. When then several have been by Holy Baptism (administered by those who under the commission of Christ have been empowered to administer it) gifted with the spiritual life, the regeneration of the Holy Ghost, then Christ is there, and there is the essential Church. If this be so, then is the being of a Church, and its true Apostolic character, not to be sought in its subjection to one Apostle or to one see, but in its possession of that duly “gathered many” upon which depends the presence of the Lord, and with that presence the Divine Gift of Prayer, and the Absolving Power.

4. But ³ it may be asked, How should our Lord ^{4.} How our Lord is to

in the midst of them, and thereby they become a Church; for they are as a builded house, and the Son within that house.—Pearson on the Creed, Art. ix.

³ Dean Field on the Church, b. 5, c. 24. “Of the pre-eminence that Peter had amongst the Apostles, and the reason why Christ directed His speeches specially to him.

“The reason why, more specially, notwithstanding this His general intendment, He directed His speech to Peter, than to any of the rest, was either that he was more ancient, and more ardent in charity than the rest,—or lest he might seem to be despised for his denial of Christ,—or else because he first confessed Christ to be the Son of the living God,—because he

be understood in addressing St. Peter only.

have said words like these to St. Peter, unless He thereby did intend to impart peculiar, separate, and so supreme pastoral power to him?

i. The words contain no exclusion of others.

Let it be first observed, that the words themselves carry no exclusion of others. “*Pasce oves meas*” do in themselves not necessarily convey the meaning “do so alone,” or “exclusively of others,” or even “pre-eminently above others.”

ii. The words are very parallel to St. Matt. xvi. 16.

Again, our Lord did, in the 16th of St. Matthew, give, as it were, an exact model of His present form of speech, when He said to St. Peter, “*Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*” These words were at the time addressed to St. Peter alone; and yet we certainly know that they were not intended for St. Peter ⁴ exclusively of the

was much conversant with Christ,—or, lastly, because Christ meant there should be a certain order among the guides of His Church, and some to whom the rest in all places should resort in all matters of importance, as to such as are more honourable than other of the same rank and degree, &c.”—p. 486.

⁴ *Quod enim ad ipsum propriè pertinet, naturâ unus homo erat, gratiâ unus Christianus, abundantiore gratiâ unus idemque primus Apostolus: sed quando ei dictum est, Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum, &c. universam significabat Ecclesiam—quæ fundata est super petram, unde Petrus nomen habuit. Non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petrâ—Ecclesia ergo quæ fundatur in Christo, claves ab eo regni cœlorum accepit in Petro.—S. Augustin. Tract. in Joh. Ev. cxxiv.*

other Apostles; for in the 18th chapter of the same Gospel they are repeated in a promise to the Church; and in the 20th of St. John the promised power is given to the Apostles without distinction or difference.

St. Cyril of Alexandria suggests one answer to this question which is perfectly consistent with the whole analogy of Scriptural doctrine. "Why," he asks, "does He ask Simon only, though the other disciples are standing by? What can the words, 'Feed my lambs,' and the like, mean to signify? We say, then, that the divine Peter had previously been appointed, together with the other disciples, to the divine Apostleship; but when the plot of the Jews was effected, and he fell in some measure, (for the divine Peter being seized with great fear, thrice denied the Lord,) He heals the disorder, and by questions elicits the triple confession, setting this as a compensation against that, and fitting the restoration as a counterpoise to the falls." The writer proceeds, quoting St. Paul as an instance of a shepherd devoting himself to the well-being of the sheep, and concludes the passage thus: "Therefore by means of the triple confession of the blessed Peter, the triple offence of his denial was done away; and through the words of the Lord, 'Feed my lambs,' a restoration of the previously given Apostleship is understood to have been bestowed, which putteth

iii. The interpretation of St. Cyril of Alexandria.

away the reproach of the former falls, and extinguisheth the little-mindedness of human infirmity⁵.”

iv. The interpretation of St. Cyprian.

St. Cyprian, in his treatise “de Unitate Ecclesiæ,” alleges another reason for the separate address to St. Peter in this passage, and the 16th of St. Matthew. “The Lord saith unto Peter, ‘I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not conquer it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.’ And again He saith to the same man after the Resurrection, ‘Feed my sheep.’ He builds His Church on one. And although He giveth equal power to all the Apostles, and saith, ‘As my Father hath sent me, so send I you;’ ‘Receive the Holy Ghost: if ye shall forgive any man’s sins, they shall be forgiven him; and if ye retain the sins of any, they shall be retained;’ nevertheless, to manifest unity, He by His own authority arranged that the origin of that unity should begin in one. The other Apostles were what Peter was, endowed with an equal participation of honour and power, but the beginning pro-

⁵ S. Cyril. Alex. in S. Joan. xxi. ed. Auber, vol. iv. pp. 1118. 1120.

ceeds from unity, that the Church may be shewn to be one ⁶.”

It may perhaps not be unsuitable to complete the sketch of this argument by referring to a few passages of the writings of the Fathers of the first three centuries, in order to confirm the ancient tradition of the entire equality in all powers and rights, not excluding the pastoral, of the whole Apostolic College.

St. Clement of Rome has no passage expressly to the point; but he speaks of the commission of the Apostles from Christ, and their ordaining successors, in a way which forms a strong negative argument against any supremacy of pastoral power in St. Peter. “Christ, therefore, was sent forth from God, and the Apostles from Christ ⁷.” “They therefore appointed those before mentioned, and left a continuation of succession, in order that if they fell asleep, other approved men might succeed to their office.” He also refers to St. Paul’s expressions in 1 Cor. i. 10, in language ⁸ which strongly corroborates the inference already drawn from that passage ⁹.

5. The equality of the Apostles confirmed from the tradition of the early Fathers.

i. St. Clement of Rome.

⁶ S. Cyprian, de Unit. Ecclesiæ, ed. Fell. p. 107.

⁷ S. Clem. Rom. ad Cor. c. xlii. καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐπινομήν δὲ δώκασι, c. xliv.—v. Jacobson’s note.

⁸ c. xlvii.

⁹ St. Clement of Rome, in a fragment of very doubtful genuineness, calls St. Peter by the title of *πρωτοκορυφαῖος*. The compound used seems to belong to a more recent date;

ii. St. Ignatius.

The argument from St. Ignatius is also negative, but more precise, for he is constantly urging upon the Churches to which he writes, the duty of unity, and yet subjection to St. Peter is an idea wholly foreign to his genuine Epistles. "As then the Lord did nothing without the Father, though He were One with Him, neither by Himself, nor by the Apostles, so do ye nothing without the Bishop and the Elders." "Be subject to the Bishop, and to one another, as Jesus Christ according to the flesh was subject to his Father¹, and the Apostles to Christ and to the Father, and to the Spirit, that there may be unity both of the flesh and of the spirit." "Let all respect the elders², as the council of God, and the company of Apostles." "The Apostles, as the Presbytery of the Church³."

but the title of *κορυφαῖος*, and many similar titles, are often given to the great Apostle by those of whom it is abundantly clear from other passages that they did not intend to attribute more than a precedency of honour by such designations.

¹ S. Ignatius, ad Magn. vii. xiii.

² ὡς συνέριον Θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς σύνδεσμον Ἀποστόλων. Trall. iii.

³ Ad Phil. v.

The Epistles of St. Ignatius here cited are not of the number of those found in the Syriac version recently procured for the British Museum, and edited by the Rev. W. Cureton. I only notice this fact for the purpose of remarking, that for my present purpose (that of establishing the ancient tradition of the equality of the Apostles) they are even more valuable for being, if they be, of more modern date; whether the

St. Polycarp furnishes similar negative evidence. He nowhere hints at St. Peter's pastoral supremacy. The same is the case with the narrative of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, in which our Lord is called by a name, which in later ages has been too often applied to His Apostle, "the Shepherd of the Catholic Church throughout the world ^{4.}" iii. St. Polycarp.

Let it be observed that, on a point like this, negative evidence in all these early writers is really a strong affirmative argument. If St. Peter's pastoral supremacy (having, as it has, the *primâ facie* support of the words of our Lord) were a point so universally acknowledged in the early Church, as it must have been if it were true, no hypothesis can be framed which will account for the total absence of all mention of it from the writings of the Apostles themselves and the Fathers of the Apostolic times. But to the negative evidence of the writings of St. Polycarp must be added the affirmative evidence of his acts. For on the great question of the celebration of Easter, on which the Asiatic Churches differed from the

absence in them of any statement of the supremacy of St. Peter be accounted for on the ground that that dogma had not even then appeared in the Church, or that the writer adapted his expressions with exact dexterity to the manner of speaking in the age of St. Ignatius.

⁴ ποιμένα τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.—
S. Polyc. Mart. c. xix.

European, he entirely refused to yield to the authority or arguments of Anicetus, Bishop of Rome. “For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to keep that day, inasmuch as he had always kept it with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the other Apostles with whom he had associated; nor could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to keep it, for he said that he was bound to observe the custom of the elders before him ⁵.” And throughout that great controversy, which in the days of St. Irenæus had risen to such a height, that Pope Victor endeavoured to cut off all the Asiatic Churches from the unity of Christendom ⁶, the Eastern Bishops held the same sort of language as St. Polycarp before them. “For in Asia there sleep great men, luminaries of the Church, who shall rise in the day of the coming of the Lord, when He cometh with glory from heaven, and shall raise all the Saints, Philip one of the twelve Apostles, who sleepeth in Hierapolis, and his two daughters, who grew old as virgins. And besides, John who lay on the bosom of the Lord, who was a Priest, and bore the golden plate ⁷, and was a martyr and

⁵ S. Irenæus apud Euseb. Hist. v. 24.

⁶ Ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ μὲν τῆς Ῥωμαίων προεστῶς Βίκτωρ ἀθρόως τῆς Ἀσίας πάσης ἅμα ταῖς ὁμόροις ἐκκλησίαις τὰς παροικίας ἀποτέμνειν ὡς ἑτεροδοξούσας τῆς κοινῆς ἐνώσεως πειρᾶται· καὶ στηλιτεύει γε διὰ γραμμῶν ἀκοινωνητοὺς πάντας ἀρδην τοὺς ἐκέῖσε ἀνακηρύττων ἀδελφούς.—Euseb. Hist. v. 24.

⁷ V. Routh. not. in Polycratem. Rel. Sacr. i. 381.

teacher. And also Polycarp in Smyrna, a bishop and martyr. And Thraseas, bishop and martyr of Eumenia, who sleepeth in Smyrna. These all kept the day of the fourteenth of the Passover, according to the Gospel, transgressing in nothing, but following the canon of the faith⁸." Thus did the great Bishops of the Asiatic Churches trace their independent descent to St. John, knowing nothing nor dreaming of any submission due to the chair of St. Peter, nor doubting that they, holding fast by the faith and order which they had inherited, were true and full Apostolical Bishops of the Church of Christ.

Very little is to be found in the writings of Justin Martyr to bear upon the present point. ^{iv. St. Justin Martyr.} What there is, however, is confirmatory of the equality of the Apostles. "After He was crucified," he writes in the first Apology, "all His friends forsook Him, denying Him. But afterwards, when He had risen from the dead, and had been seen by them, and had taught them to study the prophecies, in which it had been predicted that all these things should come to pass, then having seen Him go up into heaven, and having believed, and having received power sent by Him from thence, and having gone to the whole race of mankind, they taught these things, and were called Apostles⁹." Again, in the Dialogue with

⁸ Polycrates apud Euseb. Hist. l. c.

⁹ S. Justin. Mart. Apol. i. § 51, ed. Ben. p. 73.

Trypho, he says, "The tradition of twelve bells having been hung from the long robe of the High Priest, was a symbol of the twelve Apostles appointed by the power of Christ the eternal Priest, by whose voice the whole earth was filled with the glory and grace of God and of His Christ¹."

v. Tertul-
lian.

The book of Tertullian, *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, is full of passages which indirectly confirm the tradition of the equality of the Apostles. He speaks of "the Churches as receiving all doctrine and truth from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God²." He says, "Therefore so many and great Churches are all that one first Church of the Apostles, from which they all descend. Thus all are first, and all Apostolic, while all are one. Unity is proved by the communication of peace, the name of brotherhood, the interchange of hospitality; rights which no other principle governs, but the single tradition of the same Sacrament³." And even in the passage in which he commemorates the happiness of the Roman Church, "where Peter was made equal to the Lord's passion, where Paul was crowned with the martyrdom of John, where the Apostle John, after suffering no evil from being plunged into the fiery oil, was banished to the isle of Patmos," he speaks, indirectly indeed, but very clearly, of the

¹ Dial. cum Tryphone Jud. § 42, p. 138.

² Tertull. de Præsc. Hæret. cxxxvii.

³ c. xx.

equality of the Apostolic Churches in respect of truth and authority. “Come then, thou who shalt desire to exercise thy curiosity still better in the work of thy salvation. Run over the Apostolic Churches, in which the chairs of the Apostles still preside in their own places; in which their own authentic letters are still read, uttering the voice and representing the look of each one of them. Is Achaia near you? you have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have the Thessalonians. If you are near to Italy, you have Rome, whence we also are within reach of authority ⁴.”

The testimony of St. Irenæus is in its general spirit and effect remarkably like to that of Tertulian. He uses these words respecting the thanksgiving of the Church of Jerusalem on the release of St. Peter and St. John, recorded in the fourth chapter of the Acts: “These are the words of that Church, from which every Church had its beginning; these are the words of the metropolis of the citizens of the new covenant; these are the words of the Apostles; these are the words of the disciples of the Lord; of the truly perfect; of those who after the assumption of the Lord were perfected by the Spirit ⁵.” And again, in a chapter directed to prove that St. Peter was not inferior to St. Paul, “Peter was an Apostle of the same God as Paul; and the

vi. St. Irenæus.

⁴ c. xxxvi.

⁵ S. Irenæus, c. Hær. lib. iii. c. xii.

same God and Son of God whom Peter preached to the Circumcision, Paul preached to the Gentiles. For our Lord did not come to save Paul only ; nor is God so poor as to have only one Apostle who should know the dispensation of His Son." And in the famous passage of the third book, c. Hæreses, in which he magnifies the Roman Church, and speaks of its "potior⁶ principalitas" (expressions which are abundantly explained by the natural respect due to the see of the capital city of the Roman empire, "founded by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul," but entirely inadequate to support the modern claims of supreme dominion and infallibility), he plainly speaks of the tradition of the Apostles as preserved by the succession of Bishops in every city, and proceeds to trace that successional tradition in the instances of Rome and Smyrna. Thus this passage is precisely similar to the last-quoted passage from Tertullian, and gives the same testimony to the Apostolical descent of many other churches besides the Roman, and their true independent possession of the inherited faith. Nor did St. Irenæus⁷, when expostulating, in a synodical letter, with Pope Victor against the excommunication of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, and the other Asiatic prelates, on the subject of the Easter Fast, seem to give the

⁶ S. Iren. c. Hæreses, iii. 3, 4.

⁷ Euseb. Hist. v. 24. v. Routh, Rel. Sacr. Concilium Lugdunense, vol. i. p. 391.

smallest countenance, or even to allude to the existence of any claim of supremacy in the successors of St. Peter, to which other Bishops were bound to yield. On the contrary, he distinctly claims for the Churches the privilege of adhering to the customs which they had inherited from older Bishops, and maintains their right to communion in so doing. And, it will be observed, he claimed this privilege for them, even though on the particular point at issue between the Roman and Asiatic sees, he himself sided with Rome, and presided^s at a council of French Bishops, in which the practice of the Western Church was approved.

In the writings of the Fathers of the third century, passages occur which speak with much more direct force to the present point.

“But if you think,” says Origen, “the whole ^{vii. Origen} Church built upon Peter alone, what will you say of John, the son of thunder, or each one of the Apostles? And are we to dare to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter only, but that they shall prevail against the other Apostles, and those who are perfect? Are not the quoted words, ‘the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,’ and ‘upon this rock I will build my Church,’ said of them all, and of each single one of them? Are the keys of the kingdom of

^s Ibid. v., 23.

heaven given to Peter only, and shall no other one of the blessed men receive them? And if the words, 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' are common to the others, how are not all the words, said before and said after, said, as they seem to be, to Peter, also common to the others? For in that place the words, 'whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, &c.' seem as if they were spoken to Peter. But in the Gospel of John, the Saviour giving the Holy Spirit to the disciples by means of the Breath⁹, says, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' &c."

It is in no respect in discordancy, but rather in striking and singular corroboration and illustration of the doctrine of this passage, that we find the same writer saying in other places, "From Peter himself¹, when the supremacy in feeding the sheep was delivered to him, and the Church was founded on him as on the earth, the confession of no other virtue was exacted but that of love." And again, commenting upon the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew: "But since it was necessary, although some things are said in common of Peter and those who give their brethren the three

⁹ Origen, Comm. in S. Matt. tom. xii.

¹ Petro, cum summa rerum de pascendis ovibus traderetur, et super ipsum, velut super terram fundaretur Ecclesia, nullius alterius ab eo virtutis confessio, nisi caritatis exigitur.—Comm. in Ep. ad Romanos, lib. v.

admonitions², that Peter should have some special prerogative beyond those who give the three admonitions, the words, ‘I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of the heavens,’ are said first of Peter, and are separate from the words, ‘whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, &c.’ And yet if we should attend diligently to the words of the Evangelist, we should find even in them, and in respect of these very things which seem to be common to Peter and those who thrice admonish their brethren, a great difference and superiority in the things said to Peter above what is said to the others. For it is no small difference, that Peter should have received the keys not of one heaven, but of several heavens, and that whatsoever he should bind on earth should be bound not in one heaven only, but in all the heavens, &c.³”

The claims of the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter to the submission of Christendom, must indeed have been unheard of and unknown, when a writer like Origen, searching for some point of superiority in St. Peter above the other Apostles, finds it at last in the fact that in the passage of St. Matthew xvi. 19, the word *οὐράνων* occurs in the plural number, whereas in xviii. 18, it is *οὐράνου* in the singular!

The following passage of Firmilian, Bishop of ^{vii. Firmilian.} Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, combines the statement of

² St. Matt. xviii. 15—17.

³ Comm. in St. Matt. tom. xiii.

the true dignity of St. Peter with that of the real independence and equality of the Apostles. “What, however, is the error, and how great the blindness of him who says that remission of sins can be given in the synagogue of heretics, and who does not abide on the foundation of the one Church which was founded on the Rock, may be understood from hence, that Christ said to St. Peter alone, ‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind,’ &c., and again in the Gospel, when Christ breathed on the Apostles alone, saying, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost,’ &c. Therefore the power of remitting sins was given to the Apostles, and to the Churches which they, being sent by Christ, founded, and to the Bishops who succeeded them by vicarious ordination. And in this point I have a right to be indignant at the open and manifest folly of Stephen (this is Pope Stephen, the Bishop of Rome), because he who boasts so highly of the place of his Episcopate, and maintains that he is the successor of St. Peter, on whom the foundations of the Church were laid, introduces many other Rocks, and establishes the fabric of many other Churches ⁴.”

viii. St. Cyprian. The doctrine of St. Cyprian upon the point before us is extremely full and clear from many passages of his treatises and epistles. A remarkable passage from the treatise “de Unitate Eccle-

⁴ Ep. Firmiliani apud S. Cypriani Epist.

siaë," has been quoted above, in which he says plainly, that "Christ gave to all the Apostles equal authority," and that "all the other Apostles were what Peter was, endowed with an equal participation of honour and power."

In other places he says, "There is one God, and one Christ, and one Church, and one Chair founded by the voice of the Lord on Peter ⁵." This doctrine is thus repeated in the Epistle of Cornelius to St. Cyprian: "Nor are we ignorant that there is one God, one Christ, the Lord whom we have confessed, one Holy Ghost, that there ought to be one Bishop in the Catholic Church ⁶." This assertion, which at the first sight might seem to favour the modern claims of the Roman see, is thus interpreted in the treatise "de Unitate:" "The Episcopate is one; of which every individual (Bishop) participates possessing it entire ⁷." And again, elsewhere: "From Christ there is one Church, divided throughout the whole world into many members; and one Episcopate, diffused by the 'concordant numerosity' of many Bishops ⁸." Thus the Episcopate is "single and indivisible ⁹," but

⁵ Ep. xliii. S. Cypr. Plebi, ed. Fell. p. 83.

⁶ Ep. xlix. p. 93. Cornelius Cypriano.

⁷ Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.—De Unit. Eccl. p. 107.

⁸ Episcopatus unus, Episcoporum multorum concordie numerositate diffusus. Ep. lv. Cyprianus Antoniano, p. 112.

⁹ Episcopatum—unum atque indivisum probemus.—De Unit. Eccl. p. 108.

held in equal truth and fulness by many. All alike hold under the promise made to St. Peter¹. That promise was addressed to him personally, “to manifest unity;” but in him, was addressed alike to all. There are many shepherds, but the flock is one²; in order that if any member of our college (Bishops) endeavour to make heresy, and tear the flock of Christ, the rest may assist, and, like good shepherds, collect the Lord’s sheep into the flock. All shepherds hold by no other right than that of legitimate and successive ordination³. Yet St. Peter himself, whom the Lord chose first, and on whom He built His Church, when afterwards Paul disputed with him about circumcision, did not claim any thing to himself so insolently or arrogantly as to say that he held a primacy, or that he ought rather to be obeyed by the present and future generation.

ix. The
case of St.
Cyprian.

The force of these passages of St. Cyprian and Firmilian is greatly increased, when it is remembered how they acted in respect of the successor of St. Peter, the Bishop of the Roman see. Not only did they differ with him, strongly and pointedly, upon the subject of the rebaptism of persons heretically baptized, but they persevered in this difference to the length of incurring his excom-

¹ Ep. xxxiii. p. 66. Ep. lxvi. p. 166.

² Ep. lxviii. p. 178.

³ Ep. lxix. p. 181, 182.

munication⁴. Nor even when excommunicated did they seem to entertain any uneasiness or fear lest separation from Rome should have cut them

⁴ The fact of the excommunication of St. Cyprian is denied by Baronius. It is thus asserted by Fleury: "Il rejettoit la décision du concile d'Afrique; et déclaroit qu'il ne communiqueroit plus avec Cyprien et les autres évêques du même sentiment, s'ils ne quittoient leur opinion." But there can be no doubt of the fact. The excommunication of Firmilian and the Asiatic Bishops is proved by Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vii. 5), and Firmilian's Epistle; and that of St. Cyprian, though not absolutely proved by the Epistle of St. Cyprian to Pompeius, is plainly asserted by Firmilian in his Epistle to St. Cyprian in these passages: "Quod nunc Stephanus ausus est facere, rumpens adversum vos pacem." "Quid enim humilium aut lenius quam cum tot Episcopis per totum mundum dissensisse: pacem cum singulis vario discordiæ genere rumpentem, modò cum Orientalibus (quod nec vos latere confidimus) modò vobiscum, qui in meridie estis," &c. "Et tamen non pudet Stephanum—fraternitatem scindere: insuper et Cyprianum pseudochristum, et pseudoapostolum, et dolosum operarium dicere."—The point is also clear from the testimony of St. Augustine.—v. the passage quoted in p. 186.

It has been similarly denied, that Polycrates, Bp. of Ephesus, was excommunicated by Pope Victor (v. Routh. Annot. in Concilium Lugdunense, vol. i. p. 395). It is, no doubt, important to the Romish argument that neither of these excommunications should have taken place; for, if they did, they were certainly regarded as ineffectual to cut off from the Catholic body the Bishops against whom they were directed, and such unquestionable want of power would go far towards disproving the claims of the Roman Bishop. But, important or no, there can be no real doubt of the historical facts.

off from the body of Christ, or disproved the legitimacy of their succession from the Apostles. On the contrary, they rely on the Scriptures of God, and the Apostolic tradition of truth, and reply to the sentence of Pope Stephen by saying, "He is the true schismatic, who has made himself an apostate from the communion of Ecclesiastical unity. For while thou thinkest that all men can be excommunicated by thee, thou hast only excommunicated thyself from all ⁵." Neither of these Fathers ⁶ seems to have recanted the doctrines which they held, and neither was received into any formal reconciliation with the Church of Rome. Each of them is esteemed, the one in the Western, the other in the Eastern Church, a Saint and Doctor of the highest eminence. It is true, that the decision of the Church ⁷ has pro-

⁵ *Lites enim et dissensiones quantas parasti per Ecclesias totius mundi? Peccatum verò quam magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te à tot gregibus scidisti? Excidisti enim teipsum: noli te fallere. Siquidem ille est verè schismaticus, qui se à communione Ecclesiasticæ unitatis Apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes à te abstineri posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti.*—Firmilianus Cypriano, p. 228. see Bp. Fell's note.

⁶ S. Augustin. de Baptismo, c. Donatistas, lib. ii. says on this point: "Uni verum dicenti et demonstranti posset facilimè consentire tam sancta anima, tam pacata: et fortasse factum est, sed nescimus. Neque enim omnia quæ illo tempore inter Episcopos gesta sunt memoriæ literisque mandari potuerunt, aut omnia quæ mandata sunt novimus."

⁷ Conc. Arelat. I. (anno 314) can. viii.

[De

nounced them to have been in the wrong in the doctrine which they defended, but even those who condemn their doctrine of rebaptization, neither find fault with them for the mere fact of withstanding the Roman see, nor doubt that they were true and holy members and Bishops of the Church of Christ.

Indeed, the manner in which St. Augustine (who elaborately examines the controversy in his treatise "de Baptismo contrà Donatistas") speaks of St. Cyprian's conduct in it, is very corroborative of the doctrine of the independency of Churches and their Bishops, and the non-existence of any right on the part of the successor of St. Peter to

De Afris, quod propriâ lege suâ utuntur ut rebaptizent, placuit ut si ad ecclesiam aliquis de hæresi venerit, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint eum in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur ut accipiat Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogatus non responderit hanc trinitatem, baptizetur.

Cf. Conc. Nicænum I. (anno 325) can. viii. xix.—St. Augustin, who throughout the treatise de Bapt. c. Donatistas, speaks of the question as settled by the final authority of a plenary council, may possibly refer to either of these councils. The Benedictine editor supposes him to refer to the former, which certainly speaks most expressly to the point, but the manner in which St. Augustine describes the council in many places (*e. g.* Hoc enim jam in ipsâ totius orbis unitate discussum, consideratum, perfectum atque firmatum est. c. Ep. Parmeniani, lib. ii.), seems to suit much better with the latter; besides that the Donatists appealed from the Council of Arles to Constantine. (v. S. Aug. c. Ep. Parmen. i. 6.)

the submission of Christendom. For while he clearly condemns St. Cyprian on the point of doctrine, and seems to think that he maintains rather the side of St. Peter in the controversy of Antioch than that of St. Paul, he does not scruple to allege his authority, as drawn from this very dispute, to condemn those who break unity⁸, or recede voluntarily from communion. Thus, while on the point of doctrine he strongly sides with Pope Stephen, on the point of fraternal love and charity, he vindicates St. Cyprian. "Submission to Rome," "subjection to the chair of St. Peter," or to Pope Stephen as the inheritor of any derived supremacy from that Apostle, is an idea as wholly alien to the treatise of St. Augustine as it is to the treatises and epistles, and the conduct of St. Cyprian: the necessity of fraternal love and affectionate intercommunion of Churches is felt by this great Father to be so imperative and essential to the unity of the one Church of God, that he rather justifies the erring Cyprian, who maintained it in meekness⁹, than the harsh and

⁸ *Stephanus autem etiam abstinendos putaverat, qui de suscipiendis hæreticis priscam consuetudinem convellere conarentur: iste autem (sc. Cyprianus) quæstionis ipsius difficultate permotus, et sanctis caritatis visceribus largissimè præditus, in unitate cum eis manendum, qui diversa sentirent.—S. Aug. de Bapt. c. Don. lib. v. (ix. 158. 152.) Cf. S. Aug. c. Cresc. Don. lib. ii. c. 31—36.*

⁹ The following passages, in which St. Augustine speaks of St. Cyprian and his conduct in his compulsory separation from

imperious Stephen, who even in supporting the truth offended against it.

communion, seem to bear with no slight weight on the position of the English Church forcibly driven from communion with Western Christendom, and regretting its unwilling isolation. He is enumerating the points in which "the brightness of his Christian charity shines forth."

"Primo quia id quod sensit, non tacuit; deinde quia tam mansuetè et pacificè protulit, quia cum his qui aliud sentiebant ecclesiasticam pacem tenuit, quia in unitatis vinculo tantam salubritatem esse intellexit, quia eam tantum dilexit, et sobriè custodivit, quia vidit et sensit etiam diversa sentientes posse salvâ caritate sentire: neque enim cum malis tenere se diceret divinam concordiam et Dominicam pacem; bonus quippe habere erga malos pacem potest; tenere autem cum eis pacem non potest, quam ipsi non tenent: postremò quia nemini præscribens neque præjudicans, quo minus unusquisque episcoporum quod putat faciat habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem, etiam nobis qualibuscunque locum dedit pacificè secum ista tractandi."—v. 152.

"Spirituales autem, sive ad hoc ipsum pio studio proficientes, non eunt foras: quia et cum aliquâ vel perversitate vel necessitate hominum videntur expelli, ibi magis probantur, quam si intus permaneant, cum adversus Ecclesiam nullatenus eriguntur, sed in solidâ unitatis petrâ fortissimo caritatis robore radicantur."—i. 93.

For if St. Cyprian, holding a wrong opinion, and excommunicated at a time when the Church of Christ was an unbroken body, the 'orbis terrarum,' could be so spoken of, how cannot all this *at least* be said of a Church desirous of all things to maintain the entire Primitive Faith, and driven, not by its own act, from the Communion of a section of Christendom bound together by subjection to a single Bishop, who claims a divine supremacy and infallibility which neither St. Cyprian nor St. Augustine had ever heard of?

The letters of Pope Stephen on this controversy are lost. Fleury, in his History, speaks of a defence of Pope Stephen, which he supposes to have been written by a Bishop, and perhaps by the Pope himself. This document is to be found printed in the Appendix¹⁰ to St. Cyprian's works. There is not in it a single word to claim or prove any right of superiority or supremacy in the see of Rome.

Thus this great controversy, involving as it did the Bishops of Italy, Asia, and Africa, conducted by three of the most eminent prelates of the time, carried to the length of causing the excommunication of the Asiatic and African by the Italian Bishop, examined in detail and commented upon by one of the greatest Fathers of the Western Church, one hundred and fifty years after it had ceased, was begun, argued, completed, and judged of, without any claim of superiority in the Roman see being set up, or resisted, or heard of, or apparently conceived by any party in the discussion.

These passages may suffice for a specimen of the teaching of the earliest Church respecting the equality of the Apostles, and the supposed supremacy of St. Peter. If we were to proceed to the writings of the next century, we should find an

¹⁰ "Tractatus ignoti auctoris, a Rigaltio, in notis ad Cyprianum primum editus; in quo suadetur, non debere denuò baptizari qui semel in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi sunt tincti."

abundance of passages in which the same tradition is most clearly and fully testified. But for these it must suffice to refer to those writers of the Anglican Church who have addressed themselves to this controversy, and principally to Bishop Jewell, in his *Defence of the Apology*, and Dr. Barrow in his *Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy*. It is abundantly proved by these writers, that the doctrines of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and St. Jerome, as well as of the other principal Fathers of that age, was in entire accordance with that of the earlier times, and recognized a complete equality of all Apostolic powers among the Apostles themselves, and among those who had by due succession, and imposition of Apostolic hands, inherited their place and order in the Church of Christ.

But while we thus vindicate the equality of the Apostles among themselves, and by consequence the equality of those who cannot have inherited from them more than they themselves possessed, we should be most unfortunate if we were led to conceive any thoughts disparaging to the great Apostle of the circumcision, the Apostle whom the Lord delighted to honour, and whom the early Church ever designated by every title of affectionate and reverential respect. It is impossible to deny, that St. Peter occupies, in all the Gospel history, a place of high eminence and distinction among his brethren. From his first call

Greatness
of St.
Peter.

he was designated as Cephas, a great and noble stone of the foundation of that Christian Temple of which His Master, the Son of the Living God, was the Head Stone in the corner. Throughout his Master's ministry he was the first in speech, the first in act, the first in zeal. He was blessed by the signal revelation of God's truth. He was blessed by being the one Apostle chosen to represent the whole college of the Apostles in receiving the signal promise of the building of the Church, and the keys of the kingdom. He was blessed by being the one among his brethren to whom many special words of love and mercy were addressed, and many loving words, too, of tender rebuke and warning. He was blessed by being the Apostle for whom particularly Christ prayed that his faith should not fail, and who, when converted, should have the duty of strengthening his brethren. Though his fall was great, greater than that of all who forsook their Lord and fled, yet was his restoration great too, for he was again chosen of them all to be the one to receive, as representing all, the great pastoral commission. Thus, as he had before been the model of faith to the Apostles, so was he now of love; and as the keys of the kingdom had been the sacred reward of faith, so was the shepherd's staff the blessed gift to love. To him was given the special office of bringing the first Gentile convert into the communion of Christ's Church. And his Lord pro-

mised that he should glorify God by a death like His own, when his forward impetuous spirit having been curbed and tamed by the discipline of the Holy Ghost, and his loving indiscretion brought to the calm and gentle wisdom of a "fellow-elder¹," he at last stretched forth his hands², and another girded him, and carried him whither he would not.

That glorious martyrdom bound him for ever fast to the bright shore of love and joy. He now, we doubt not, is with the Lord whom he believed and loved, and in his death was permitted to imitate. There he has high and sacred communion with his Lord, and with every other member of his Lord's sacred and immortal body, as every true member of that sacred body cannot but have communion with him.

For he was made, on two most signal occasions of his life, to be the very symbol of unity in God's Church. The symbol of unity is indeed not identical with the head of unity, nor will we so praise and magnify St. Peter as either to eclipse the glory of his brethren the Apostles, or (which God forbid!) to put him into the place of his Lord. But as the symbol of unity he holds eminent rank and station among the people of God;—such rank, and dignity, and station, and claim of honour, that they who disregard and

¹ 1 St. Peter v. 1.

² St. John xxi. 18.

disown and care not for it, would seem to risk putting themselves out of the unity of that body, by whose oneness in Christ the world should believe that God had sent His Son ³.

³ St. John xvii.

DISCOURSE IV.

“Ὅτε δὲ ἐπίστευσαν τῷ Φιλίππῳ εὐαγγελιζομένοις τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐβαπτίζοντο ἄνδρες τε καὶ γυναῖκες.—Act. SS. Apost. viii. 12.

WHEN we look at the exact terms in which the Baptismal Commission is given to the Apostles, it is impossible not to perceive that they are of a very remarkable kind: “Go ye, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;” or, when the idiom of the original is duly represented in the English, “make disciples, and baptize into the Name.” For two things are to be done into the Holy Name of the Trinity. The Apostles are to make disciples into the Name, and they are to baptize into the Name; or, more exactly still, they are to make disciples into the Name by baptizing into it.

1. The Baptismal Commission resumed. Baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

It is plain, therefore, that the Holy Name of God, the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is made to hold a most remarkable

and prominent place in the Charter of the Christian Church. And not only so, but it is also somewhat difficult to understand what the precise place is which it does hold. For what is it to make disciples into a Name? again, what is it to baptize into a Name? or, conjointly, what is it to make disciples into a Name, by baptizing into it?

These are the questions which it will be attempted to answer in the present Discourse.

Three things appear to be clear: first, that the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, must be not a Name only, but a Name containing Doctrine. For doctrines only can be made the subject of teaching, and they must needs be taught who are to be made disciples. The Apostles, then, being directed to go into all nations and make disciples, are to find in this Name the matter of the teaching of the world. Secondly, that the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is given to be the name also of the Church. For the Gentiles converted by the Apostles to the truth of the doctrine of the Name, are to be received into the Name; and to be received into a name (whatever else it may mean) can hardly be conceived to mean less than to be made partakers of that name, so as, in some manner or degree, to be called by it. And thirdly, that the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is not only thus a Doctrine and an Appellation, but is also some-

thing to be admitted into; something within which a man is not where he was before; something, from being within which he comes to have a claim to that appellation; a holy Precinct, as it were,—a position of new relation, an estate of new privilege, a condition of some kind of nearness, union, and reception with God.

To give a name¹ at all to the great God must needs far surpass all knowledge and power of man. We may call Him the Creator, indeed, as He created the world; our Father, as He loves and protects us with fatherly love; our Lord and King, as He rules over us with absolute dominion; but this is not so properly to name Him as to name His deeds, or His relation to ourselves. It is as though we identified and named a few of the separate rays which issued from the primary source of light, while we vainly endeavoured to raise our eyes to the fountain and centre of all brightness. For who could span with a name, a true and adequate name, the incomprehensible and unapproachable Being of God, whose throne is set amidst clouds and darkness, unapproachable to human sight and thought?

¹ Ὄνομα δὲ τῷ πάντων πατρὶ θετὸν, ἀγεννήτῳ ὄντι, οὐκ ἔστιν· ᾧ γὰρ ἂν καὶ ὀνόματι προσυγορεύηται, πρεσβύτερον ἔχει τὸν θέμενον τὸ ὄνομα· τὸ δὲ πατήρ, καὶ Θεός, καὶ κτίστης, καὶ κύριος, καὶ δεσπότης, οὐκ ὀνόματά ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν εὐποιϊῶν, καὶ τῶν ἔργων προσρήσεις.—S. Justin Martyr. Apol. ii. 6.—v. too Suicer's Thesaurus, sub voce Θεός, I. f.

Accordingly in the ancient Scriptures, the sacred Name of God is always spoken of with the utmost reverence, solemnity, and awe². It is a secret name and wonderful, a name not to be taken in vain, a name excellent in all the earth³; a name to be praised and exalted above all blessing and praise⁴, which they who know will put their trust in Him⁵; a name which is a defence; a name to be remembered, in which we are to set up our banners; a name to which glory is due⁶; a name through which we will tread them under that rise up against us⁷; a name to be remembered in all generations⁸; a name to be waited on⁹; a name whereby He rideth on the heavens¹; a name to endure for ever², to be continued as long as the sun; a glorious name to be blessed for ever; a name which is great and terrible, for it is holy³; a holy name for men to glory in⁴; a name to be praised from this time forth for evermore, and from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same⁵; a glorious and fearful name; a name for the sake of which God will be en-

² Gen. xxxii. 29. Judges xiii. 18.

³ Ps. viii. 1. 9.

⁴ Ps. vii. 17; xviii. 49; xxxiv. 3. Neh. ix. 5.

⁵ Ps. ix. 10.

⁶ Ibid. xx. 1. 5. 7; xxix. 2.

⁷ Ibid. xlv. 5.

⁸ Ibid. xlv. 17.

⁹ Ibid. lii. 9.

¹ Ibid. lxviii. 4.

² Ibid. lxxii. 17. 19.

³ Ibid. xcix. 3.

⁴ Ibid. cv. 3.

⁵ Ibid. cxiii. 2, 3.

treated for sin⁶; a name to be called upon in sorrow⁷; a name for the destruction of enemies⁸; a name wherein is our help⁹; a name to be praised, for it is lovely¹, a name magnified above all things², a name to be praised by all created things with joy³.

But it is observable, that from very early times the name of God is spoken of as containing a revelation of truth⁴. There is a very remarkable passage to this effect in the Book of Exodus: “And God spake unto Moses, and said unto

The name of God a gradual revelation.

⁶ Deut. xxviii. 58. Jer. xiv. 7. 21. Ps. xxv. 11; lxxix. 9; cix. 21.

⁷ Ps. cxvi. 4. 12. 15.

⁸ Ibid. cxviii. 10. 12.

⁹ Ibid. cxxiv. 7.

¹ Ibid. cxxxv. 3.

² Ibid. cxxxviii. 2.

³ Ibid. cxl. 5.

⁴ Ferunt virtutem hujus sancti nominis primum innotuisse Mosi. Observandum est hoc loco, notitiam hujus nominis Dei habere sua incrementa, sicut hic manifeste dicitur, majorem contigisse Mosi, quam Patribus. Quam Paulus adventu Christi adeo auctam esse dicit, ut principum et potestatum cœlestium de Deo cognitionem auxerit.—Clarius ad Exod. vi. 3. (Critici Sacri.)

Καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς, τῶ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τῶ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ τῶ Ἰακώβ, ὦν, διὰ τὸ εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν τελεῖν, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὀνομάζεσθαι, ὡς τι ἐξαίρετον καὶ πρέπον τῇ ἑαυτοῦ μεγαλειότητι, προετίμησε,—τούτοις οὐδὲ τὸ ὄνομα ἑαυτοῦ ἐδήλωσεν ὁ Θεός, ἤπου γε τὴν οὐσίαν ἣτις ἐστὶν ἀπεκάλυψεν· Ἐγὼ γὰρ, φησὶ, Κύριος· καὶ ὤφθην πρὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, Θεὸς ὦν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου οὐκ ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς· ὡς μεῖζον ἠθλονότι, ἢ ὥστε ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἀκοῇ χωρηθῆναι.—S. Basil. adv. Eunomium, lib. i. 13.

him, I am the Lord : and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the Name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah, was I not known unto them⁵.” That name, however, of Jehovah, thus withheld from the patriarchs, was solemnly given to Moses ; for when God appeared to him in the burning bush, and in answer to his inquiry, what he should say unto the children of Israel, and how he should name Him by whose commission he spoke to them with authority, He said unto him, “ I AM THAT I AM ;” and He said, “ Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.” “ And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you ; this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations⁶.”

From these passages it is clear, that when Moses was sent to speak with authority to the children of Israel, and to assure them of deliverance from Egypt, he received as his credentials this sacred name of Jehovah ; and that he received it in some manner in which it had never been given before.

The first impression produced on reading the passage of Exodus vi. 3, is, no doubt, that the

⁵ Exod. vi. 3.

⁶ Exod. iii. 14, 15. Ps. cxxxv. 13. Hosea xii. 5.

name of Jehovah (regarded merely as a name or appellation) was absolutely unknown to the nation before the mission of Moses; and this impression receives support from the authority of Josephus⁷, and various other Jewish and Christian writers. But there are so many passages in the book of Genesis, in which the name is used, that it is difficult to feel sure that this impression is a just one. In some, indeed, of these passages, the name may be used *historically*, — that is, Moses, the writer of the book, knowing, by more recent revelation, the new name of God, may have introduced it in narrative places, and sometimes even substituted it where some other appellation was the one actually employed. But there are some passages (such for instance as Genesis xiv. 22; xv. 2. 7. 8; xvi. 11) in which this explanation appears to be hardly admissible,

⁷ Μωϋσῆς δὲ—ἠντιβόλει μηδὲ ὀνόματος αὐτῷ γινῶσιν τοῦ ἰδίου φθονῆσαι, φωνῆς δὲ αὐτῷ μετεσχηκότι, καὶ ὄψεως ἔτι, καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν εἰπεῖν.—καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῷ σημαίνει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ προσηγορίαν, οὐ πρότερον εἰς ἀνθρώπους παρελθοῦσαν, περὶ ἧς οὐ μοι θέμις εἰπεῖν.—Josephus, *Antiq. Jud. lib. ii. c. 12.* (vol. i. p. 106. Haverc.)

Theodoret, *quæst. xv. in Exod.* τί ἐστίν, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα μου Κύριος οὐκ ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς;—Διδάσκει πόσης τιμῆς καὶ εὐμενείας αὐτὸν ἠξίωσεν· ὁ γὰρ τοῖς πατριάρχαις οὐκ ἐδήλωσεν ὄνομα τοῦτο αὐτῷ δῆλον ἐποίησεν· ἔφη γὰρ πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὢν· τοῦτο δὲ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ἀφραστον ὀνομάζεται.—*v. J. Drusii Tetragrammaton, c. 25.* (*Crit. Sacri, vol. ii. p. iii. 355.*)

and which will rather lead to the conclusion that the words of Exodus vi. 3, imply, that though the name Jehovah, as a mere appellation, may have been used before the time of Moses, its significancy and truthfulness had never before been made known to the people. Hitherto the names of God and God Almighty had been those by which He had been called, and of which the patriarch, and older worshippers of God, had had experimental knowledge. They had known Him as their God, and they had witnessed in his care and preservation⁸ of them his almighty power, dominion, and all-sufficiency. But now He made Himself known to his people by a new name; and if the actual appellation were one not unknown before, this fact only makes it the more clear and certain, that it is the truth involved, and the promise given, in this holy name, which God now designed to impress with all solemnity upon the nation. The name Jehovah then contained a great revelation of God's truth, and that truth was the self-existent being, and high eternal

⁸ See the notes of Vatablus and Drusius on Exod. vi. 3, among the *Critici Sacri*: "God was known to Abraham by the true importance of the title *Adonai*, as much as by the name of *Shaddai*; as much by his dominion and sovereignty as by his power and all-sufficiency; but by any experimental and personal sense of the fulfilling of his promises, his name Jehovah was not known unto him."—Bp. Pearson on the Creed, art. ii.

perfectness of the God of Israel, and it contained a strong comfort of promise; and that promise assured the people in the moment of their affliction, and in the anticipation of the struggle of their rescue from the bondage of Egypt, that this eternal and self-existing God, whose name Jehovah was his memorial to all coming generations, was pledged to their continual, uniform, and ever-present protection, and would forthwith make good the promises which He had given, and to which their faith looked forward.

And accordingly we find this sacred name regarded in Jewish history as the peculiar possession of the chosen people, the memorial of God among them. So in the 68th Psalm, "Sing unto God, sing praises to his name, extol him that rideth on the heavens by his name JAH, and rejoice before him⁹." And in the 83rd, "Let them be confounded and troubled for ever; yea, let them be put to shame, and perish; that men may know that thou, whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth¹." The 135th Psalm speaks of this name being the enduring memorial of God: "Thy name, O Lord, (JEHOVAH) endureth for ever; and thy memorial, O Lord, (JEHOVAH) throughout all generations²." And the prophet Hosea says, "The Lord God of hosts; the Lord (JEHOVAH) is his memorial³."

⁹ Ps. lxviii. 4.

¹ Ibid. lxxxiii. 18.

² Ps. cxxxv. 13.

³ Hosea xii. 5.

The beginnings, though hitherto quite obscure and shadowy, of a still further revelation of the sacred name of God, are to be found in the prophecies of Christ. Who should He be, and what his nature,—how distinguishable from the nature of God, or joined and united with it, whose name should be called “wonderful, counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace⁴?” If He be David’s son, how could David in spirit call Him Lord⁵? If the God of Israel be still one God, as He had so solemnly declared Himself to the people, and his sacred incommunicable name “I AM⁶,” how should He inspire his prophets to give this wonderful name so often to another⁷, or say to Him, “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom; thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows⁸?”

With the holy nativity came fresh signs of a

⁴ Isaiah ix. 6. cf. Jer. xxiii. 6.

⁵ Ps. cx. 1. St. Matt. xxii. 43.

⁶ Deut. vi. 4.

⁷ Lowth’s note on Jer. xxiii. 6. “The title of Jehovah is elsewhere given to the Messiah by the prophets. See Is. xl. 10; xlviii. 17. Hos. i. 7. Zech. ii. 10, 11. Mal. iii. 1.” Cf. Vitrina in Is. vol. ii. p. 574. S. August. 1 P. tom. iii. p. 57.

⁸ Ps. xlv. 6. Heb. i. 8.

further approaching revelation of God's sacred name. The blessed mother knew that the Holy Ghost, whose being, divinity, and greatness, she could hardly yet have heard of, was to come upon her, and that therefore the holy child born of her should have the name of the Son of God. Yet even she, and even then, though she pondered deeply, and treasured in her heart the many marks of Divine love and subjection of her dutiful child, and felt her heart burn within her, no doubt, at the sparks of unearthly wisdom which fell from his lips, while even as a boy He was bent upon his Father's business, knew not yet the full revelation of his greatness. Still less did the Jews, and even the disciples, understand the great truth that was about to burst upon them; so that the mysterious words, "Before Abraham was, I AM," "I and the Father are one," and others such as these, with all his words and deeds of Divine power and Majesty, must have been like glimmering lights in the East, foretelling an approaching dawn of high and Divine truth.

In this great Saying, then, of the holy forty days, the Saying which imparts the baptismal commission to the Apostles, the name of God is published to the Church, in its third and final revelation to be given upon the earth. He who was "God Almighty" to the patriarchs, who was "Jehovah" to Israel under the law, should now be "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," to the Church.

The name of God fully published after the Resurrection.

The various great and wonderful things said by Christ and of Him, in the prophecies of old, and in the Gospels, the scattered words of greatness spoken of the Spirit, were gathered up into a great truth. God, who had hitherto revealed Himself as One, was henceforth not less one, but in some mysterious manner Three. Within the unity was to be worshipped a Trinity. A sacred and most mysterious distinction of personality and subsistence was made known amid the one eternal substance of the most high God. To be seen, but not seen through; to be heard, but not penetrated by hearing; to be believed, but not comprehended; to be accepted as a truth, but not, like human truths, to be seen all round, converted, deduced into consequences, the great new Name of God was given for ever to the Church to reveal Himself and his nature, and the scheme of Divine mercy for the restoration of the world. For "this," says the Creed of St. Athanasius, speaking of none other than the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which is the name of God, "This is the Catholic faith, which, except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved."

The name of Christ includeth that of the Holy Trinity.

Nor must it be forgotten, that the later Scriptures speak of the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, as it were, by Himself, as a great, mysterious, and saving Name, which doth not exclude, but rather includes, and in its own mysterious comprehensiveness, declares the entire Name of God.

It is not only that the designation of Him as Lord, used often by the prophets, and continually by the Evangelists and Apostles, carries with it a distinct and unquestionable implication of his being the divine and self-existent Jehovah; for the word Lord (or *Kύριος* ⁹, as derived from the verb *κύρω*, to be) is the ordinary translation of the Seventy, for the great incommunicable name, the sacred tetragrammaton; nor only that the name of Jesus, as given by Divine direction, and fulfilling prophecy signifies, “God with us, saving us from our sins ¹ ;” nor only that the name of Christ, according to the doctrine of many of the fathers, is the confession of all the Trinity ², for it exhibiteth the Father the Anointer, the Son the Anointed, and the Holy Ghost the Sacred Unction;

⁹ v. Schleusner on the New Testament, in voc. *κύριος*, and Bp. Pearson’s notes to the 2nd Art. of the Creed (vol. ii. p. 158).

¹ St. Matt. i. 21. 23. Is. vii. 14.

² In Christi enim nomine subauditur qui unxit, et ipse qui unctus est, et ipsa unctio in quâ unctus est. Et unxit quidem Pater, unctus vero est Filius, in Spiritu qui est unctio: quemadmodum per Esaiam ait Sermo, Spiritus Dei super me; propter quod unxit me; significans et ungentem Patrem, et unctum Filium, et unctionem, qui est Spiritus.—S. Irenæus, c. Hæreses, lib. iii. c. xviii. 4.

‘*Ἡ γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσηγορία τοῦ παντός ἐστὶν ὁμολογία ἑηλοῖ γὰρ τὸν τε χρίσαντα Θεόν, καὶ τὸν χρυσθέντα Υἱόν, καὶ τὸ χρίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα.*—S. Basil, de Sp. Sancto, c. xii. See the whole section.

but beyond all this, there are many passages in which the “name of the Lord,” and “the name of the Lord Jesus,” must needs signify the name of the Holy Trinity. Such are those many places in the Acts of the Apostles, in which we read of persons baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus³. Akin to which are those very frequent expressions of the Epistles, about “being in the Lord,” “being in Christ,” “putting on Christ in baptism.” These phrases, which have already been referred to in connexion with other parts of the argument, and which are too numerous to be all cited, bear unquestionable reference to that new and glorious estate of privilege and blessing, in which, having had that sacred name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, called over us, and being called by that sacred name, we have our fellowship by holy baptism with the Father and the Son, by drinking into one Spirit. So that being baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, we are shortly said to be in Christ. His name, as it is on the one hand, the name of the Church, so on the other, is it the name of God; and the double name of Jesus Christ contains within itself, in no doubtful or distant implication, the whole mystery of God and man; God incarnate, saving, reconciled, God in three Persons; man saved from the power and punishment of sins, made partaker of the Divine

³ Vide Appendix, on Baptism in the Name of the Lord.

nature, restored from the fall, and united, all in one body of many members, in sacred mystery with God. Thus is his sacred name made glorious⁴. Thus is his name a name which is above every name; a name at which every knee must bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, while every tongue confesseth that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father⁵. Thus hath He by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than the angels, a name “far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.”

Revealed, then, in this great Saying, the mighty name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the one name of three, the sacred three in one, is given to the Apostles, as the sum and substance of Christian truth and doctrine⁶.

This name the substance of Christian Truth.

⁴ Notandum, quod in primitivâ Ecclesiâ baptizabatur in nomine Christi, et hoc ut redderetur nomen venerabile. Sed numquid modo sufficeret? Credo quod non, quia expressa requiritur invocatio Trinitatis. In Christo continetur implicite Trinitas.—Thom. Aquinas in S. Matt. xxviii.

⁵ Phil. ii. 9. Heb. i. 4. Eph. i. 29.

⁶ Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν· τὸ μὲν περὶ ᾠγμάτων, τὸ δὲ περὶ ἐντολῶν παραγγέλλων· Καὶ Ἰουδαίων μὲν οὐδὲν μέμνηται, οὐδὲ εἰς μέσον φέρει τὰ γεγενημένα, οὐδὲ ὀνειδίζει Πέτρον τὴν ἄρνησιν, οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων οὐδενὶ τὴν φυγὴν·

It is the only word of doctrine delivered to them in the course of the forty days, the only word of doctrine contained in this great Church charter. It is the only doctrine contained in it, no doubt for this reason, because it comprises all doctrine. There is no part nor portion of Divine truth which does not fall under some one of its three great heads. It is not that *the other parts*, as men might think them, of revelation, are omitted, or overlooked, or disregarded in comparison of a greater truth. It is rather that they are all contained under it; so that while the sum is given, all is given,—while the great comprehensive truth is taught, nothing is omitted.

The doctrine of it unexplained.

Be it observed, then, that it is given, comprehensive and vast as it is, in a short unexplained summary—unexplained either at the time when it was given, or in any recorded discourses before. Much doctrine, indeed, had been delivered, which would tend to fill up, illustrate, and confirm it, and many things had been said on which it would throw back the full and clear illustration of its own bright light; but the doctrine in its completeness, the doctrine as herein revealed, was new to the Apostles as well as to the world. Even the separate portions of it were but scantily and darkly indicated in previous discourses; for even

κελεύει δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκχυθῆναι πᾶσαν, σύντομον διδασκαλίαν ἐγγχειρίσας, τὴν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος.—S. Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. xc.

in St. John's Gospel the promises of "another Comforter," "a living water," "a guide into all truth," gave but small doctrinal declaration of the nature and person of the Divine Holy Ghost; but as a complex and full revelation of the Godhead, the doctrine of the sacred and indivisible Trinity, of the one God in three Persons, was absolutely undeclared until our Lord sent his Apostles forth to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But in this official, sacred summary, it is given, conveyed, intrusted. As Moses was sent to deliver the Israelites out of Egyptian captivity, and his commission was the name I AM, so the Apostles were sent to all the world to turn them "from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God," and their credentials were the sacred Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Name was given to them, and to them only, to their keeping. It was their holy deposit, and they knew not yet the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, of grace and salvation, which were hidden in it. They were directed to baptize into it; but the details, the mysteries, the distant and various bearings of this great doctrine, were not yet made known to them. The Holy Ghost, who was about to descend on the day of Pentecost, should bring all things to their knowledge and remembrance, said darkly, summarily, or, as it

were, cursorily, by their Master — He should guide them into all truth, and enable them to fill up and articulate those great outlines of doctrine which were thus given to them by their Divine Teacher.

Hence
came all
dogmatic
teaching in
the Church.

Accordingly, it is probable that from this holy name, thus given to the Apostles, came all dogmatic teaching in the Church. From this, as from a fountain head, they derived all their streams of sacred Christian doctrine. “From this sacred form of Baptism ⁷,” says Bishop Pearson, “did the Church derive the rule of faith, requiring the profession of belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before they could be baptized in their name. When the eunuch asked Philip, *What doth hinder me to be baptized?* Philip said, *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest*; and when the eunuch replied, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, he baptized him.* And before that, the Samaritans, *when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women.* For as in the Acts of the Apostles there is no more expressed than that they baptized *in the name of Jesus Christ*; so is no more expressed of the faith required in them who were to be baptized, than to believe in the same name. But being the Father and the Holy

⁷ v. Bp. Pearson on the Creed, art. i. p. 55. cf. art. viii. p. 499, and art. ix. p. 512.

Ghost were likewise mentioned in the first institution, being the expressing of one doth not exclude the other, being it is certain from the Apostles' times the names of all three were used; hence, upon the same ground, was required faith, and a profession of belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

Of the details, indeed, and particulars of the dogmatic teaching of the Apostles, they have left very small written record. We know that they taught dogmatically; we know that the writings of the New Testament are not their dogmatic teaching. Those writings are without exception addressed to persons already instructed, already put in charge of the sacred deposit of Christian truth by the sacrament of Baptism. It is true, indeed, that they were so directed by the Holy Spirit in writing these apparently casual and unconnected pieces, that no portion of the mass of divinely revealed truth lacks written proof or confirmation from some part or other of their writings. But that truth is nowhere exhibited entire, nowhere systematically or theologically stated as in a creed or catechism, nowhere so stated as it was used for purposes of instruction or profession. But very shortly after they were dead, their contemporaries and successors began to state and write down in books the great outlines of their systematic teaching, and the principal heads of doctrine which they delivered, and required to be

professed by persons to be baptized ; and thus THE APOSTLES' CREED⁸ came to be acknowledged, all the Church over, as the genuine summary of all great and fundamental truths as taught by the Apostles.

Be it observed, then, that the Apostles' Creed is the first doctrinal expansion made theologically and with authority in the Church of the great Name of God, the baptismal tradition. Just outside of the canon of actual Scripture, and not claiming a literal inspiration like that of actual Scripture, it is nevertheless the earliest historical record of the systematic doctrine of the Apostles. And it, according to the summary of it given in the Church Catechism⁹, teaches the doctrine of (1) God the Father, who hath made me, and all the world : (2) God the Son, who hath redeemed me, and all mankind : (3) God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God. The Apostles' Creed is the earliest, simplest,

⁸ King's Hist. of the Apostles' Creed, ch. i. (pp. 34—44, 2nd ed. Lond. 1703.) Bingham's Antiq., b. xi. ch. vii. 5. 8. Bp. Pearson on the Creed, vol. i. p. 499. 512 ; ii. p. 6. 26.

⁹ The person baptized acknowledges these three (the Holy Persons), and by desiring baptism, makes profession of that acknowledgment, which is, in effect, the sum of the whole creed, which that catechism excellently abbreviates by saying that the chief things learnt in these articles are, first, to believe in God the Father, &c.—Hammond, Practical Catechism, b. vi. c. 2.

and most Apostolical expansion or enlargement of the sum of doctrine given by our Lord in the great baptismal tradition. And the second ecclesiastical development of the same great doctrine is the Creed of Nicæa and Constantinople, the Nicene Creed, and the third and last is the Creed of St. Athanasius. Since then the universal Church knows no Creed.

That the baptismal form was thus, as a matter of fact, expanded or developed into the Creed, seems to be very clear, for many reasons, and not the least, because we find several instances in which forms of Creed, very similar to it in general construction, are expressly traced to that source. Such¹ is the Creed of Arius and Euzoius, delivered to Constantine: "This faith we have received from the Holy Evangelists, the Lord having said to his disciples, Go, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" upon the exhibition of which confession of faith they were restored to the communion of the Church by the Synod of Jerusalem. In the same manner, Eusebius (of Cæsarea) gave in a copy of the Creed, by which he was catechized, baptized, and consecrated, to the Council of Nice, concluding and deducing it from the same text. "As our Lord, sending

¹ This passage is taken from the notes to Bishop Pearson on the Creed, art. i. (vol. ii. p. 55. cf. vol. i. pp. 499. 512; ii. p. 26.)

forth his disciples to preach, said, Go, make disciples of all nations," &c. The same is also alleged by the Council of Antioch, under the emperor Constantius and pope Julius. So also Vigilius Tapsensis makes Arius and Athanasius jointly speak these words: "We believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his Son our Lord, and in the Holy Ghost. This is the rule of our faith, which the Lord, with heavenly command, delivered to the Apostles, saying, Go, baptize," &c.

Thus is the great baptismal tradition², the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the sum of Creeds. Enlarged and unfolded during four centuries, according to the needs of the Church, and the various assaults of heresy, the great baptismal tradition—the doctrine of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,—has been, throughout the history of the Church, her possession, her sum of truth, her sacred deposit; that which she hath maintained against adversaries, rightly divided to her children; that with which she hopes to meet her Lord when He returns to judgment.

Important to trace the principles of this great development of doctrine.

It is highly important, in tracing this great and, as we believe, single development of the Christian summary of truth into the form of an extended dogmatic Creed, to observe the prin-

² V. Appendix. The Baptismal form the sum of Creeds.

ciples which appear to direct and limit the application of the developing power; not only because it much concerns the well-being of the Church that her real authority to divide the word of truth should not in any respect be injuriously questioned or denied, but still more because it is plain that any unduly allowed claim of development would afford a ready and irresistible defence to any sort of corruption of doctrine, however far removed from the real matter of the original Revelation.

Let it, then, be observed, that the development of the Creeds, though often spoken of as if it were a simple and uniform one, is really a complex or twofold one. The one portion is, (1) Apostolic, (2) of truths, and (3) affirmative; the other, (1) ecclesiastical, if I may so term it, (2) of words, and (3) negative.

The Apostolic development is the Apostles' Creed. This is the summary of what they taught; of what they held to be fundamental; of what they catechized with; of what they required to be professed in holy Baptism. Possessing this, men possessed the word of truth; holding this, no doubt the promises made to faith were assured to them. With this they might pass from glory to glory, and be gradually transfigured to some faint shining of likeness to their Lord.

Here indeed is an affirmative development of matters of faith. The name of God is expanded

The development of the Creeds complex.

i. Apostolic, of truths, and affirmative.

into three paragraphs. Each is replete with Divine truth; each particular is vital; several of the particulars (as, for instance, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body,) are not directly or obviously contained in the original form of the deposit of truth. But all together constitute the sum or body of the faith once delivered to the saints.

Of this affirmative Apostolic development it is of the utmost consequence to observe, that it is in every particular supported, confirmed, and filled up by the Apostolic Scriptures. That which the Apostles taught orally, they also wrote. They indeed did not write it formally, or dogmatically, nor are the theological statements of the Apostles' Creed to be found all laid together, or set out for statement or proof in any part of their letters. But every particular of that Creed, by the good providence of God, is also amply written; and as in the case of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, just referred to, it pleased God that St. Paul should write the 15th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, so throughout do the affirmative developments of the Apostles rest on two columns, — the dogmatic column of their Creed, and the epistolary column of their letters.

ii. Ecclesiastical, of words, and negative.

But the other two Creeds, wherein they differ from the Apostles' Creed, differ from it essentially. They no longer expound new matters of

faith; they no longer develope new truths; they no longer map out, as it were, new regions of the Church's doctrinal empire; as, indeed, how should they, if the engrafted word, able to save men's souls, were fully and faithfully delivered already?

On the contrary, the doctrinal decisions of the Church, as made in the later Creeds, are,

1. Logical only; consisting in words, and not in truths. The Church rather adjusts language in them than discovers truth. She is occupied with the exact arrangement of expressions. She decides that such and such modes of stating the doctrine already held by her, are wrong and inadequate to the truth which she believes, and such and such other ones right and, as far as may be, adequate.

2. And, secondly, negative. She is driven to say all this, not so much for its own proper affirmative force and importance, as because the various incorrect methods of expression adopted by other teachers, endanger the truth and simplicity of the doctrines which she holds. She finds, by degrees, the necessity of more precise language; but her precision is, if I may so term it, protestant,—protestant against error; negative,—negative of heresy. And this is not the less true, though the form of her decisions be dogmatic and affirmative. She uses her penetrating exactnesses of speech in order to deny and repel. She

identifies and concentrates her already possessed truth, in order to precipitate and expose error. She teaches no more than she taught before, but erroneous forms of thought and phrase compel her to borrow the terms of philosophy, and to select with delicacy, and almost subtlety of discrimination, the exactly balanced words in which she shall clothe her teaching. Thus the close examination of the great original development, appears to disclose a double law, (a law analogous to many natural laws, in which a process is often continued up to a certain point, and then apparently reversed,) under which affirmative development of matters of faith seems to be limited to the Apostolic days, to the Apostles, and to such dogmas, as by a divinely ordered coincidence, if I may so express myself, are also fully written in the inspired Scriptures: and negative development is the perpetual defensive duty of the Church of God.

Power of
the Church
to develop.

This distinction between the two kinds of development appears to suggest at once the nature and the limits of the power which the continuing Church possesses of developing.

i. not by
adding new
doctrines.

Can she add to the original stock of affirmative, Apostolical truth?

Surely not. For in the first place such a power supposes the continuance of Apostolic inspiration in all ages of the Church subsequent to the death of the Apostles,—a claim unheard of in any age

of Christendom, and widely different from the power of judging of truth which, in whatever manner and with whatever limitations, has always been accorded to the true Church of God.

Again; such a claim assumes the insufficiency, for the salvation of future generations, of the original revelation of truth as explicitly taught by the Apostles, and believed in the Churches; and the consequent necessity of further discoveries of doctrine to supply the need. But not only is such an idea to be entirely rejected as a fiction of later ages, and a grievous disparagement of the Divine truth originally given, but it is also expressly negated by the various and often repeated words of Holy Scripture, which in three different ways seem to exclude all further developments of this kind.

1. By denouncing them. For what can be stronger, or more to the point, than St. Paul's language to the Galatians against those who should preach another Gospel (which is not another, but a perversion of the true) than that which he had preached to the Galatians, and they had already received? "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed³."

³ Gal. i. 8, 9.

2. By pronouncing the Revelation, as already given and received, final. St. Paul tells the un-inspired Corinthian converts, that “the ends of the world ⁴” were come upon them, by which phrase he means, that the old types and prophecies were now all fulfilled, and that the “last days,” the days, that is, of the final and long expected realities were arrived. Again, he tells the Hebrews that the ancient patriarchs, though they “obtained a good report through faith, yet received not the promise,”—*they* lived under a progressive, developing dispensation, which ever looked forward to a further end,—“God having provided some better thing” for the Christians even of the first generation, whereby they and the ancients might “be made perfect” together,—“looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of their faith ⁵.”

3. By declaring, in every variety of phrase and manner, the full sufficiency of the revelation, as already given and received, for the salvation of man. “The engrafted word, which is able to save your souls.” “Ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.” “Being born again—by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever ⁶.” “The law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come,

⁴ 1 Cor. x. 11.

⁵ Heb. xi. 39, 40; xii. 2.

⁶ 1 Pet. i. 8, 9. 23.

we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ⁷.” “Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” “Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God⁸.”

Having then absolutely no power at all to add ^{ii. but by} to the matter of original revelation, as once de- ^{defining} ^{old.} livered to the Saints, what authority does the Church possess of judging of doctrine, of recognizing her own perpetual inheritance, and defensively defining the truth which she believes against the errors and heresies of later times?

It is plain, that the promise of being led into all truth by the perpetual indwelling of the Holy Ghost, was, after the death of the Apostles and inspired Teachers of the New Testament, no longer assured to any individuals specified by name or station in the Church. It had been given to the Church, and the Church possessed it. It had been given to all, and all shared it alike. No single person could be absolutely safe from error, but the gates of hell should never prevail against the universal Church. Error and heresy might creep in or spread, but the promise was sure, that what

⁷ Gal. iii. 24—27.

⁸ 1 Cor. i. 30; vi. 11.

the universal Church, with one consenting voice, held, should be true. The truth of God was in such sort her gift and inheritance, that what all the Church in all the world taught, should be undoubtedly that very faith of which she was constituted the ground and pillar.

If it follows from this promise that the universal Church of God is infallible, it follows equally that such a diffused infallibility can be exercised only very seldom, and in defence. Very many conditions are requisite before any such decisions can be pronounced at all; when pronounced, it must needs be long before the universal recognition of Christendom imparts to them their full authority. The universal Church cannot give away to one or more rulers her own divine gift; she cannot alienate her own precious possession. She may speak in her Bishops, but she cannot abdicate her own authority of deciding ultimately in herself. She may utter by her Bishops in council the "senatûs consulta" of doctrine, but she retains in herself the inalienable right of finally authorizing, by long continued acceptance and recognition, the decrees of divine truth implicitly contained in her original charter of faith.

In like manner the universal Church, possessed of such a diffused infallibility, seems capable only of speaking in defence. She must be moved to speak. Doctrines do not need definition till they

are denied. Her old simple inherited language is enough, till new-invented heresy necessitates new methods and depths of expression.

It seems therefore plain, that this power in the Church of defining Christian doctrine, of developing, if it is to be so called, defensively, cannot be fully exercised unless the Church is fully at unity in herself. United in a single body, if she recognizes and receives, as a faithful exposition of the Divine mind that is in her, the decisions of any council, her voice is authoritative, and not to be gainsaid. Divided, and rent into portions, she loses authority as she loses universality. The voice of a part of the Church is no longer the glorious voice of the Church Catholic, the irresistible words of the beloved Spouse of Christ.

Once, indeed, she spoke with such a voice, and challenged and received the submission of Christendom to her Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. And by the good providence of God, the doctrine of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, "the Catholic Faith," was defensively established before the deep and melancholy rent, which made over the West of Christendom to usurpation, and its dire effects in schism and disunion, took away from her for ages the power of speaking with united and authoritative accents.

But since that time she has felt, and felt increasingly, the wounds of many divisions. It is, no doubt, her duty still to defend, as she best

may, her inheritance. In the attempt to discharge this duty she has, with her enfeebled powers and essentially imperfect authority, put forth in various lands articles, confessions, and terms of communion.

Whereinsoever, then, such documents, issued in days of division, add to the mass of affirmatively developed truth, there they would seem presumptuously to usurp; whereinsoever they endeavour to identify and fix the precisely accurate statements of Apostolic truth, there they endeavour to do that which is, essentially, within the province of the successive and inheriting Church of God provided always that they travel not beyond the original decrees of Apostolically taught, and scripturally proved doctrine, and claim no more than their proportionate and scanty powers, as emanating from a portion only of the holy Church of Christ.

The name
of God the
name of
the
Church.

The sacred name of God is also given to be the holy name of the Church. Called "Christians," not without Divine direction⁹, at Antioch, as partakers of the Divine name and nature, admitted into the fellowship and unity of the body of Christ, we are become his people, and are admitted into the holiest of all names, the name of God¹. As the Jews, in comparison of all the

⁹ Vide Hammond, Annot. on Heb. xii. 25; and Schleusner, sub voc. *χρηματίζω* et *χρηματισμός*.

¹ Isa. lxv. 1; lxiii. 19. Nam omnis congregatio cujusque

nations of the world, were called by His name, who bore rule over them, so is there now a heavenly name, the name of God, for them who were no people, but in Christ have become a sacred people. The holy name has been called over us, and by that holy name we are called².

To each separate Christian, his own Christian name is the separate token of his belonging to the body, whose name is thus the name of God. It was given to him when first he was planted into the life-giving body. It denotes promise, like the new names of Abram, Sarai, and Jacob ;

regionis nomen sibi vindicare consuevit, ut Ægyptii, Æthiopes, Syri, Judæi, Arabes provinciæ suæ terrarumque suarum vocabulum præferunt : nos de diversis populis congregati, vocabulum nobis unius gentis non possumus usurpare, et ideo quia nomen non habebamus in terris, de cælo accepimus, ut Christi populus diceremur.—S. Ambros. Enarr. in Ps. xxxvi. 7. (vol. i. p. 780.)

Et exaltabit cornu Christi sui. Quomodo Christus exaltabit cornu Christi sui? De quo enim suprâ dictum est, *Dominus ascendit in cælos*, et intellectus est Dominus Christus, ipse, sicut hic dictum est, *exaltabit cornu Christi sui*. Quis ergò est Christus Christi sui? An cornu exaltabit uniuscujusque fidelis sui, sicut ista ipsa in principio hujus hymni ait, *Exaltatum est cornu meum in Deo meo*? Omnes quippe unctos ejus chrismate, recte christos possumus dicere, quod tamen totum cum suo capite corpus, unus est Christus.—S. August. de Civ. Dei, lib. xvii. c. iv.

Omnes Christianos dicimus propter mysticum chrisma.—Ibid. lib. xx. c. x.

² St. James ii. 7. cf. Acts xv. 17. 1 Cor. i. 2, and Hammond's Commentary.

subjection, like the new names of the Jewish kings; belief, like the new Christian names of Simon, and Saul the persecutor. It denotes his new estate, as a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. It is his earnest of that new name, which God will give to him that overcometh, which no man knoweth but he that receiveth it³; the name of God, and the name of the city of God; that name of the Father of the Lamb, to be written on the foreheads of the Saints.

The name of God that into which we are received at Baptism.

But beyond and above the holiness of this great name, regarded as the sum of Christian truth, and the name of the Church, is its mysterious sanctity, when viewed as the sacred precinct into which disciples are by holy Baptism received, the presence of God Himself⁴. Forthwith, on passing through the mystical washing, we are made disciples into the kingdom of heaven⁵. We are in Christ⁶. Then all these great and wonderful sayings become applicable to us, to our bliss, or to our confusion, which are scattered in such profusion throughout the Apostolical epistles. We become partakers of the Divine nature, escaping the corruption that is in the

³ Rev. ii. 17; iii. 12; xiv. 1.

⁴ Prov. xviii. 10.

⁵ μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν.—St. Matt. xiii. 52.

⁶ Rom. xii. 5; xvi. 7. 1 Cor. iii. 1; iv. 15, &c.

world through lust⁷; our citizenship is in heaven⁸; we have access by one Spirit unto the Father; we are fellow-citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God; we are made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus; we “are come unto the Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God,” that city “which the glory of God doth lighten, and the Lamb is the light thereof,” “the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God, the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant⁹.” Then prayers are heard, not only because in Christ we have our separate access to the Father by the Spirit, but still more, because wheresoever two or three have been gathered into the name of Christ, there is He, whom the Father always heareth, in the midst of them¹. Then Christians, all together, become the true temple of the living God, as God hath said, “I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people².” Then he that overcometh shall be made a pillar in the temple of God, and he shall no more go out³.

⁷ 2 St. Peter i. 4.

⁸ Phil. iii. 20. Eph. ii. 18, 19. 6.

⁹ Heb. xii. 22—24. Rev. xxi. 23. ¹ St. Matt. xviii. 20.

² 2 Cor. vi. 16.

³ Rev. iii. 12.

Thus, on every side of us, do we find the sacred name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It is over us as a name and appellation, it is in our mouths as our glorious confession unto salvation, it encircles us as our Divine protection and defence. No hand of man, nor power of evil spirit, can ever tear us from our tower of strength, which is the name of God. No grace, nor favour, nor help of God, can ever be wanting to those who are called by His name, who dwell for ever in His holy fellowship, whose lips are permitted to turn every ascription of Jewish praise of Jehovah into "glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

This great name to be hallowed.

Only let us see, that in all our hearts and lives ever hallowed be his name! Most holy it is in itself; be it treated as holy; reverently, awfully, devoutly hallowed by us. As a name, let us hallow it, by using it with devout and sacred frequency in prayer, by refraining with the most anxious and conscientious diligence from all light, or casual, or irreverent use of it at other times. As a nature, let us hallow it by the most wary and careful thoughts, conscious that He is in heaven, and we upon earth, conscious that at the most we see but the skirts of his adorable and immortal Being; let us studiously and anxiously keep within the words of holy Scripture and the

Creeds, in expressing ourselves about it, nor ever speak of it without the present consciousness of his greatness, and nearness, and most awful majesty. As the presence of God on earth, let us hallow it by duty to God in the Church, the body of Christ; by submission,—holy, active subjection; by seeing Him ever in His earthly ministers, people, rites, ordinances, judgments, mercies; by feeling ourselves already living in His continual sight and presence; His eye upon our bodies and our souls, upon our thoughts, our words, and deeds; His Spirit striving in our hearts with increasing or decaying grace, according to our increasing or decaying efforts to cherish it; His holy Son not far from every one of us⁴, who are planted into His body, buried into His death, risen with His resurrection, fed with His sacred body and blood, who are, unless we be reprobates, living stones of the most holy temple, in which He abideth for ever, even unto the end of the

⁴ Severianus (apud Suicerum sub voce *ὄνομα*): *Ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου οὐχὶ ὅτι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐχόμεθα, (τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἀγιάζει πάντα,) ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπικέκληται ἡμῖν (Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ καλούμεθα) λέγει, Τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἀγιασθήτω. Improbatur Suicerus, sed ad S. Cyprianum de Orat. Dom. "Sanctificetur nomen tuum, non quod optemus Deo, ut sanctificetur orationibus nostris, sed quod petamus ex eo, ut nomen ejus sanctificetur in nobis:— id petimus et rogamus, ut qui in baptismo sanctificati sumus, in eo quod esse cœpimus perseveremus, et hoc quotidie deprecamur."*

world. As a profession, let us hallow it, by holding it fast, and never swerving, in liberal word, or wavering thought, or inconsistent deed, from its simple, sacred, divine firmness. It admitted us to the militant kingdom; kept whole and undefiled from heretical taint, or falling away of sin, it shall admit us to the triumphant. "For if baptism," says the great St. Basil, speaking of the holy baptismal tradition of the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, "is the beginning of my life, and the day of my regeneration to me the first of days; surely, the words which were uttered when the grace of sonship was given to me, are the most precious of all words. Shall I then ever betray the tradition which thus introduced me to the light, through which I was declared the child of God, who before that time had been his enemy through sin, because I am deceived by the specious arguments of men? Nay, rather, I pray in my heart that I may, with this confession on my lips, depart hence unto the Lord ⁵."

⁵ St. Basil de Sp. S. c. x.

DISCOURSE V.

Τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ
ἐξ ὑμῶν, Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον. Eph. ii. 8.

BESIDES the general commission of the Church to occupy the Lord's place upon the earth, and the particular offices and powers entrusted to the Apostles as governors and teachers, our holy Lord did also, in the great Forty Days of His remaining upon earth in His glorified body, say very gracious things of the privileges and blessings which should belong to the separate individuals who by Holy Baptism should be grafted rightly into His Church.

VIII. The
privileges
of the bap-
tized.

The first of these is thus given by St. Mark :
“ He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved ¹.”

This saying, regarded in connexion with the words that precede it in St. Mark's Gospel, seems

¹ St. Mark xvi. 16.

in the first place to point out who are the fit subjects for Holy Baptism. Sent out into all the world to make disciples of all nations, by what rule were the Apostles to proceed in admitting persons to the great Name with which they were entrusted? What was to be the qualification for baptism? what the attainment which should fit persons to be taken out of heathenism, out of the power of Satan, and admitted into the kingdom of God, the mysterious and saving Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost? These words supply the true answer to such a question. "He that believeth" may be baptized. "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest²," were the express words of the deacon Philip to the Ethiopian eunuch. "He that believeth," but what? What is the truth, the message, the doctrine to be delivered by the Apostles, and believed in all the world? No doubt, as it has been fully explained in the last discourse, the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. So in effect, and almost in words, the eunuch confessed; so Timothy doubtless professed his good profession before many witnesses³; so Christians have made profession at the holy font of baptism in every age of the Church's history.

The Nature
of Faith.

But there is no need to enter further than has

² Acts viii. 37.

³ 1 Tim. vi. 12.

been done already into the illustration of this point. We must now rather ask, What is it to believe? What is the nature of that belief or faith of which our Lord herein speaks? What is that faith which qualifies for baptism, and which, with baptism, gives salvation? which may, and by God's help shall, perform miracles? which is doubly blest when unaided by sight? What is, as nearly as we may be able to ascertain it, the exact nature of faith, that virtue which precedes and follows baptism, the gift of God, whose early beginnings fit a man for the justification of baptism, whose later maturity perfects him for final acceptance, the title, from the first to the last, of the just man's life?

If ever there were a word which requires clear definition, that word is faith, respecting which there is apparently such deep and sore disagreement amongst Christians; to which there are attached so many meanings and shades of meaning; respecting which no man seems to doubt when he uses it, that he understands fully what he means, and is in no danger of being misunderstood by others.

The word faith, then, appears to be used in Holy Scripture in several senses, differing, some of them widely from one another. For instance, (1) Two principal senses of Faith in Holy Scripture. in one place it means certainty of mind, or undoubtingness; and in this use ⁴ it does not neces-

⁴ See Rom. xiv. 22, 23.

sarily refer to Christian doctrine at all. In this sense, to have faith is to be quite sure, to have no doubt. Again, (2) faith, or the faith, is used to signify the whole mass of Christian doctrines, as in the expression, "the faith once delivered to the saints⁵." Again, (3) faith is used in a sense akin to the last, but not identical with it, for the Christian system: not expressly as in the last instance, for the objective doctrines of Christian revelation, but for that system, or body of religion, in which men are taught that salvation is obtained, not by their own earnings, but by the sacrifice of the death of Christ. This is the sense which seems to run through the argumentative portions of the Epistle to the Romans. Fourthly, (4) faith is used to signify simple intellectual belief. This is the sense in which St. James speaks of it in the passage of his Epistle in which he contra-distinguishes it from works, and in which St. Paul speaks of it when he distinguishes it from love, or from hope and charity. Fifthly, (5) it is used⁶ to signify all sorts of human virtue, grounded on the belief in divinely revealed truth. This is the sense in which, as will be presently explained, it is often used by our Lord in the Gospels. There are also two or three other subordinate senses of the word faith, such as that in which it signifies (6) a promise⁷, or (7) faithful people⁸, (8) fidelity or faithfulness⁹; but there are senses from which no

⁵ Jude 3, &c.⁶ v. Appendix on Faith.⁷ 1 Tim. v. 12.⁸ Rom. i. 17.⁹ Tit. ii. 10.

doctrinal confusion is likely to arise, and which may for the present purpose be wholly neglected.

Of these various senses, the greater number are plainly irrelevant to the present subject. The fourth and fifth are the only two which it is necessary to consider. In the former of these senses faith signifies mere simple belief. According to the usual way of speaking upon these subjects, mere belief is commonly called an act of the purely intellectual, in opposition to the moral part of the mind; and though this kind of expression is so far dangerous, as it may lead us to think that our minds are really made up of different parts or portions capable of separate existence or action, yet it is convenient, as it enables us to form a clear conception of the nature of mere belief, abstractedly regarded. This mere belief then may be by us abstractedly regarded without any reference whatever to the state of will and affections in the person believing. It may be found accompanied with love, gratitude, obedience; it may co-exist with hatred, fear, and misery. It is in itself neither good nor bad; but it becomes either eminently pleasing or displeasing to God, according as it has its place in a good or an evil heart, and is followed by growth of holy or unholy feelings. In this abstract sense St. James uses the word faith, when he says¹, that the devils also believe

¹ St. James ii. 19.

and tremble. They believe, but not one feeling, affection, or practical inclination proper to such belief is theirs. They believe and hate; they believe and shun; they believe and tremble.

Yet it is not to be forgotten, indeed it is of the first consequence to remember, that though in its purely abstract nature mere belief has no quality of goodness or acceptableness with God, yet, in man, belief in the truths of Christian revelation cannot but be acceptable with Him, inasmuch as it cannot be admitted by the intellect except through the medium of the will. If its evidence were demonstrative, or if it were merely such as the natural intellect of man could sufficiently judge of, then, indeed, the presence of religious belief would be no more acceptable with God than that of mathematical or other natural knowledge. It might show dutiful assiduity, or laudable anxiety of improvement, but in itself it would be disjoined from what is moral, and by consequence from what is good. But being, as it is, of a wholly different nature, being such as requires humility and reverence of mind, consciousness of sin and weakness, and love and fear of God, before it can be adequately appreciated, even the mere intellectual belief in Christian truth is a condition to which a perverse and sinful human heart cannot arrive. Faith, then, in the mere sense of belief, must of necessity be the gift of God. To believe, then, with the intellect, as it is, on the one hand,

a token of a good heart opened by the Lord to believe, and gracious affections, so, on the other, it lifts the heart and affections to address themselves to higher objects, and gives them a more exalted and diviner scope and range of action.

Still, however, though this be true, it does not appear that intellectual belief in the truth of divine doctrines is all that our Lord intends, when He says to his Apostles, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." It is no doubt a part of saving faith; the first and fundamental part; but it is not all. Alone (if it could exist alone in man, as it may by us be regarded alone) it would certainly be insufficient, as we have the authority of the Apostle St. James² for asserting, to do those great things for us which the Lord here attributes to faith. It is the basis, the foundation, the necessary beginning, insomuch that we may truly say, that whosoever will be saved by Holy Baptism, before all things it is necessary that he thus hold and believe the sacred doctrine of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

But beyond this confined and more peculiar sense of the word faith, there is another, of somewhat laxer and less strict kind, in which the word is commonly used in Holy Scripture, particularly by our blessed Lord Himself. In this sense it

² St. James ii. 14.

means Christian virtue : the whole superstructure, if I may so express myself, of acts inward and outward, acts whether buried in the recesses of the heart, or exhibiting themselves outwardly in visible external deeds ; of virtuous acts of every sort and kind, done because of the belief in Christian truth, and addressed to God by Christian truth made known to us. These acts are sometimes, in their own kind, acts of bravery (acts, that is, of the noble habit which, helped by God's grace, and governed by a spiritually enlightened conscience, makes a man act bravely in respect of his natural emotion of fear), sometimes of humility, sometimes of modesty, sometimes of other separate and distinguishable virtues ; but inasmuch as in every case the acts are done by reason of the belief which a man reposes in revealed truth, and are addressed to God, they go by the general name of faith. Faith is in this large sense human virtue, when it rises out of the belief in revealed truth ; Christian faith is all virtue proper to or rising out of the belief in the Christian revelation of the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

But why, it may be asked, should acts like these be called faith ? Is not the nature of virtue essentially dissimilar from that of faith ? Does not faith mean belief ? and is not belief a different thing in kind from virtuous action ?

No doubt, in strictness, belief is, as already

explained, a different thing from virtue. But by a very natural, and common laxity of speech, the word belief, or faith, is taken, in a larger way, to comprehend within the scope of its meaning those things which are proper consequences and fruits of belief. And such virtue may not improperly be called faith or belief, partly because it is founded upon faith or belief, strictly so called, as upon a necessary basis; and partly because (this belief making known the invisible God, the invisible world, the invisible rewards) its essential and characteristic nature is a faithful resignation or consignment of a man's whole self, in soul and body, into the hands and government of that invisible God, a living even while in the flesh with the ever-conscious nearness of that invisible world, an addressing of every thought of the heart, every word of the lips, every secret and every public act, to those distant and invisible rewards.

It is not one virtue among virtues, one grace among graces, one flower of the garland of goodness, one human excellence selected from amongst, or holding rank with or above others. Faith is not one virtue, and courage, modesty, temperance, compassion, other virtues. Each and all of these are Christian faith in the larger sense, in so far forth as the deeds proper to them are done because of Christian belief, and are addressed to the invisible God, and the invisible rewards. He who is brave, loving, just, modest, earnest in prayer,

holy, self-denying, because of Christian belief and the invisible God, is therein faithful. Every act of Christian bravery, of Christian modesty, of each Christian virtue, is not only such, but it is also a *venture*, a venture on the strength of believed truth, a venture for God, a venture in order to please Him, and win his favour. It is faith; and faith is virtue venturing. Belief gives eyes to virtue, and then virtue ventures: and faith, as in its stricter sense it is confined to the sight-giving belief, so in its more comprehensive use it includes this noble venturing virtue.

Nor, again, is it proper to say that faith is the inward principle or secret feeling of trust and reliance upon God, and all those habitual virtues the fruits or consequences of it. Each virtue springeth in its own feelings. Each virtue secretly germinates in unseen and secret movements, deep in the heart. Each virtue doth root itself directly upon the revealed truths. There needeth not, nor is there any intermediate fiduciary state of mind between belief and virtues, to be, as it were, a moral soil of virtue, metaphysically distinguishable from virtue, and of different acceptableness from virtue in the eyes of God.

The first voluntary feelings of love, reliance, humility, self-denial,—the first moral energies which spring towards God when in a good heart belief begins to germinate into virtue, are virtue. Are they feelings of faith? No doubt they are;

for they have an unseen scope, they deal with things hoped for as substantial³, and things not seen as evident. But they are also feelings of love and gratitude, of modesty or courage, or whatever other be the specific name belonging to them according to their kind. Are they feelings of love and gratitude, or of the other virtues? No doubt they are; but they are also feelings of faith; for they spring from belief, and their province and objects are the things of the invisible world.

In this sense of the word faith it comprehends and includes the former and narrower sense. The intellectual and moral parts, distinguishable as we regard them, are practically one. Each is, in some degree, cause and consequence of the other; and though we may rightly speak of belief as being, in the natural order of things, the basis and ground of virtue, yet does virtue in many ways strengthen, confirm, introduce, and prepare belief; just as in many plants the living shoots or leaves, when divided from the parent stock, will of themselves put forth roots, and reverse the natural process of growth; and many a beautiful race of exotic flowers blooms, without root or soil, wreathing itself lightly from bough to bough of South American forests.

It is in this second sense of the word, as was before observed, that our blessed Lord speaks

³ Heb. xi. 1.

more commonly of faith as a thing of the heart, a virtue, or as comprising virtues. Thus, when of the ten lepers, the Samaritan alone returned to give glory to God ⁴, our Lord calls his gratitude (for gratitude alone the narrative exhibits) by the name of faith. In the case of the poor woman who was a sinner, the many tears, showing "much love ⁵," are by the Lord called faith. In the case of the father of the demoniac boy, tears, and the prayer to "help his unbelief ⁶," receive the blessing expressly said to belong to Faith. In the case of the poor superstitious woman ⁷, who hoped to steal, as it were, a cure by touching the hem of His garment in the press of people that followed to the house of Jairus, her anxious search of bodily restoration from Christ is by Himself called faith. In the poor Syrophenician woman ⁸, whose daughter was grievously vexed with a devil, her obstinate undiscouraged prayers are called great faith.

Nor is the way in which St. Paul enumerates the great instances of faith ⁹ in the worthies of the Old Testament at all different from that in which our Lord speaks in these passages. All of them believed that God is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. All of them regarded these rewards which they did not

⁴ St. Luke xvii. 19.

⁵ Ibid. vii. 50.

⁶ St. Mark ix. 22.

⁷ St. Mark v. 4.

⁸ St. Matt. xv. 28.

⁹ Heb. xi. 1—28.

see, but hoped for, as evident and substantial. All of them died thus in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and having been persuaded of them, and having embraced them and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth; and so faithful Abel offered his more excellent sacrifice, faithful Enoch was translated, faithful Noah prepared his ark, faithful Abraham obeyed the command of God to leave his country, sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country, and when he was tried, offered up Isaac; faithful Isaac blessed Jacob, faithful Jacob when he was dying blessed both the sons of Joseph, faithful Joseph when he died made mention of the departing of the children of Israel, faithful Moses when he was born was hidden of his parents, when he came to years refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, forsook Egypt, kept the Passover; for all of them alike, in all these faithful acts, had respect unto the recompense of the reward. Thus speaks St. Paul of the faithful obedience of the patriarchs; nor are his expressions in any way to be understood differently from those of Mattathias to his sons as recorded in the first book of the Maccabees: "Call to remembrance what acts our fathers did in their time; so shall ye receive great honour and an everlasting name. Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness? Joseph in

the time of his distress kept the commandment, and was made lord of Egypt. Phinees, our father, in being zealous and fervent, obtained the covenant of an everlasting priesthood. Jesus, for fulfilling the word, was made a judge in Israel. Caleb, for bearing witness before the congregation, received the heritage of the land. David, for being merciful, possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom. Elias, for being zealous and fervent for the law, was taken up into heaven. Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing, were saved out of the flame. Daniel, for his innocency, was delivered from the mouth of lions. And thus consider ye throughout all ages, that none that put their trust in him shall be overcome¹.”

Thus, in all these cases, to believe God and his promises, and act as believing, are together spoken of as faith. Faith, which, strictly used, means belief only, is used more largely to cover all that mixed mental state and complex virtue which is built by the operation of God's grace in our hearts upon belief, and addresses itself to the invisible God, and his invisible rewards. And such faith—such as the Lord Himself, in the instances adduced, acknowledged and blessed; faith, the virtue of the heart grounded upon belief in the understanding; faith, the virtue of the heart, looking through belief as through a tele-

¹ 1 Macc. ii. 51—61.

scope, and thence gaining the view, and by the view, the love and obedience of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; faith, the complex goodness of the Christian mind, the joint work of every faculty of intelligence and capacity of feeling in man, is, according to the commission given to the Apostles in the great forty days, to be the fit estate for holy baptism, and with baptism the title to every other blessing.

“He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.” Shall be saved! He shall be saved forthwith, saved from death, put into the ark out of the raging waters of the flood; he shall become one of those that are saved, be put into the state of salvation. He shall be made God’s own child, being a member of Christ. He shall be at once, in title, privilege, and condition, elect, a saint of God, enrolled among the citizens of heaven, rescued from the thralldom and dead estate of the subjects of Satan. Shall be saved! Living on in the world, wandering awhile up and down in time,—that duration created by the most high God to give scope for choice, free-will, voluntary action, growth, gradual perfecting of the saints,—he shall, if he hold fast his belief, and mature his virtue, if he persist in prayer, and by the grace of God grow to the full stature of a perfect man in Christ, he shall be saved; saved in the awful day; saved from the wreck of the world; saved from weaknesses, temptations, and sins; saved from

dangers and drawbacks ; saved out of the state of trial into the state of joy ; saved from the glory of the Church militant, into the greater and eternal weight of glory of the Church triumphant.

He that believeth and is baptized : yea, and he that is baptized and believeth. Such belief or faith, as it is the fitness for holy baptism, so is the business of life after baptism. As its first and weak beginnings introduce to the fountain of life, so its daily increasing strength, and continual accessions of habitual firmness, lead the baptized on to glory. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" the whole moral law of Christianity is comprised within its high functions. The love of God ², and the love of man, the almsgivings, the prayers, the fastings, the forgivenesses, the humilities, all the details of that high Christian righteousness which must exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, come within and are part of this fulness of Christian faith. Christian faith requires all. Every thought and feeling ; every word and action ; body and soul with all their powers ; the understanding and the will ; the imagination, the hopes, and the desires ; all consecrated to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are faith ; and all work onward and onward, fearful indeed, and

² St. Matt. xxii. 37—40 ; vi. 1—18 ; xviii. 4. 21—35 ; xi. 29 ; v. 20.

trembling for themselves, but hopeful and trusting in God, who is their source and strength, from the salvation of baptism to the salvation of glory.

“And these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover ³.”

Such shall be the further powers and triumphs of faith. In the name of Christ nothing shall be impossible to it. The ordinary limits which bound the agencies of man shall be removed for those who, planted into the body or name of Christ, and growing daily stronger in faith, work miracles in prayer, yet not they but the grace of Christ which is in them. To the universal Church, His indwelling Presence is grace and strength and Divine power. And individual members of the body win the separate blessings by separate faith. As they grow in faith, as they realize more and more the greatness of their station and privilege, and live more nearly up to it; as Christ dwelleth more and more in their hearts by faith; so they obtain more and more enjoyment of the great and supernatural blessings which belong to the body. Their prayers are more heard, their graces are

³ St. Mark xvi. 17, 18.

greater, their knowledge and power of sight and judgment in divine things are enlarged, they have more and more constant sense of the nearness and holiness of God, they see differences in things apparently indifferent, they gain greater powers⁴, powers over themselves, their friends, their enemies, the visible and invisible world. According to the often repeated promise of the Lord, they may work miracles. “Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say to this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you⁵.”

And where shall a word be found in the Holy Scriptures of the cessation of these powers of faith? or what ground of reason can be given which should make us think that, if the blessed presence of Christ amid His Church is assured even unto the end of the world, faith hath ceased to have the privilege so often promised in the Gospels, and so solemnly conferred in the Forty Days? It is plain that there is none such. The promise is nowhere spoken of as though it was a temporary one, nor has the gift been ever ex-

⁴ καὶ τάχα ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν σωμάτων ἐστὶ τισι πρὸς τινα φυσικὴ ὀλκὴ, ὡς τῇ μαγνησίᾳ λίθῳ πρὸς σίδηρον, καὶ τῷ καλουμένῳ Νάφθα πρὸς πῦρ, οὕτως τῇ τοιαύτῃ πίστει πρὸς θεϊὰν δύναμιν.—Origen. in Evang. Matt. x.

⁵ St. Matt. xvii. 20; xxi. 21. St. Mark xi. 23. St. Luke xvii. 6.

pressly withdrawn. The Church is still the Body of Christ, and where He is, there is still the power which exhibited itself in all the mighty works of the Apostolic days. We may not doubt it. We must not doubt these holy solemn sayings of our departing Lord. We must not apply the miserable standard of our own deficiencies to measure the height and breadth of our gracious Master's word of promise, and thus make it speak only our own language, echo our own thoughts, and represent only our actual condition. No; amid the sacred sayings of these forty days, there is yet one which seems to meet this very doubt, and bid us not fear for the blessedness of faith, in whatever distant ages or lands it may be cherished in the hearts of Christian men. "Thomas, because thou hast seen, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed ⁶." Yes, whenever or wherever they may be born, or live, of whatever hue, of whatever speech, of whatever rank or station among men,—“blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed;” blessed, even as St. Thomas! blessed even above St. Thomas! blessed with every blessing that is, by God's mercy in Christ, the inheritance of faith. The indwelling Presence decays not, nor grows old. The promise is everlasting, and shall never fail. God still looketh on his Church in love,

The greater blessedness of them that believe without seeing.

⁶ St. John xx. 29. cf. 1 St. Pet. i. 8.

as on the Body of His Son, and shall do so to the end.

Alas ! it is not from the failure of these causes that men grow cold, and doubt whether powers and privileges like these were ever given in perpetuity to the Church, or to her faithful children, or whether they were not the mere credentials of the first Apostolic preachers, of no further use or benefit to the Church than to be historical evidences of Christianity to later days. Is it not, rather, that the abundance of iniquity⁷ hath chilled love? Is it not, rather, that according to our Lord's own mournful forecasting, the Son of Man, when He cometh, is little likely to find such faith upon the earth⁸? The faith that prayed without ceasing; the faith that loved God above all things; the faith that devoted time, talent, labour, soul and body, to God's service; the faith which caused a man to realize his membership of Christ as his first and greatest, and, so to speak, his only (because his most inclusive) relation upon earth; the faith which was as eyes to the soul, and made it see God in His Church, and in every ordinance of His in her; which showed to it the dishonour and irreverence that is done to God in thousands of actions which the world calls innocent and indifferent; such faith is surely rare and discouraged among us. Credit, character, ease, power, money,—

⁷ St. Matt. xxiv. 12.

⁸ St. Luke xviii. 8.

these things and such as these fill the hearts who claim to be of the Body of Christ, and profess to be making their glorious calling and election sure. These things and such as these have supplanted faith in the chilling and chilled hearts of too many of those who are in estate and privilege heirs of God, and joint heirs of Christ. Truly we need, one and all, never to weary of the apostolic prayer⁹, "Increase our faith." It is of Thee, O Lord, alone that we can believe. It is not of ourselves, it is thy gift. Do Thou, of thy great goodness, stir our hearts! Quicken us to a stronger, a holier, and livelier faith. Make us to yield ourselves up to Thee with fuller and truer devotion, that in the last day, at thy coming, we may be found among the number of thy faithful and blessed children!

There remains but one more saying of the great Forty Days to be briefly noticed, but it is the greatest of all. It is the one upon which all the others depend for their full and divine accomplishment. "And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you. Tarry ye here in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high¹:" the gift of the Holy Ghost, the descent of the Blessed and Eternal Comforter, to dwell in the Church.

Till the Holy Ghost was given, these other IX. The Promise of the Holy Ghost.
The most important,

⁹ St. Luke xvii. 5.

¹ St. Luke xxiv. 49.

as giving
life and
force to all.

great sayings were, so to speak, dark and ineffective. The very receivers² of them knew not half their sacred meaning, nor the wonderful exaltation of privilege and blessing to which they themselves were raised by them. With the day of Pentecost, and the full effusion of the fiery Spirit, light flashed through all these sacred words, and they were seen to be full of mighty and unexpected significancy, the very outlines of the kingdom of Heaven. All that their Lord had said to them was brought vividly before their minds. The wondrous vision of "all truth" was opened before them. They were taught of God, and became at once the teachers of the world.

The delegation of the Church to occupy the place of her Lord upon the earth, and the perpetual Presence of the Lord with her as the secret of that delegation, which verities are at the very foundation of the being of the Church, and all its powers and privileges among men, do both altogether depend for their completion upon the Divine gift of the Holy Ghost.

In the predictions uttered by our Lord to give comfort to His disciples before His departure from

² Witness their inquiry of the Lord, even after all these great Sayings had been solemnly declared to them: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Our Lord in His answer points to the day of Pentecost: "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." Acts i. 6. 8.

them, the coming of the Comforter, and His own return to dwell among them are spoken of, as has been shown above, as if they were either one and the same event, or at least took place the one by the means of the other. "He would not leave them orphans; he would come to them³." "Yet a little while and they should see him." "He would see them again, and their heart should rejoice, and their joy no man should take from them;" and yet "it was expedient for them that he should go away, for if he went not away, the Comforter would not come unto them; but if he departed he would send him unto them."

When, again, the Church is spoken of as the temple of Christ, we are taught that it is by the Presence and indwelling grace of the Holy Ghost in the hearts of separate Christians that it becomes so. "All the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit⁴." "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you⁵?" "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ⁶."

If the Church is called by the name of the Body of Christ, it is in like manner owing to the

³ St. John xiv. 18; xvi. 22. 16. 7. ⁴ Eph. ii. 21, 22.

⁵ 1 Cor. iii. 16.

⁶ 1 Pet. ii. 5.

Presence and indwelling strength of the Holy Ghost in the members that they are thus mysteriously united to Him. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have all been made to drink into one Spirit⁷." It is by the Holy Ghost that we may "grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love⁸:" and "hereby we know that God abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us⁹." As we become spiritual men by the Spirit which is in us, as that union with the Body and unto the Head is a spiritual conjunction, so it proceedeth from the Spirit; and "he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit¹." In the same manner we are taught that if we have not the Spirit of Christ², we are none of His; but that when being born of God by the Spirit³ we have love of Christ, then the Father and the Son love us, and will come unto us, and make their abode in us.

Again, what were the sacred tradition of Holy

⁷ 1 Cor. xii. 12.

⁸ Eph. iv. 16. Col. ii. 19.

⁹ 1 St. John iii. 24.

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 17. Cf. Bp. Pearson on the Creed, art. viii.

² Rom. viii. 9.

³ Cf. 1 St. John iv. 7; xiv. 23.

Baptism without the Holy Ghost, who is not only one of the sacred Three-in-One in whose Holy Name it is given, but who is, more particularly still, Himself the very gift and grace of Baptism? The very point in which the divine sacrament of the Lord's institution differs from the washing of the Baptism of John is this, that it imparts the sacred and most holy gift of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. We sacredly believe, that with the due use of the holy water of Baptism comes the birth of the Holy Ghost mentioned in our Lord's discourse ⁴ with Nicodemus, and that thereby the laver of Holy Baptism becomes, as St. Paul ⁵ calls it, the laver of Regeneration. We believe that like as the body was anciently dipped in the water in the external act of Baptism, and thence raised up again, so the souls of the baptized have been made in a mysterious and Divine way, by the means of that action, to partake of the death⁶ and burial, and of the Resurrection of Christ. "O strange and inconceivable thing! we did not really die, we were not really buried, we were not really crucified, and raised again. Our imitation was but in a figure, whilst our salvation was in reality. Christ was actually crucified, and actually buried, and truly rose again; and all these things have been vouchsafed to us, that we, by imitation, communicating in His sufferings, might gain sal-

⁴ St. John iii. 3. 5.

⁵ Tit. iii. 5.

⁶ Rom. vi. 3—5. Col. ii. 12; iii. 4.

vation in reality⁷." Thus St. Cyril of Jerusalem shows eloquently and clearly how the holy Sacrament, which is in itself a figure or imitation of that which was done for us by Christ, conveys to us the reality of the blessing. We wash in the sacred water, and our soul is spiritually re-born; we descend into the figurative sepulchre, and we rise to real life by an eternal Resurrection.

What new birth may be, what the precise change worked upon our souls and bodies by this Divine operation may be, we cannot say. As "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and we hear the sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth," so viewless, deep, and mysterious are the inward workings of the Holy Ghost, whereby our souls are re-born to immortality, re-born to holiness, re-born to the likeness and love of God our Saviour. But then first begins in us that which God looketh on in love. We begin to be in Christ, and Christ begins to be formed in us.

But, again, as the beginnings of natural life are small and feeble, nor comparable in point of vigour and efficacy with the maturity of life full grown, so are the beginnings of spiritual life weak and feeble too. The mysterious gift is indeed present, and the soul is changed in itself and in its aspect to God, but hitherto it has made no spiritual attainments, nor risen beyond the first

⁷ St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Myst. Cat.* ii.

and, as it were, germinal condition of spiritual being. But with every act of faith, with every voluntary activity of the mind in obedience to the inward working of the Holy Ghost, and in the direction of the invisible rewards of God, the Spirit grows in us, and we grow in the Spirit. As the Spirit grows in us, so are we more sanctified, so are we more holy, so have we more faith, so do we realize the unseen things better, so are we more citizens of heaven, so do we draw nearer to the likeness of Christ, so do we more make our calling and election sure. In prayer the Holy Spirit⁸ cries within us; by prayer we receive fresh grace of the Holy Spirit⁹. In Confirmation¹ we receive the outpouring of the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the spirit of knowledge and true godliness, and the spirit of holy fear. In every Communion of the Lord's Body and Blood we strengthen the union (that sacred union of the Holy Ghost!) which is betwixt the members of the Body and their Divine Head. Thus in all our Christian life, from the font to the grave, the Holy Ghost is the very principle and source of vitality in us. Without Him we cannot think a thought, or speak a word, or do a deed which is not evil. Faith or works, things inward or things

⁸ Rom. viii. 26.

⁹ St. Matt. v. 11. St. Luke xi. 13.

¹ Prayer in the Order of Confirmation. Cf. Isa. xi. 2.

outward, all alike without Him are vile, with Him are precious. Cherishing His Presence, growing in His grace, not quenching His movements of fire, we shall pass unhurt from earth to heaven, from the state in which He is "the earnest"² of our bliss, to the state in which, by His perfect sanctification, we shall at last be fitted and made capable of our bliss.

In like manner to the Holy Ghost, the ordainer, we trace every authoritative commission to rule, to teach, to feed, to bind and loose, which Apostles held, or successors of Apostles hold, in the Church of Christ; and because of that Divine authority inhering in them, we believe that they justly claim a Christian³ submission to the acts of their separate functions, to the end of the world. It is the Holy Ghost who maketh men to be overseers over the flock of God⁴. It is the Holy Ghost by whom they are empowered to forgive and retain sins⁵. It is the Holy Ghost, by whom is given to one the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy; all these manifold gifts which He worketh, dividing to every man severally as He will⁶.

To the Holy Ghost therefore we attribute, in

² 2 Cor. i. 22 ; v. 5. Eph. i. 13, 14.

³ Bp. Pearson on the Creed, art. viii.

⁴ Acts xx. 28.

⁵ St. John xx. 22.

⁶ 1 Cor. xii. 8. 10.

all lowliness and thankfulness of mind, all holiness, all power, all acceptableness in the Church. From Him is the authority of governors; from Him the obedience of the governed. A mighty work of God is doing on the earth; on men, and in men; a work which each may resist, if in the wilfulness of a rebellious spirit he resolves to reject the counsel⁷ of God against him; but which, too, each may further by yielding himself up in all devotion of body and soul to perform, with the help of God, the work which God hath given him to do. But though man may further, as man may reject, though man by using the means of grace with all diligence may work out, as he may also lose and ruin, his own salvation, yet of the work and gift of God the Holy Ghost is all that is good or faithful or well-pleasing in him. He keeps our souls as their sole indwelling principle of truth, purity, and firmness. He is our Lord and Giver of life, our growth, our grace, our joy, our hope. "Through Him is the lifting up of hearts, the leading of the weak by the hand, the perfecting of those who make progress. He, shining upon those who have been purified from every stain, maketh them spiritual by union with Himself. And as clear and transparent bodies, when a ray of light falls upon them, become shining themselves, and reflect another ray from themselves,

⁷ St. Luke vii. 30.

so spirit-bearing souls, shone upon by the Spirit, are themselves made spiritual, and send forth grace to others also. Thence comes the foreknowledge of things to come, the understanding of mysteries, the comprehension of things concealed, the distributions of gifts, citizenship of heaven, union with the choir of angels, endless joy, perseverance with God, likeness to God, and what is the chief of all things desirable, the becoming divine ⁸."

Thus to the Holy Ghost, the Divine Paraclete, the Church owes her life, her light, and spiritual being. Without Him, even the sacred words of Christ, the charter of her marvellous powers and graces, had been words without deeds, a body without a soul, a shadow without a substance. With his Divine Presence, and unfailing help, all these sacred words are full of energetic, life-imparting force. The words were spoken in the Forty Days; the Spirit and the power descended on the fiftieth. From that day forth the Church began to bear her sacred witness to the world. From that day forth she began in the life and strength of the Holy Spirit of God to strike her roots deeply, and to spread her branches. From that day forth she began to cover the hills with her shadow, and to fill the land; to send out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the

* S. Basil, de Spiritu Sancto, c. 9.

river. From that day forth she began, through a long and various, a mournful and wonderful history, to prepare the world for the terrible advent of her Lord in Judgment.

APPENDIX.

PAGE 36.

S. Cyprian. adv. Judæos, lib. ii. c. xxvi.—Quod cum resurrexisset, acciperet a Patre omnem potestatem, et potestas ejus æterna sit.

Apud Danielem : Videbam in visu nocte, et ecce, in nubibus cœli quasi filius hominis veniens venit usque ad Veterem dierum, et stetit in conspectu ejus, et qui assistebant ei obtulerunt eum : et data est ei potestas regia, et omnes reges terræ per genus : et omnis claritas serviens ei : et potestas ejus æterna, quæ non auferetur, et regnum ejus non corrumpetur. Item apud Esaïam : Nunc exurgam, inquit Dominus, nunc clarificabor, nunc exaltabor, nunc videbitis, nunc intelligetis, nunc confundemini : vana erit fortitudo spiritus vestri, igni vos consunet. Item in Psalmo 109 : Dixit Dominus Domino meo, Sede ad dexteram meam, quoadusque ponam inimicos tuos suppedaneum pedum tuorum : Virgam virtutis tuæ mittet Deus à Sion : et dominaberis in medio inimicorum tuorum. Item in Apocalypsi (Rev. i. 12—18). Item in Evangelio, Dominus post resurrectionem : Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo et in terrâ : ite, ergo, et docete omnes gentes, tingentes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, docentes eos observare omnia quæcunque præcepi vobis.

PAGE 125.

On the use of the words 'Ο Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου in the New Testament.

It has been often observed, that the appellation 'Ο Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου is only used of our Blessed Lord by Himself, until the Ascension; and only once by any other person in the New Testament afterwards,—that is, by St. Stephen, in Acts vii. 56.

There can be no doubt of its general meaning as so used. As the expression υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου twice used of our Lord in the Book of Revelations, and once in St. John's Gospel ¹, and, recurring continually in the Prophet Ezekiel, in the Psalms, and other places of the Old Testament, probably means *a man, one born of human race*, so ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου means, *the man, the one of human race, the particular single eminent man*. Without the articles, the expression seems to signify, by a common Hebrew idiom, a man; just as the corresponding phrase is used of men, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God ², οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, they are sons of God." With the articles, it is no longer a mere description, but a descriptive appellation, "Whom do men say that I, *the Son of Man*, am ³?" It is true that in one place the expression τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων is used of men in general (πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ⁴). This use, however, is perfectly simple, and different from the one of which I am speaking. The first article is wanted in the sentence to give definiteness to the word υἱοῖς, and the second is added by the ordinary rule, which attaches the article to the second noun, whensoever it has been attached to the first. Besides, being used in the plural number, the expression has no semblance of an *appellation*, or *proper*

¹ Rev. i. 13; xiv. 14. but vide Bp. Middleton, p. 246, on St. John v. 27.

² Rom. viii. 14; ix. 26. ³ St. Matt. xvi. 13. ⁴ St. Mark iii. 28.

descriptive designation, which is the manner in which it is so often used of our Lord.

The first article, then, Ὁ Υἱός, contradistinguishes from other sons, ὁ υἱὸς τῶν υἱῶν. The second either marks the abstract noun, τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου, of humanity, or human stock, (as Grotius interprets, “Nam ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου rectè dicitur cum de generis humani universitate agitur. Sæpe enim articulus notat τὸ καθόλου totum genus⁵,”) or, what is more probable, is added to the latter noun, because the former one has also an article; which is the interpretation of Bp. Middleton.

The appellation then, Ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου, is used by our blessed Lord, of Himself, eighty-two times in the New Testament. Of these instances, thirty-two occur in St. Matthew, fourteen in St. Mark, twenty-six in St. Luke, and ten in St. John; many, that is, in all, but fewest in the deepest, and, if we may so say, the divinest of the Gospels, where nevertheless the *Heavenly Sonship* is spoken of thirty-one times, more frequently, that is, than in any of the others.

In far the greatest number of instances, the appellation of the Son of Man is used to express either the humiliation of our Lord, as a man, or his glorification, as a man.

First, It expresses his humiliation; as,—

1. He has not where to lay his head. (St. Matt. viii. 20; St. Luke ix. 58.)
2. He must suffer. (St. Matt. xvii. 12. St. Mark viii. 31; ix. 12. St. Luke ix. 22.)
3. He is betrayed. (St. Matt. xvii. 22; xx. 18; xxvi. 2. 24, 25. St. Mark ix. 31; x. 33; xiv. 21. 41. St. Luke ix. 44; xviii. 31; xxii. 22. 48; xxiv. 7.)
4. He gives his life. (St. Matt. xx. 28. St. Mark x. 45.)

⁵ Grot. in Marc. ii. 28.

5. He is lifted up. (St. John iii. 14 ; viii. 28 ; xii. 34.)

6. He is buried. St. Matt. xii. 40. St. Luke xi. 30.)

Of these particulars of humiliation, *none* (except His being lifted up) occur in St. John ; and this one is not found in any of the other three Gospels.

Secondly, It is used to express the glorification of His human nature :—

1. Angels ascend and descend upon him. (St. John i. 52.)

2. The hour draws near for his glorification. (St. John xii. 23 ; xiii. 31.)

3. He rises from the dead. (St. Matt. xvii. 9. St. Mark ix. 9.)

4. He ascends. (St. John vi. 62.)

5. He is at the right hand of God. (St. Matt. xxvi. 64. St. Mark xiv. 62. St. Luke xxii. 69.)

6. He is to return to judge ; with a sign in heaven ; like lightning ; with angels ; in the clouds ; sitting on the throne of his glory ; will send his angels to gather his elect. (St. Matt. x. 20 ; xvi. 27, 28 ; xix. 28 ; xiii. 41 ; xxv. 31 ; xxiv. 27. 30. 37. 39. 44 ; xxv. 13 ; xxviii. 19. St. Mark viii. 38 ; xiii. 26. St. Luke xii. 8. 40 ; xviii. 8 ; ix. 26 ; xvii. 24. 26. 30 ; xii. 40 ; xxi. 27. 36.)

These two uses of the appellation will explain far the greatest number of passages in which it occurs in the New Testament. There remain about twelve, in which the appellation is given to our Lord equally decisively, but without so direct reference to either of these two states of humiliation or glorification. Such are the following : “The Son of Man hath come eating and drinking,” “He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man,” “Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am ?” “The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost,” the “days of the Son of Man,” “unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man.”

Respecting these two main uses of this expression, Bishop Middleton remarks ⁶: “I have, indeed, observed, that in a majority of the places in which our Saviour calls Himself the Son of Man, (and He is never in the New Testament so called by others before his ascension,) the allusion is either to His present humiliation or to His future glory: and if this remark be true, we have, though an indirect, yet a strong and perpetual declaration, that the human nature did not originally belong to Him, and was not properly His own. He who shall examine the passages throughout with a view to this observation, will be able duly to estimate its value: for myself, I scruple not to aver, that I consider this single phrase, so employed, an irrefragable proof of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ.” Bishop Horsley puts the same remark still more forcibly: “The Son of man and the Son of God are distinct titles of the Messiah. The title of the Son of man belongs to Him as God the Son: the title of the Son of God belongs to Him as man. The former characterizes Him as that one of the Three Persons of the ever blessed Trinity which was made man; the other characterizes Him as that man which was united to the Godhead ⁷.”

I therefore will assume, that whensoever the appellation of the Son of Man is used for our blessed Lord, there is some particular meaning intended by it: that it is not a mere proper name, signifying, without distinction, Himself in all his nature: but that His being born of a human parent, and possessing truly the entire proper nature of a man, is so conveyed in the appellation, as to require not to be forgotten in the interpretation of the passages in which it occurs.

There are, then, a few passages on which I desire to make a few particular observations, inasmuch as the meaning of them seems to be considerably affected by the introduction of this appellation.

I. The first of these is found in St. Matthew xii. 32; St.

⁶ Page 247.

⁷ Bp. Horsley, Serm. xiii.

Mark iii. 28; and St. Luke xii. 10. It is thus given by St. Matthew: ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὅς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι, οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

I notice this passage in order to observe, that if the appellation ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου is to be allowed any weight in the interpretation of our Lord's words, then the comparatively venial blasphemy here spoken of is not that against the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, in comparison of the Third, but against man in comparison of God. For the blasphemy of which the Jews had been guilty, and which led to these words, (ὅτι ἔλεγον, πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει⁸;) had in fact been against our blessed Lord, and only against the Holy Ghost in and through Him. This is the interpretation of many commentators⁹. The meaning is thus given by St. Jerome¹: "Whoever shall say a word against the Son of Man, scandalized at my flesh, and thinking me only a man, because I am the son of the carpenter, and have for brothers James and Joseph and Judah, and am a man gluttonous and a winebibber; such an opinion, without blasphemy, although it is not devoid of the fault of error, yet may be pardoned on account of the vileness of the body. But he who while he plainly recognizes the works of God, being unable to deny his virtue, yet through envy calumniates them, and says that *Christ*, the *Word of God*, and the works of the Holy Spirit are Beelzebub; for him there shall be no forgiveness, either in the present world or in the future."

There is no need, for the present purpose, to go into any further interpretation of this verse; only it may be added, that it seems, when understood as above, to signify that the general nature of irremissible sin is the plainly seeing manifestations of Divine power, and yet deliberately shutting up one's heart against them, whether this be done by determining *à priori*

⁸ St. Mark iii. 30.

⁹ Vid. Hammond, Macknight.

¹ Hieron. in Matt. tom. ix. 12.

that we *will not* believe them, or resisting them when they appear. So that the Christian temper most opposite to the “*presumptuous sins*” which constitute “*the great offence*,” is the temper of waiting to see what God may be pleased to do, of being ready to acknowledge it if it should come, and keeping our hearts open to the consciousness of his presence, his power, and of our ignorance of the ways in which He may be pleased to manifest Himself. But it is better to pass from this verse, as one of extreme difficulty (St. Augustine doubts if there be any more difficult in the whole of Holy Scripture, so that his custom was, as he says, to shun it in all popular preaching²), and consider another which occurs in the same chapter.

II. Our Lord said, in the 8th verse of the twelfth chapter of St. Matthew, *Κύριος γάρ ἐστι καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. The same saying is found in St. Luke vi. 5, and more fully in St. Mark ii. 28. *τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο, οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον· ὥστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου*.

Two versions are often given of this passage, neither of which seems satisfactory. One is thus boldly stated by Grotius: “*Errant qui υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου hoc loco Christum peculiariter intelligunt. Christus enim in terris agens Legi se subditum professus est, neque ei aut derogavit aut abrogavit, sed ex Patris sententiâ eam est interpretatus, suamque interpretationem et Legis auctoritate et ductis ex æquo bonoque argumentis confirmavit. Est ergo hic υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου homo quivis: quod ita apertum facit Marcus, ut contradici nequeat. Ita enim apud illum loquitur Christus, ‘Sabbatum est hominis causâ, non homo Sabbati causâ: quare filius hominis etiam Sabbati est Dominus.’”* The other version may be taken from Dr. Hammond, who, taking no notice of the peculiar appellation, and seeing that an interpretation such as that of Grotius would prove *every man* Lord of the Sabbath, in-

² Vol. v. p. 388.

terprets of Christ, as God : arguing “ He that gave the positive Law can dispense with the observance of it.”

Each of these interpretations appears to have a point of strength which is not found in the other. Is it not then possible to combine these points, and interpret the verse without omitting either the force of the peculiar appellation, or the *argument* as stated by St. Mark ? The following suggestions appear to me not inadequate to this object.

The Sabbath ἐγένετο διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον : that is, if I rightly understand, the Sabbath was instituted for man’s good, and after man was himself created. Man was not created in order to keep the Sabbath. The Sabbath was not itself a previous moral condition which man was created to fulfil. On the contrary, man was created first ; and then, subsequently to his creation, a law, positive in its own kind, and having his good for its object, was laid upon him, and in him upon all his posterity. “Ὡστε, *so that*, that is, from the peculiar nature of the law, as a positive law, of the creation, it follows that man’s good is its rule. Is then every or any man, “*homo quivis*” according to Grotius, at liberty to apply the rule according to his own judgment of the way in which he may think the law most likely to conduce to his good ? Nay, but ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *the man*, the greatest of the sons of men, the son in the house of which Moses was but the servant, he whom God hath specially anointed and sent into the world, is He who may adapt, re-arrange, apply the positive law to its great uses. He does not, indeed, now claim, as God, to abrogate a positive law of God’s original appointment, but as *the Son of Man* to be its Lord. And let it be observed in passing, that the instances which our Lord alleges of David, and the priests in the Temple, are not instances of breaking the law of the Sabbath ; for the case of David is quite of another sort, and the priests acted according to the very letter of the law, as written in the Book of Numbers ³ ; so that

³ Numb. xxviii. 9.

He is the first, except Moses, to claim any power of alteration or addition to this ancient law.

And here I may observe, that there are two laws, which, in the particular respects now referred to, seem to be remarkably similar to one another; the law of the Sabbath, and the law of Marriage. They are, so to say, the two laws of the Creation; not original moral laws, so impressed upon the very nature and heart of man, as to be morally discoverable by the mere force of his natural, unsophisticated reason, but laws positive, passed by God's express enactment, subsequently to the Creation of Mankind, and binding upon all humankind through their first parents. They are respectively, as it were, the law which guards Morality, and the law which guards Religion—entrusted in Adam to humankind, the original matter of the first service of God, the property of the whole race of man. In the case of both of these laws (*οἱ διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένοντο, οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τοῦτους*) an alteration was introduced by Moses, speaking God's words, as a faithful servant. In the law of marriage he enacted, "When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him give her a writing of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her away." The law of the Sabbath he surrounded with various particulars of strictness: he added the Sabbatical year and the jubilee; in all these things going far beyond the letter of the law of the creation. And in both, the Lord, Ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου, was Κύριος. As Moses διὰ τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν αὐτῶν had relaxed the strictness of the one, and added strictness to the other, (for moral relaxation and ceremonial strictness belong, however dissimilar they may seem, to the same character of hardness of heart,) so our Lord, the Son of Man, re-adjusted both laws. It had not been so from the beginning. He disallowed the easiness of divorce in the one case, restoring the law of marriage to its primitive simplicity; and by His Apostles He renewed the ancient form of the Sabbatical Law, by abro-

gating its Mosaical ceremonies, and appointed a new day among the seven, to commemorate the new creation of the world in the Resurrection from the Dead.

III. The next passage is thus given by St. Matthew ix. 6. St. Mark ii. 10. and St. Luke v. 24, (there only being a very slight and immaterial transposition in St. Mark's account,)

ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ

If we may pursue the same method of interpreting this appellation in this place as in the former ones, it will follow that our blessed Lord here forgives sins, and raises the paralytic, not as God, but as man. The Scribes had asked, "Why doth this man speak blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God only?" Our Lord in His reply neither denies the prerogative of God to be the only forgiver of sins, nor claims to forgive them as being God himself. All that He alleges in this place is, that He, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, truly human as He is, yet most eminent and glorious of humankind, has ἐξουσία to forgive sins ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Ἐξουσία, that is, permission, or delegated power. For as ἔξεστι is "licet," "it is permitted," so ἐξουσία is licence or authority emanating from higher power. That this is the meaning of the word in this place, (as indeed it always is in the New Testament, in spite of some seeming exceptions which, when fully examined, support rather than overthrow this interpretation,) is clear from the comment of the Jews themselves upon our Lord's words :

ιδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐθαύμασαν, καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν Θεὸν, τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

Ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς—that is, in opposition to *in Heaven*. Thus in the 18th chapter of St. Matthew, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅσα ἐὰν δῆσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. These are the two pardons to which our Lord refers in the passage which we just now considered, when He says, 'It shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.' It

is to be observed that all these three expressions, the Son of Man, the Exousia, and “upon the earth,” are repeated by all the three Evangelists.

IV. When we pass from these passages to examine two remaining ones, which occur in St. John’s Gospel, we seem to pass at once into a more mysterious and difficult class of doctrines from those which we have been considering hitherto.

The first of these occurs in the 3rd chapter of St. John, at the 13th verse, and is as follows :

καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.

The second is in the 6th chapter, at the 62nd verse :

ἐάν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον.

The principal modern interpretations of these verses appear to overlook the point on which I am principally insisting, the appellation, namely, of ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου, or, if they take notice of it at all, do so only in order to observe that the name is given, not with particular meaning, but in the same sort of way as in some other passages ‘the Prince of Life’ is said to have been crucified, the Lord of Glory to have suffered, and God to have purchased a Church with His own blood⁵, that is to say, (they are the words of Whitby,) ‘the Son of Man is in Heaven, not as the Son of Man, but as the Son of God.’

Yet when we consider that this peculiar title is used, as I have said, upwards of eighty times in the New Testament, and in almost every instance with a distinct and most unequivocal reference to our Lord’s Humanity, and that in the other eight passages in which St. John records the use of it by our Lord, it is used equally decisively in the same sense, we can, I think, hardly help supposing that in these two difficult verses it is used with the same meaning, or that, to say the least of it, if these interpretations be, as I believe they are, true in the

⁵ Acts iii. 15. 1 Cor. ii. 8. Acts xx. 28.

main, yet there is some good and probably assignable reason why this particular appellation is here used. To which consideration it is to be added, that, *to a certain extent*, there can be no doubt that the appellation, even in these two passages, has its own distinct signification; for when our Lord in the one passage spoke of His own witness, and in the other of His Ascension, He surely meant to say that He, poor and merely human as He seemed, was yet able to witness of heavenly things, and would hereafter visibly ascend into Heaven.

If then the appellation is to be considered as so forming part of our Lord's sayings, as to require to enter into the interpretation of them, two very considerable difficulties immediately present themselves: the one, that 'the Son of Man' is said to have descended from heaven, where He was τὸ πρότερον, ever before; the other, that He is said, even while He was on earth, to have been in Heaven, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.

It may be observed, that these two sayings are very similar to one another,—and therefore that they may be considered to support and throw some light upon one another. If we may say it with reverence, each seems to put 'the Son of Man' beyond the ordinary laws which govern the world: the one seems to speak of Him as independent of the laws of time, the other of space; by the one He seems to be said to have been, and in some sort to have ever been, before His human birth; by the other to have been, and with a sort of divine being *to be* as Son of Man, even in His manhood, in Heaven even while He was in the earth.

Now these are plainly very mysterious and difficult sayings; and if, as we do not doubt, every word of Holy Scripture is so divinely inspired and guarded as to be entirely free from all suspicion of indistinctness, or impropriety of expression, it seems to be hardly reverent to assume that they are used without some real meaning. Let us, then, for a few moments,

endeavour to pursue the train of thought to which they lead. And first, of the saying that the Son of Man came down from Heaven.

Let it be observed, then, that there are several other passages of Holy Scripture which seem to speak in somewhat the same language : as in the third chapter of St. John, we have the words *ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, so, as I have already quoted, we have in the sixth chapter, *ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον*. So again, in other verses of the sixth chapter of St. John, it is said, that the living bread of God came down from Heaven, (in some true sense in which the manna in the wilderness did not come down from heaven,) and that that bread is His Flesh, the Flesh of the Son of Man. Not very unlike to this, again, is the saying of St. Paul to the Corinthians, that the first man is of the earth, earthy ; the second man is the Lord from Heaven. And again, the passage of the Revelations ⁶, in which we read of “ the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,” seems to contain a remarkable acknowledgment of some manner in which the manhood and death of Christ were not directly dependent upon the ordinary laws of time. And this last passage becomes still more remarkable when we consider how strongly it contrasts with St. Paul’s expressions to the Hebrews, “ Nor that he should offer himself often, as the high priest enters into the holy place every year with blood of others ; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world : but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.”

Let it not be imagined for a moment that I allege these passages with any idea of arguing that our blessed Lord, the Son of Man, descended from heaven. This, indeed, was the heretical doctrine of Apollinarius, of which Gregory Nazianzen speaks in the following terms of most just severity :

⁶ xiii. 8.

“ If any one should say that the flesh [of Christ] came down from heaven, and did not draw its beginning from hence, and from us, let him be accursed. For the saying, ‘ the second man is from heaven,’ and ‘ such as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly,’ and ‘ no one hath ascended up into heaven, but He who descended from heaven, the Son of man,’ and if there be any other such, is to be understood as said on account of the union with Him who is heavenly : just as the saying that all things were made by Christ, and that Christ dwells in your hearts, (is to be understood) not with reference to that nature of God which is visible to the eyes, but to that part which is conceivable by the understanding ; the two names, like the two natures, being mingled together, and passing into one another by the force of their conjunction,” τῷ λόγῳ τῆς συμφυΐας.—S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 51, p. 740.

I have rather quoted these passages with the very object of observing upon the marvellous character of that *συμφυΐα*, or union of natures, under which (when, in the course of the duration of this world, the fulness of time had arrived for it to be accomplished) forthwith the words and sayings which belong to the Divine Person are not unfrequently transferred to the human. The eternal Son of God took man’s nature upon Him in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance ; and behold the human nature in Him is at once, both by the sacred Lord and his inspired Apostles, spoken of in terms not inappropriate to the divine !

Perhaps human thought, like human language, is altogether inadequate to pursue the consideration of this marvellous union. Certainly the words of Holy Scripture and the Creed ought to bound the speculations of men respecting it. But do not the very words of Holy Scripture, in the passages which I have adduced, invite us, as it were, to these reflections, and set us upon considering some of the mysteries of this great doctrine ?

We commonly recognise the two ideas of time and eternity as dissimilar to one another. We speak of time, as having

had a beginning, and destined to have an end ; and we conceive of duration, altogether, as if it were not a necessary condition in the existence of things, but for the purposes of God in the government of the world, drawn out, as it were, and evolved, or, in some manner, created where it was not. Thus we not unfrequently talk of “ *time being no more ;*” and, though neither human words nor thoughts can penetrate either before or after time, or think or speak of eternity otherwise than by using the very instruments of thought and speech which belong exclusively to a state of duration, and are formed and framed under it, yet we do keep fast hold of the idea of an eternity, bounding time at either end, and distinct altogether in kind from any duration however long. A duration which never did begin, and never will end, appears impossible and inconceivable to our thought, and seems to drive us at once, and of itself, to the idea that eternity, whatever it be, in which, and of which, is God, is wholly diverse and unlike to all duration or succession,—such as we call time.

If, then, this be the true exposition of our common thoughts of time and eternity, how shall not that doctrine be inherently mysterious, which declares the union into one Person of Him who is for ever and ever, who is with no gradations or successions, no beginnings nor endings of being, and the seed of the woman, the Son of David, the promised Child of Abraham, living amid all the conditions which belong to and surround this transitory world, a being of time, born, when time was already, as it were, old, and after a few years departing hence, and being no more seen in the body? How shall we not expect, that when this sacred Person, thus mysteriously and indissolubly joined of natures so diverse, is spoken of, when the very instruments of thought and speech are all such as I have described them, and when the occasion is one which has reference to matters of comparative time or eternity, that language may be applied to the eternal Son of God, which

may seem to identify Him too nearly with the race of men, and phrases be used of the Son of man, in which it may appear to be forgotten that He was born, at a certain date in the history of the world, the child of a blessed Virgin? And how, indeed, might not our thoughts be rather withdrawn, in some degree, from appreciating the unspeakable and sacred mystery of this holy doctrine, if it were otherwise?

Thus, then, I would venture to interpret this great text, in respect of its first statement, *ὁ καταβάς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. The name of the Son of Man is given (*τῷ λόγῳ τῆς Συμφυΐας*) to Him who is both God and man, who, in the unity of his sacred Person, is truly one, and one only. And the particular title of Son of Man is given in this place, partly, (as the context of the discourse seems to suggest,) in order to show to Nicodemus that poor and ignorant and merely human as the speaker seems, He is yet the only person who can speak of things heavenly, as He who knows, and has seen them; and, partly, according to our present interpretation, to put the Church for ever in mind of the unspeakable mystery of the sacred doctrine of the Incarnation, whereby the Son of Man, born in time, is united into one Person with Him, who is for ever and ever the eternal Son of God.

V. Having, then, thus offered an interpretation of the words *ὁ καταβάς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, as applied to the Son of Man, I proceed to consider the other statement of the same verse, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὁ ὧν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*. As, in that former clause, the Son of Man seemed to be spoken of as if He were independent of the laws of time, so (as I before remarked) this clause appears to speak of Him as independent of the laws of space. How it is obvious to ask, could He, who had a true body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, be said to be in heaven, even whilst He was visibly present, and speaking upon earth? And if such a saying be intelligible in respect

of his Divine nature, so that we should not be surprised to find it said of the Son of God, how is it to be understood when spoken, as it expressly is, of the Son of Man?

It appears to me, that a parallel interpretation to that which was offered in the former case, will go far towards explaining, or at least accounting for, the use of the appellation in the present one. The mystery of the union of the two natures in one true and single Person, as it necessarily produces insurmountable difficulties to our thought in respect of time, seems to have precisely the same effect in respect of place.

Let it be observed, then, that we possess no word nor idea which bears to space the same relation as eternity to time.

In speaking of the Divine Being, as we call Him Eternal, in contra-distinction to beings who live in time, we have no other attribute but *Omnipresence* to apply to Him in contra-distinction to beings who live in space. It is obvious, I think, that to say of God that He is *omnipresent*, is to say what is indeed unquestionably true, but what is quite inadequate even to such conceptions as we might form of Him in this regard.

Omnipresence falls altogether short of a Being whose existence is necessary. Just as omni-temporal would fall far short of eternal, and yet be undeniably true of God; so omnipresent is an equally inadequate expression of that which we believe, and, in a certain way, can conceive of Him.

Not, then, to dwell any longer on these abstruse matters, I merely wish to observe, that we ought to conceive of God, not only as a Being who is necessarily every where, *i. e.* being *omnipresent*, but as one to whose Being the thought of *where* is not incident at all. His Being is independent of space; perhaps, for we know but little of such things, it may transcend and surpass it infinitely, as it assuredly permeates and fills it.

If then the nature of God be thus mysteriously exempt from every property and condition of space, how shall not that doctrine be inherently mysterious, which declares the close and indissoluble union, in one Person, of this nature with the nature of a man? How shall we venture to say or think what may or may not be the effects of such an union upon the sacred manhood? Above all, how shall we be surprised, if, when our blessed Lord and his inspired Apostles speak of this mysteriously united manhood, (and the context introduces the idea of place,) they use expressions which surpass the simple and ordinary things which may be said of common men?

Thus, then, I would venture to interpret this difficult saying. The Son of Man is said to be in heaven even whilst on earth, because He, who is both God and man, whose Person, though combined of these two most dissimilar natures, is absolutely and indissolubly One, is assuredly in both. And the title of Son of Man seems to be given to Him in this place, partly, (according to the context,) in order to show to Nicodemus the extraordinary dignity and greatness even of that lowly and humble Son of Man, with whom he was speaking; and partly, (according to our present interpretation,) in order to remind the Church, in every age, of the mysterious and unsearchable nature of that sacred union, of God and man, under which, and because of which, even the descendant of human kind, the child of time and space, appears to have, in some sort, put off the conditions of his natural being, and to be spoken of as Divine.

I trust it is not necessary to guard myself any further against the danger of being understood to maintain either the doctrine of the pre-existence, or present independency or space, of the manhood of our blessed Lord. I am very far indeed from designing any such thing. What I purpose to say, is almost wholly said in the following words of St. Augustine: "What, then, doth He mean, when He saith,

‘When ye shall see the Son of Man ascending where he was before?’ There would have been no question, if He had said, When ye shall see the Son of God ascending where He was before; but when He saith, ‘the Son of Man ascending where He was before,’ was then the Son of Man before in heaven, when He began to be on earth? In another place, He saith, ‘No one hath ascended into heaven, except Him who descended from heaven, the Son of Man, who is in heaven.’ He was speaking upon the earth, and He said that He was in heaven. What does this mean, but that we should understand, that Christ, who is God and man, is one person, and not two? Christ then is One. The word, the soul, and the flesh are one Christ. The Son of God and Son of Man are one Christ. The Son of God ever, the Son of Man in time, but one Christ in unity of person. He was in heaven when He was speaking on the earth. The Son of Man was in heaven, as the Son of God was on earth; the Son of God on earth in his assumed flesh, the Son of Man in heaven in unity of person.” S. Aug. in Joh. Ev. c. 6. tract. xxvii. (Vol. iii. p. 503.)

This, as another ancient author says, is the manner of the exchange; for each nature lendeth to the other its own properties, because of the unity of person, and their mutual circulation (*τὴν εἰς ἄλληλα αὐτῶν περιχώρησιν*).—Joann. Damascenus, quoted by Hooker, bk. v. c. liii. 4. (Vol. ii. p. 294.)

The *Unity of Person* is, as these writers thus say, the first great lesson which we should learn from such sayings; may we not add, that the *Mystery of the Unity* is the second? We should, I think, be dealing irreverently with this mystery, if we ventured into any explanations of it, beyond what Holy Scripture and the Church authoritatively sanction; whether, on the one hand, we so exalted the mankind of Christ, “as that the majesty of His estate should extinguish the verity of His nature,” or so claimed to limit or explain the properties of the divinely assumed manhood, as to deny what the Sacred Scriptures seem to say expressly of it. I do not feel quite sure whether the decisions of Hooker, in his discussion

of this subject, do not go somewhat further than such prudent reverence would sanction. (Eccl. Polity, bk. v. c. li—lv.)

But, however this may be, the mystery of this great doctrine may well make our sayings wary and few about it, lest, as Hooker says in the same place, we be like those who, “because this Divine mystery is more true than plain, having framed the same to their own conceits and fancies, are found in their expositions thereof more plain than true.” (Vol. ii. p. 284.)

The sayings which I have been endeavouring to interpret were all spoken of our blessed Lord whilst He was yet living in the flesh upon the earth. Sanctified, and sent into the world for the great work which He had to do, the *Son of Man* was nevertheless one, of whom all these great things were true, and many more which are said in the other passages which we have not particularly considered.

But when He had done the work which God had given Him to do, and having died in the flesh, and been buried, had risen again from the grave, and was about to ascend into heaven with His body, the case was in some degree changed. For *a little while*, his followers should not see Him; in some sense, He was about to depart from them; in some manner, “the Son of Man,” whatever mysterious presence He might still maintain among them, was not to be with them as He had been, while they had companied with Him as He went in and out among them on the earth.

But before He went, He commissioned his Church to occupy the place which He was about to leave, to be the visible representative of Himself, the Son of Man. And Jesus came and spake unto them, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth;” and again, “Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.” In a few days, power from on high was given to them, by the full effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost; and then the Church, her commission and her gifts being full, the Lord God dwelling

among them, seems to have been clearly placed in the same sort of position which her Lord had occupied before. She was indeed not Christ, (though, be it observed, she is called even by that great name in Holy Scripture⁷,) but she was in some mysterious way, His body, His spouse, His temple.

Like Him, she had the indwelling Spirit; like Him, she had an outward human form. Great, and almost infinite, as is the difference between the Church and her Lord, yet great also, and most astonishing, is the likeness!

And as in many other ways, so also in respect of these passages of Holy Scripture which I have been considering, that which was true of *the Son of Man*, while He remained upon earth, is true also of the Church, which is His body.

For instance, in the first passage which was referred to, the blasphemy against the Son of Man is declared by our Lord to be a venial sin in comparison of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; and the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is expressly said by the Evangelist to consist in attributing the miracles of our Lord to an unclean spirit. If then the presence of the eternal Spirit is still with the Church, and shall be, to the end of the world, may we not fear lest men may sometimes, when they suppose themselves only speaking against sons of men, the earthen vessels of God's great gift, be rashly blaspheming Him who dwells within them? And may not language, such as that of St. Peter to Ananias, possibly apply with slight variation to those who are in various ways bold in denying spiritual powers, "Thou hast not blasphemed unto men, but unto God?"

In the second passage before examined, the delegated authority of forgiving sins upon the earth, was said to be given to the Son of Man. There needs no argument to show, that this power was expressly transferred by Himself to his Church. "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had

⁷ 1 Cor. xii. 12.

said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost : whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

Then we read of his being, as the Son of Man, Lord of the Sabbath. It is remarkable, that though He thus claimed the title of Lord of the Sabbath, and stated the grounds upon which He claimed it, yet, as far as we read, He Himself exercised no such lordship. The alteration of the day to be sacredly observed among the seven, the actual exercise of authority over the law, in respect of the way of obeying it, was left by Him to his Church. Nor did even the Apostles, at any particular stated time, or by special and solemn act of authority, make the change. But yet the Church has universally made it, and therein laid claim to have inherited, of the Son of Man, the Lordship of the Sabbath.

And again, in respect of the more mysterious attributes of *the Son of Man*, which were stated by St. John, in how many points does the condition of Christians and the Church of Christ bear a remarkable resemblance to them !

Are things said of the Son of Man in which He seems to be made independent of time in some sort, as when His sacrifice is spoken of, as having been offered from the foundation of the world ? How parallel to this, in their degree, are many of the sayings of Holy Scripture, respecting the ancient Church and its faith in Christ ! When Abraham rejoiced to see Christ's day, and he saw it, and was glad ; are we to understand only that the Son of God was before Abraham was born, and not that Abraham himself, in the omni-temporal power of faith, lived, as it were, in the future, and saw the day of his Lord's flesh ? For faith is religion's memory and hope, all in one, and, like them, witnesseth our divine eternity by seizing and gathering up both past and future into its own single possession. Faith such as this, making things hoped for to be substantial, and regarding things not seen as evident, was to all the ancient Church her ground of good report, and

her mode of pleasing God. The Church believed in Christ, and was accepted in the Beloved, ages before He was born in Bethlehem, and partook of His blessings, by partaking, in some kind, of His Divine attributes.

In like manner, if the Son of Man be spoken of in Holy Scripture, as, in some way, independent of the laws of place, being in heaven while He was yet alive and speaking on the earth, what shall we say of the many similar things which are in many passages of the Epistles said of His Church? How was St. Paul's *πολίτευμα*, or citizenship, in heaven? How are Christians already come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God, the Judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect? How are we raised up together with Christ, and made to sit together in heavenly places in Him? What is the mysterious link, independent surely of all space, whereby the Church is one body in Christ, receiving nourishment from the Head through every joint, however widely it be locally separate, and so bound together, that, if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it? And what again is that real inward communion of the body and blood of Christ, whereby, according to the teaching of the Church, we are one with Christ, and Christ with us, we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us, our sinful bodies are made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, our bodies and souls are preserved unto everlasting life?

There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. Do not these awful words sum up, as it were, into a short compass, the mystery of which I am speaking? A *spiritual body!* what a profound, unfathomable depth! A body, without *where*, or *when!* A body of which we only know, that, being a true body, it yet unspeakably transcends every property of a body which we know upon the earth!

Such, we know, the faithful servants of God are destined

to be clothed with at last. In that house which God has built, which is not made with hands, but is eternal in the heavens, they will at last be fully what they are now in part, and title, as little dependent as the Son of Man Himself on the laws of the material universe; for they shall wake up after His likeness, and shall be satisfied with it.

PAGE 146.

On the Pastoral Office.

All the heads of the argument on the pastoral office will be found in the following passages of St. Augustine.

Christ was the Shepherd even in the time of the Patriarchs: "Quotquot ergò illo tempore crediderunt vel Abrahæ, vel Isaac, vel Jacob, vel Moysi, vel aliis patriarchis, aliisque prophetis Christum prænuntiantibus, oves erant, et Christum audierunt. Judex fuerat in præcone.—Si per prophetas vox pastoris erat, quanto magis vocem pastoris proferebat lingua ipsa pastoris!"—In Joh. Evang. c. 10. Tr. xlv.

He is the Shepherd promised in Ezek. xxxiv. 23. "Quem Pastorem unum? Et pascet eos servus meus David. Jamdudum Ipse pascebat nos: modo pascit nos servus ejus David. Quare tanquam alter? Nam utique cum ille pascebat, Deus pascebat: et cum Deus pascebat, Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus pascebat. Modo excitatur, et fit tanquam alter pastor; sed non alter. Non alter secundum formam Dei; quia in formâ Dei, ipse et Pater unus Deus; in formâ autem servi tanquam alter excitatur, ut pascat, quia major est Pater."—Serm. xlvii. De Ovibus, in Ezek. xxxiv.

All good shepherds are in the One Shepherd. "Hic invenio omnes pastores bonos in Uno Pastore. Non enim vere pastores boni desunt, sed in uno sunt. Multi sunt, qui divisi sunt; hic unus prædicatur, quia unitas commendatur. Neque enim vere modo ideo tacentur pastores, et dicitur pastor, quia non invenit Dominus cui commendet oves suas: tunc autem ideo commendavit, quia Petrum invenit: immò verò et in ipso

Petro unitatem commendavit. Multi erant Apostoli, et uni dicitur, *Pasce oves meas.*”

The commission is founded on love of Christ. “Idem ergo ipse pascit, cum ipsi pascunt : et dicit, Ego pasco ; quia in illis vox ipsius, in illis caritas ipsius.—Proinde ut oves commendaret, quid ei prius dicit, ne illi tanquam alteri commendaret ? Petre, amas me ? Et respondet, Amo. Et iterum, Amas me ? Et respondit, Amo. Et tertio, Amas me ? Et respondit, Amo. Confirmat caritatem, ut consolidet unitatem. Ipse ergo pascit unus in his, et hi in uno : et tacetur de pastoribus ; sed non tacetur. Gloriantur pastores ; sed qui gloriantur, in Domino gloriatur. Hoc est Christo pascere, hoc est in Christo pascere, et cum Christo pascere, præter Christum sibi non pascere.”—Serm. xlv. De Pastoribus, in Ezek. xxxiv.

PAGE 206.

On Baptism in the name of the Lord.

There cannot be any reasonable doubt that the Baptism in the Name of the Lord, or in the name of Jesus Christ, so often mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, (chap. ii. 38 ; viii. 16 ; x. 48 ; xix. 5,) did not *exclude*, even if it did not expressly include and signify, the form of Baptism, as given by our Lord to His Apostles. That it did not *exclude* it, may be argued (i.) from the fact, that in the four passages quoted above, it is not necessary to suppose that the *actual words* used in holy Baptism are intended to be referred to at all. St. Peter in the first passage, and the Historian in the other three, may be understood merely to be speaking of being baptized in the regular way, the way ordained by Christ, according to an interpretation quoted by Bingham, (book xi. c. iii. § 3.) τὸ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν βαπτισθῆναι σημαίνει ἂν τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν καὶ παράδοσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθῆναι τούτ- ἐστιν, εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. (ii.) It would also be quite inconceivable that the Apostles should instantly

and constantly depart from a form so recently and solemnly given to them by their Divine Master. (iii.) Besides which, the fact that the Church did always and every where, according to the unvarying testimony of the Fathers, consider all baptisms invalid which were not administered in the Name of the Trinity, strongly confirms the opinion that we *must* interpret the expressions of the Acts in some way consistent with the use of the full form as instituted by our Lord.—But there seems every reason to interpret these expressions in a deeper way, as is done in the body of the Sermon; that is, to understand “the Name of the Lord,” “the Name of Jesus Christ,” as containing within it the Name of the whole blessed Trinity; so that when St. Peter or St. Luke speaks of persons being baptized into the Name of Christ, he may probably mean by that Name, the whole Name of the Three Persons. This is, unquestionably, the manner in which St. Basil interprets these expressions. Καὶ μηδένα παρακρούεσθω τὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὡς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ βαπτίσματος μνήμης πολλάκις παραλιμπάνοντος, μηδὲ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπαρτήρητον οἰέσθω τὴν ἐπίκλησιν εἶναι τῶν ὀνομάτων. “Ὅσοι, φησὶν, εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. Καὶ πάλιν, “Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθητε. Ἡ γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσηγορία τοῦ παντός ἐστὶν ὁμολογία· δηλοῖ γὰρ τὸν τε χρίσαντα Θεὸν, καὶ τὸν χρισθέντα Υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ χρίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὡς παρὰ Πέτρου ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι μεμαθήκαμεν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, ὃν ἔχρισεν ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ.—Φαίνεται μέντοι ποτὲ καὶ μόνου τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος μνημονεύσας.—Ἄλλ’ οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο τέλειον ἄν τις εἶποι βάπτισμα, ᾧ μόνον τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπεκλήθη. Χρῆ γὰρ ἀπαράβατον μένειν αἰεὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ζωοποιῷ χάριτι δεδομένην παράδοσιν.—S. Basil, de Sp. Sancto, c. xii.

And St. Ambrose, in a remarkable passage, which has been variously interpreted, (vide not. Benedict. edit. ad locum, Bingham’s Antiq. book xi. c. iii. § 3,) following St. Basil, uses similar language: “Sicut qui benedicitur in Christo bene-

dicitur in Nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, quia unum nomen, potestas una; ita etiam ubi operatio aliqua divina, aut Patris, aut Filii, aut Spiritus designatur, non solum ad Sanctum Spiritum, sed etiam ad Patrem refertur et Filium; nec solum ad Patrem, sed etiam ad Filium refertur et Spiritum. Denique Æthiops eunuchus Candacis reginæ baptizatus in Christo plenum mysterium consecutus est.—Cum dicitur ‘In Nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi,’ per unitatem nominis impletum mysterium est.—Qui unum dixerit, Trinitatem signavit. Si Christum dicas, et Deum Patrem à quo unctus est Filius, et Ipsum qui unctus est, et Spiritum Sanctum quo unctus est, designasti.”—S. Ambros. de Sp. Sancto, lib. i. c. iii. Cf. also S. Cyprian. Ep. ad Jubaianum, lxxiii. (p. 206, ed. Fell.)

Πῶς δὲ τὸ βάπτισμα νοήσομεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ μόνον γίνεσθαι;—πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοῦτό φαμεν—ὅτι τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βάπτισμα ὁ Χριστὸς ἐβαπτίσασατο, τουτέστι, πνευματικὸν οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκὸν, οὐδὲ οἷον τὸ Ἰωάννου.—ἔπειτα τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ βάπτισμα, ἀντὶ τοῦ, εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, νόει.—Ἄλλως δὲ τὸ Χριστὸς ὄνομα ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐμφαίνει καὶ τὸν Πατέρα τὸν χρισαντα, καὶ τὸ χρίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸν χρισθέντα Υἱόν.—Theophylact. Comm. in S. Luc. xxiv.

But the case narrated by St. Luke, in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts, seems to make the matter quite clear. When St. Paul found that the converts baptized by Apollos, during his absence from Ephesus, had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost, he asks, *Εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε*; as though he said, How is it possible for you to have been baptized, and not have heard of the Holy Ghost, *into whose Name* ye must have been baptized? *Into what name*, then, were ye baptized? When they explained that they had only received the baptism of John, he baptized them “in the Name of the Lord Jesus.” Thus it is plain, that they who were baptized “in the Name of the Lord Jesus,” must have heard of the Holy Ghost, and have been able to answer, *Εἰς τί ἐβαπτίσθητε*;

PAGE 214.

The Baptismal Form the sum of Creeds.

I have spoken in the text of the Baptismal Form as being the germ or summary of all Christian doctrine ; as being the only doctrine delivered by our Lord (and that in summary) in the great forty days ; and as being the ground-work and origin of all dogmatic teaching in the Church, and specifically of the Apostles' Creed. This view will be seen to be highly probable, if we remember :—

1. That a certain profession of faith was always required before holy baptism. (Acts viii. 37. 1 Tim. vi. 12. 20. 2 Tim. i. 13.)

2. That this faith was of course the same (at least in sum) which the catechumen had been taught, and into which he was to be baptized.

3. That the universal practice of the Church was to baptize into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and that, therefore, it is probable that this was the profession also. (Vide note, p. 287. Bingham's *Antiq.* bk. xi. c. iii. § 1.) “Formula, quâ primitus ad baptismum venientes fidem suam de SS. Trinitate profitebantur, simplex erat, atque his fere verbis concepta, Credo in Deum Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum. Hæc est passiva doctissimorum hodie theologorum sententia.”—*Bull. Judic. Eccl. Cath.* c. vi. 19.

4. That as soon as we knew of the Apostles' Creed at all, we knew of it as the form of faith required to be professed at holy baptism. (King on the Creed, c. 1, p. 37. Bingham's *Antiq.* b. xi. c. vii. § 8.)

5. That this Creed is principally, or (as it may truly be said) wholly, an expansion of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which doctrine the Church has always regarded as the sum of Catholic Truth.

The following passages, from some of the earliest Fathers, will tend to illustrate these positions.

St. Clement of Rome : ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐκλεῖν καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς ἀγίας κλήσεως ἡμῶν κανόνα.—Ad Cor. i. p. 32. ed. Jacobson.

(This phrase, common with the Greek Fathers, is much illustrated by the words of St. Irenæus, who often alludes to and adopts expressions from St. Clement, κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινηῆ—ὄν διὰ βαπτίσματος εἴληφε, contra Hær. bk. i. c. ix.)

S. Ignatius : Σπουδάζετε οὖν βεβαιωθῆναι ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων (ἵνα πάντα ὅσα ποιῆτε, κατενοδωθῆτε σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι, πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ) ἐν Υἱῶ, καὶ Πατρὶ, καὶ Πνεύματι, ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ ἐν τέλει.—Ad Magn. xiii.

S. Irenæus, having spoken just before of the κανὼν ἀκλινηῆς τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ βαπτίσματος εἰλημμένος, goes on to say :—

Ἡ μὲν γὰρ Ἐκκλησία, καίπερ καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς διεσπαρμένη, παρὰ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθητῶν παραλαβοῦσα τὴν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, πίστιν· Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν σαρκωθέντα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας· καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας, καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Παρθένου γέννησιν, καὶ τὸ Πάθος, κ. τ. λ.

τοῦτο τὸ κήρυγμα παρεληφῦα, καὶ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν, ὡς προέφαμεν, ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καίπερ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη, ἐπιμελῶς φυλάσσει, ὡς ἓνα οἶκον οἰκοῦσα. Adv. Hær. bk. i. c. x.

S. Justin Martyr : Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύουσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὐχέσθαι τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνενχομένων καὶ συννηστεύοντων αὐτοῖς, ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀναγεννήθημεν ἀναγεννῶνται. Ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὄλων, καὶ δεσπότης Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λου-

τρὸν ποιῶνται.—Ἐπονομάζεται τῷ ἐλομένῳ ἀναγεννηθῆναι, καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις, τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὄλων καὶ δεσπότητος Θεοῦ ὄνομα. αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον ἐπιλέγοντες, τοῦτον λουσόμενον ἄγοντες ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρὸν. Ὅνομα γὰρ τῷ ἀρρήτῳ Θεῷ οὐδεὶς ἔχει εἰπεῖν. εἰ δέ τις τολμήσειεν εἶναι λέγειν, μέμνηε τὴν ἄσωτον μανίαν. Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμὸς, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων. καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, ὃ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα, ὃ φωτιζόμενος λούεται.—Apol. i. p. 79, 80.

Tertullian having, in the thirteenth chapter of the book de Præscriptione Hæreticorum, given the Regula Fidei, or an account of the Christian faith, in which he speaks of the persons and offices of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the nineteenth and twentieth chapters speaks as follows :—“ Ergo non ad Scripturas provocandum est ; nec in his constituendum certamen, in quibus aut nulla, aut incerta victoria est, aut par incertæ. Nam etsi non ita evaderet collatio Scripturarum, ut utramque partem parem sisteret, ordo rerum desiderabat, illud prius proponi, quod nunc solum disputandum est. Quibus competat fides ipsa ? Cujus sint Scripturæ ? A quo, et per quos, et quando, et quibus sit tradita disciplina, quâ fiunt Christiani ? Ubi enim apparuerit esse veritatem et disciplinæ et fidei Christianæ, illic erit veritas Scripturarum, et expositionum, et omnium traditionum Christianarum.

“ Christus Jesus Dominus noster—quid esset, quid fuisset, quam Patris voluntatem administraret, quid homini agendum determinaret, quamdiu in terris agebat, ipse pronunciabat sive populo palam, sive discentibus seorsum : ex quibus duodecim præcipuos lateri suo adlegerat, destinatos nationibus magistros. Itaque uno eorum decusso, reliquos undecim digrediens ad Patrem post resurrectionem jussit ire et docere nationes, intingendas in Patrem, et in Filium, et in Spiritum Sanctum. Statim igitur Apostoli—consecuti promissam vim Spiritus Sancti ad virtutes et eloquium—in orbem profecti eandem

doctrinam ejusdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt: et proinde ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt: a quibus traducem fidei, et semina doctrinæ cæteræ exinde ecclesiæ mutuatae sunt, et quotidie mutantur, ut ecclesiæ fiant.”

I trust I need not guard myself against being understood to mean that the other great verities of the Christian Faith were untaught by the Apostles, or not required to be believed by the early converts. I only intend to trace, as matter of historical probability and truth, the Apostles' Creed, and thereby the whole fabric of dogmatic teaching in the Church, to the Baptismal Form as delivered by our Lord to his Apostles, which very thing is done by Tertullian in the last-cited passage.

It is not necessary for my argument, that the Apostles, even at the baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, should have been satisfied with so short a Creed as that stated by Episcopus, and admitted by Bishop Bull: “Credo in Deum Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum.” On the contrary, the more and the sooner they enlarged the original summary of dogmatic truth, by the aid of the Holy Ghost received on the day of Pentecost, the more clearly will appear both the richness of the original tradition, and the fullness of the authority to understand and expound it with which they knew themselves to be now endowed. Vide Bishop Bull, *Judic. Eccl. Cathol.* iv. et seq. with the Notes of Dr. Grabe; Grotius's learned note on St. Matt. xxviii. 19; and particularly Bishop Pearson on the Creed, ii. 6. note *d.*

PAGE 234.

On the Nature of Faith.

In examining the nature of faith it appears to me to be a matter of no little importance to remark, and keep steadily in mind, the different way in which it is spoken of in the Gospels and in the Epistles. Throughout the Gospels, the word

and its conjugates are used in a simple, uncontroversial way. Men believe⁸, or they do not believe. They have faith, or they have not faith. The Lord observes and blesses their faith or belief, or He reproves and laments their want of it. Every thing relating to faith or belief, or to believing, is said in a simple, intelligible way, and no controversy could well arise (if the Gospels existed alone, or if they could be interpreted without reference to the other Scriptures of the New Testament) as to the meaning of the terms.

For instance, when Nathanael “believed” because the Lord had seen him under the fig-tree,—when the disciples are said to have “believed the Scriptures, and the word which Jesus had said,”—when the Lord reproving the Jews to Nicodemus, told him, “If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things?” it would seem as if all these expressions were very simple and easy, regarded by themselves. Our Lord seems to be speaking of “believing;” and everybody knows, without metaphysical discussion or distinction, what believing is. Some matter or other is told to a man, or otherwise proposed to his mind, and he either believes it, or he does not. Again, when in other places the Lord attributes faith to various persons, whose particular states of mind, as exhibited by their actions, are somewhat fully opened to our investigation, (as in the case of the poor woman with the issue of blood, the bearers of the paralytic, the woman of Canaan, and others,)—although the words “faith” and “believing” seem to be used (according to the ordinary practice of human language) in an extended⁹ way,

⁸ It is remarkable that the substantive *πίστις* does not occur in St. John: the verb *πιστεύω* occurs in his Gospel nearly three times as often as in all the other Gospels together. We, meanwhile, in English, incur some inconvenience from having *no verb at all* of the same root as faith; so that “faith,” the substantive, gets a sort of meaning more or less dissimilar to that of the verb “to believe.”

⁹ I observe, thirdly, that (as it is ordinary in like cases concerning the use of words) the word *belief* is by a kind of *synecdoche* (or *metonymy* if

so as to cover not their abstract believing only, but also the acts which their believing led to,—yet still the usage of the terms is simple, natural, and without difficulty; so that, as I just observed, if these uses stood alone, or if the written Scriptures were limited to the four Gospels, there would seem to be little or no room for serious diversity of opinion respecting the nature of faith or believing.

It would then seem, as I have said in the text, as if faith or believing were used by our Lord in two very naturally connected ways; first, simply for believing; and secondly, for believing with action. And it might be added, that this latter more complicated sort of faith is capable of slight varieties, according to the relation or proportion of strength which its parts bear to one another, as is illustrated in the case of the father of the demoniac boy, in whom action *as if* believing, action on imperfect belief, receives the blessing of faith.

Such, I say, is the case with the use of the words ‘faith’ and ‘believing’ in the Gospels. In the Epistles it is otherwise. From the very opening of the Epistle to the Romans, the word “faith” obtains a technical use. It is used in contradistinction. And henceforward it is involved in difficulty and obscurity, and that obscurity is unfortunately allowed to embarrass the simpler and directer statements of our Lord, as contained in the four Gospels.

In the Gospels, the only distinction taken is between belief and unbelief. The Canaanitish mother, the poor woman with the issue of blood, *believe*; the Pharisees and Scribes *believe not*; and we read of nothing more subtle or metaphysical than this. The difference is a difference between *people*. Believing may, as used in one passage, cover more of a man’s mind

you please) so commonly extended in signification, as, together with such a persuasion as we spoke of, to imply whatever by a kind of necessity, natural or moral, doth result from it: so comprehending those acts of will, those affections of soul, and those deeds which may be presumed consequent upon such a persuasion.—Dr. Barrow, Sermon IV. of Justifying Faith.

and actions, and in another may be confined to something more exact and particular in him; but, either way, it is not contradistinguished from any thing else *in him*; it is his Christian goodness, larger or smaller, vaguer or exacter, as the case may be; and it distinguishes him from those who do not possess it.

There are three portions of the epistolary Scriptures in which the technical and contradistinguished use of "faith" must be considered, in order to come to a clear understanding of the Scriptural meaning of this most important word; and I do not scruple to declare my conviction, that the two meanings already attributed to it, as it occurs in the Gospels, will be found to be its proper doctrinal meanings in the Epistles also; and that the passages, in which other things seem to be said of it, will appear on examination to refer to other subjects, and to be improperly applied to elucidate the nature of that Christian goodness of faith which is made by our Lord the title of baptism, and with baptism, of salvation.

These three portions of the epistolary Scriptures are, 1. that part of the Epistle to the Romans, in which faith is distinguished from works: 2. those passages, scattered in different parts of the Epistles, in which faith is distinguished (not contradistinguished doctrinally, as though any great or important doctrinal point were involved in the contradistinction, but simply, separately spoken of,) from love, or charity; such are principally the passages 1 Cor. xiii. 13. Gal. v. 6: 3. the passage of St. James's Epistle, in which he contradistinguishes faith from works.

In these three parts of the Scripture, the word 'faith' appears to be used differently.

In the first, it seems to be used, not for any thing *in a man*, at all. But whereas '*works*' stand for the Jewish system of religion, the system under which salvation is regarded as a thing capable of being purchased or earned, *Faith* seems to stand for that other system whereby salvation is regarded as a gift of God, obtained for us who believe through the sacri-

fice of the death of Christ. Even believing would fall under the condemnation of a law of works, as explained in the Epistle to the Romans, if it thought to earn salvation of its own proper goodness ; and, on the other hand, any deeds of goodness would seem to lie within the scope of the law of faith, if they were done as part of the devotion of body and soul, due from those who thankfully acknowledge, that all they have and hope for, is the free and undeserved gift of God in Christ.

In the second set of passages, faith, and love, or charity, are distinguished from one another, but not in such a manner as to indicate any superiority of acceptableness with God in faith over love or charity. On the contrary, of the two, St. Paul says charity is the greater. Faith seems to be belief ; and love or charity, the whole set of virtuous and godly feelings and deeds, which are proper to Christian belief, and ought to arise from it.

In the third passage, faith unquestionably seems mere abstract intellectual belief ; and works signify, as in the last case, the whole of the moral acts, inward and outward, which form the Christian energies of that belief.

But in order to render the whole of this subject more clear, it seems to be necessary to enter to some extent into the theory of moral virtue. Much of the confusion and apparent disagreement which exists among theologians on the subject of faith, is, I am convinced, not so properly a theological difference as a philosophical obscurity. They are not differing really in the value that they are respectively setting upon one and the same thing, but they are talking of separate things, and seeming to differ, when, in fact, they are more agreed than they suppose.

Let it be first observed, however, that every person who speaks of faith and works in a man as distinguishable things, and, still more, every person who speaks of them as of different acceptableness in the eyes of God, and as holding a different place in the work of man's salvation, is really maintaining

some theory or other of moral virtue. He may perhaps have represented his theory to his own mind very indistinctly, or possibly not at all; but still he has a theory. Faith is not works, to his mind; whatever it be, and possibly he is very little able to explain what it is, it is certainly different from works; and works are not faith. The two things differ; perhaps, he thinks, essentially; certainly intelligibly, and certainly importantly. But in that he thinks them different at all, he has a theory—some theory or other, in which they occupy different places, have different scopes and duties, and, possibly, different values.

There appear to be two principal theories of virtue; from the clear and separate understanding of which, much of the embarrassment of the subject of faith, as it appears to me, may be removed.

I. The nature of one of these theories may be gathered from the following observations.

We are born with various moral capacities. By saying this, I mean that there are within us, by nature, various distinguishable powers, each one of which is capable of acting under its own peculiar circumstances, and in its own peculiar way, each one of which is capable of acting rightly or wrongly, and, according as it acts rightly or wrongly, of affecting or altering the character of a man for moral good or evil.

These capacities, moral because of their effect upon our characters, are in themselves capacities of *feeling*, capacities of being moved in the way of pleasure or pain (*ἐννάμεις ἐπὶ—καθ' ἃς παθητικοὶ τούτων λεγόμεθα*¹). Thus we are naturally capable of a feeling of the particular kind called '*fear*,'—of another, easily distinguishable from it, called '*anger*,'—and of many others.

Each of these is distinguishable from others, partly by being different in the sort of emotion it produces, and partly by being produced in us by different external circumstances.

¹ Arist. Eth. Nicom. bk. ii.

Dangerous circumstances, for instance, being presented to us, at once exhibit and develope that natural pain which we know by the name of fear; things lovely awaken love; things displeasing to us, awaken, according to their distinctions, dislike, anger, hate, &c.

How many of these moral capacities there are in us, it is impossible to say. We are able to be affected very variously by the things which surround us in our life; our minds reply with various kinds or modifications of feeling to a vast variety of external things; and, according as these external things are divided according to their kinds, the emotions which they excite may be divided and classified also. They may also be divided and classified in other ways.

The moment that a being thus constituted is placed in the midst of the world, his capacities of feeling are forthwith solicited in various and constant ways. No part nor portion of his mental constitution, in respect of feelings, is without continual exercise. The circumstances by which he is surrounded, are extremely various, and succeed one another in all manner of rapid and multifarious combinations, and they touch and agitate those *tender places* of the soul, so that they are ever vibrating with the emotions which belong to them.

It is plain that mere capacity of feeling is not, of itself, morally good or evil. One man may be more likely to become good than another, as his natural capacities of feeling lie naturally towards better objects, or are better proportioned to one another, in relative natural strength, than those of another; but till these capacities are excited, and the man acts upon the excitement, nothing moral has taken place in him, nor can he be considered to be, morally, either bad or good.

Nor is there any thing moral in the simple, passive excitement of feeling. There is no more morality in merely 'being afraid,' or 'being angry,' than in 'being cold,' or 'being hot.'

But immediately upon the excitement of feeling, action inevitably and instantly ensues. The feeling puts the vessel under weigh, as it were, and instantly it has a course or

direction. Till it moved, it had no moral direction; till it moved, it could not be steered.

Whatever, then, a man *does* under the excitement, whether he acts on it in the direction which the feeling suggests or no; whether he dwells on the feeling, or puts it aside; encourages or represses it; however he treats or manages it,—he acts. He does a moral act. He has *pro tanto* a character. He has taken a step in habit. He is no longer a thing of mere capacities, but he has begun to be developed into a moral being.

It is no part of my present purpose to inquire into the nature or powers of the “moral faculty², the natural object of which is actions,” or to consider the standard or law by which that faculty is instructed to operate in its government. Suffice it, in this regard, to say, that such a power there undoubtedly is, having some natural sight of what is right and wrong, but itself wanting instruction, and strengthening, both from increase of knowledge and steadiness of moral habit.

Every act, as it passes, leaves a moral colour on the mind. Each single act is a step in its particular habit, and an accession, in its particular kind, of character. The mind having acted, is not where it was before acting. It has done what has a moral value; it has deserved praise or blame; it is better or worse than it was; it has got upon it the beginning of a new thing, a self-made character; it has rendered its subsequent acts more easy in the same direction, more difficult in the reverse; it has gone some way towards settling the question whether it shall be permanently good or bad, permanently happy or miserable.

These acts are very numerous. They are without number. Indeed they are often hardly separable into distinct acts, but are continuous. Such are cherished feelings, as of love, or hate. Many of them, nay, very much the larger number of them, are secret and inward. They take place in the inner recesses of the heart, and hardly the passing shade or smile

² Bp. Butler ‘On the Nature of Virtue.’

upon the features marks the inward step which is making habit inveterate, and stamping the character. Many exhibit themselves in words, which are a most important set of acts,—acts which re-act,—acts which are remembered, and so tend to produce many more like themselves.

And some acts are visible and outward. They are seen by the agent himself, and they are seen by others. In these respects they are very important acts; for they identify the growth of habit, and exhibit its gradual strengthening. Moreover, they are testimonies of what a man is, and means to be. They are the shining of His light before men, who see His works. They have also some peculiar dangers attending them; for they may sometimes be done in order to be seen, and so be in reality acts of a habit entirely different from that which they wish to seem to belong to.

But if the outward acts be genuine, they do not differ in any essential respect, as acts, from the inward ones. Each are steps in habit; the outward ones even more realizing, decisive steps than the inward ones. Though no doubt many a habit grows inveterate, and makes a large portion of a character without a single exhibited outward act, yet do many genuine outward acts make the growth of habit stronger, quicker, and more deliberate and intentional.

Few things could be conceived more irrational than to suppose that inward acts are good or acceptable to God, or otherwise the conditions of His favour, and outward ones in comparison of them vile and odious in His sight.

If then, upon these principles, we should reply to the question, What is virtue? the answer would probably be something of this kind. Virtue is the state of mind ensuing upon habitual right action in respect of any natural emotion; or if we were asked how many virtues are there, we should answer, As many as there are natural emotions. If every natural emotion produces its own acts, and if these acts are habitually under the government and control of a rightly ordered reason or conscience, then the man has all virtues.

On this theory of virtue, courage, temperance, modesty, charity are virtues. Each is the rightly habitualized capacity of emotion on its own subject.

But is not veracity a virtue? Is not justice a virtue? But of what natural emotion are they respectively the conscientiously governed habit?

Take veracity for instance.

It is, I think, plain, that veracity is a virtue in a different sense of the word from that in which courage and temperance are virtues.

What tempts a man to offend against veracity? Sometimes, no doubt, his shame; sometimes his desires; sometimes his fears.

If then his natural emotion of shame were, under the habitual government of conscience, become modesty the virtue, and his desires, under the same government, temperance, and his fears courage, he would be, *pro tanto*, veracious.

What sort of virtue, then, is veracity? Plainly, as I think, not a virtue which ranges in the same rank with courage, temperance, and modesty; not a habit of a man's mind, but a department of his actions; not so properly an inward thing in him, a practical principle, grown under right regulation of conscience into a part of his character, as an outward thing, a certain class or, as it were, region and division of his deeds. Veracity, then, is truth of words; and veracity, spoken of (as no doubt it may be) as a virtue in a man, is all those separate virtues or parts of virtues combined, which lead a man to use truth of words; it is courage, modesty, temperance, &c., all together, in so far forth as these virtues lead to or produce truth of words.

Justice, in like manner, is a virtue in the second sense. For what are the desires which lead a man to be unjust? love of money, love of power, other lusts of various kinds. If then each one of these is duly governed by conscience, and ripened thus into its own habit of virtue, a man is just; and that, not because he has won the fresh or further habit of

justice, but because these separate habitual virtues prevent any of his natural desires from leading him to transgress his neighbour's right. Justice therefore, like veracity, is a department of a virtuous man's actions rather than a habit in his mind; and if justice be ever spoken of as a habit, it will signify all those separate and particular habitual virtues combined which lead a man, in his intercourse with others, to observe the laws of fairness and equity.

If I have in any degree succeeded in making my meaning plain, I hope that these two senses or uses of the word 'virtue' are distinguished from one another. The former sense is far the more accurate, philosophical, and true; the second is the more popular and common. The first is derived from the mental view of habits; the second, from the outer view of actions. The first takes account of the upward growth of habits as processes of mental development and formation; the second takes, as it were, a horizontal section of the growing habits, and maps out the performances of virtue according to the departments of human conduct. The first begins by examining the emotions which need to be educated, and traces up the growth of the virtue through its inward and outward activities to its perfection in established habit; the second begins by thinking what regions of human conduct need virtuous government, and, dividing the virtues according to these regions, then speaks of the necessity of these virtues springing from true principles and motives within.

According to the former sense, every personal energy belonging to a particular emotion, from the slightest voluntary wish or cherished thought, up to the latest and most perfect act of visible virtuous devotion in the same kind, is an act, having all the properties, and, in proportion to its perfectness, the value of a virtuous act; the inner and secret ones, not less than the outer and visible ones, the outer and visible ones (provided, as before distinguished, they be genuine and real energies of the same principle) not less than those which are inward and secret.

According to the latter sense, virtue is often a hollow

thing. Apparent veracity, or apparent justice, is present in the outer life of a man, but it does not follow of course that he has the inner heart of a veracious or a just man. Real inward vice may, by the aid of more than ordinary cunning, wear the outward garb of virtue. Therefore, on this view of virtue, it becomes necessary to make very strong distinctions between what is outward and what is inward. We confuse what is, in fact, *the uncertainty of the judge* of an action with *imperfect nature* in the action itself. What is the inward heart? becomes the question. What is the secret motive? What is the hidden principle? Visible external deeds being felt to be uncertain criteria of character, virtue is said to *depend* upon the *motives* of deeds; and there springs up a dark and obscure philosophy of motives, which is difficult to explain, and not very satisfactory when explained.

For what is a motive? and what do men commonly mean when they speak of the motives as giving value to deeds?

It is rather difficult to decide, and still more difficult to explain clearly. Perhaps if we attempt to analyse the process of an act, we shall come to some understanding on the point.

1. Some external thing suggests itself to one of our natural emotions as desirable to be pursued. This is the *object* of an act, its final cause, its *ὄν ἕνεκα*.

2. The natural emotion is awakened, and instantly, and necessarily, would act with an immediate appetency of the object; but that

3. The moral faculty interposes, and rules whether or no, and in what degree, and direction, action is to be permitted.

This may be taken as an analysis of the *first* act of a habit.

But the man's moral constitution is in some degree affected by his first act; and when he comes to his subsequent acts, he finds himself in the following state:

1. The external thing presents itself as before.

2. The emotion is no longer purely natural. There is the beginning of something acquired or artificial combined with

it. The simple natural excitement is weaker than at first, but there is a complicated condition of mind in the place of it, of which one part is the remains of the natural emotion, and the other is the moral, semi-habitual result of previous action.

3. The moral faculty is also becoming habitual; strengthening, if so be, in exercising true and virtuous government, or else beginning to have its powers crippled, and to fall under the dominion of the emotions.

What then is a motive, as men commonly speak of it?

If the above analysis be in any respect just and true, it must be, 1. the object; 2. the natural emotion; 3. some energy of the moral faculty, original or habitual; 4. the complex activity of mind rising out of the remains of natural emotion, and the effect of habit together; or, 5. the *ἔξτε*, or mental condition ensuing upon habit, by itself.

Now I think that when persons speak of motives giving value to deeds, they mean either the first or the fourth of these senses; so as by the word *motive* to signify either the *object* or the complex activity of mind rising from the remains of natural emotion, and the habitual result of previous acts.

When by the *motive*, they really mean the *object*, it is plain, first, that they are using words improperly; and secondly, that the object, though very important in *identifying the real character* of a deed by exhibiting its intended *direction*, cannot in any possible way *impart value* to it, or give it a moral worth which it does not possess already. When, again, by the *motive*, men mean the complex internal activity just described, it is to be remembered, that the natural portion of it is not moral, because not voluntary. There remains, therefore, as the moral motive, properly so called, only the inward activity of that state of mind which is the result of previous acts

Thus, then, it seems that *motives* are but acts of dispositions which themselves result from former acts, after all. Instead of imparting value to other acts, they are, metaphysically, of the same nature with them; energies of the same moral

man, like steps in the direction of confirmed and inveterate character. They impart no value. They are valuable, as being real and moral; and the deeds, supposed real, are not less valuable than they.

Now, I am very far from wishing to object to what I have called the second theory of virtue. The expressions which belong to it, are so many, and so deeply entwined with current language, that it would be quite impossible to discard or banish it.

But I wish to observe, that the way in which faith is commonly spoken of, and the way in which St. Paul's distinction between faith and works, as made in the Epistle to the Romans, is commonly interpreted to be a distinction between *two things in man*,—the one of an inward, and the other of an outward quality,—are both entirely due to this latter and less philosophical theory of moral virtue.

Deeds being, according to this moral theory, outward things, of no positive character and value of their own, but dependent (not so much for the settlement of their own real character and value, as for character and value altogether,) upon inward motives, seem to fall in very naturally with the sort of way in which the Apostle speaks of *works*. Motives again, being, according to the same theory, inward things, which impart all value to the outward deeds, seem to offer a standing place for an imaginary faith, which, being not identical with belief, but itself moral, nor yet being virtue or any part of virtue, is spoken of as a fiduciary principle, or state of mind, intermediate between belief and virtues, giving to virtues their goodness and acceptableness in the sight of God.

I do not mean that I am aware of any person having ever actually thus drawn out a supposed parallel between motives and deeds, on the one hand, and St. Paul's faith and works on the other; but that these two ways of speaking are very near akin to one another, and both are due to the same fundamental theory of moral metaphysics.

If, then, the whole theory which, regarding virtue in respect

of its visible outward manifestations, makes these strong distinctions between the inward and outward activities of the moral mind, be itself hardly philosophically tenable, the parallel theory which speaks of works (meaning by works Christian deeds) as vile and worthless, as filthy rags, &c., in the eyes of God, and faith (meaning by faith an inward moral fiduciary principle, considered as the basis of virtue) as alone of any value in his sight, would seem to be equally questionable.

Nor questionable only ; it also seems to be both morally and theologically dangerous : for it not only confounds and disarranges the real relative values of the inward and outward activities of virtue ; but while it denies their due value to the outward ones, it magnifies the inward ones to the extent of making them liable to the very condemnation of the law of works which St. Paul writes against.

Indeed, I feel sure that the fiduciary theory, so to call it, is, in fact, however little its supporters may intend it, or suppose it, essentially a theory of works : for, while outward acts are spoken of as so vile and worthless, from what is it that they are contradistinguished ? From faith. *Faith then is not vile and worthless.* Nor will it be a sufficient defence of this consequence to rejoin, that faith receives all its value from being the gift of the Holy Ghost ; for this is the precise defence which is disallowed, when urged in behalf of outward acts. It is *then* answered, Nay, but there is something of one's own mixed up with the gift of the Holy Ghost ; there is some personal agency, something human, something to tempt a man to rest on himself in such acts.

I suppose it to be agreed on all hands, that every act, even in the inner acts of faith, must involve some consent, or willingness, or at least willingness to be acted upon, on the part of the man in whom they take place.

If, then, the personal agency that is mingled with spiritual grace in the outer acts, be sufficient to vitiate them, and take from them all character of pleasing and acceptableness with

God, how must the persons, who argue so, think of the personal agency that works with or submits to spiritual grace, in the case of the inner acts of faith? Must they not of necessity attribute it to that proper goodness which they refuse to the other agency?

This danger is only more deeply incurred by the miserable expedient of interpreting acceptable faith to be a *disclamation*, a *disowning* of all personal power of acting acceptably: for,

1. The act of abnegation is itself an act, and a voluntary one; just as stripping off one's clothes is as much an act, as putting them on.

2. It is a self-contradictory act,—an act of one trying not to act; just as if a man should say, "I cannot speak," and so claim the credit of silence.

3. It is an act which cannot be attributed intelligibly to any other than a man's own self; and so whatever goodness or value it may be supposed to have, seems to be broadly claimed as a personal and meritorious goodness.

I mean, therefore, to say, that faith, when regarded as something *in a man*, must be of necessity, 1. Belief; or, 2. Virtue, incipient or habitual, grounded on belief; or, 3. Belief and such virtue together. There is nothing between. The very earliest movements of voluntary will, the very first beginnings of morality, the first elementary stirrings of action towards God and heaven, are, in their degree, virtue.

If, then, it is answered, faith is the grasping, faith is the realizing, faith is the appropriating of the promises of God, I should reply, that grasping, realizing, appropriating, *are* all acts. If a man intellectually believes in the promises of God, and morally loves and desires them, then, in proportion to his imaginative power and strength, he grasps at them, realizes them, regards them as evident though unseen, and substantial though only hoped for. To believe is, itself, to realize. If a promise is made to a man, and he believes it, he does to that extent and degree make it to himself a reality. His belief is, *pro tanto*, a realization; it operates to make him see what is

unseen, to give substance to what is, hitherto, only clad in words. As memory substantiates the past, so belief substantiates the future ; and man lives on, not only in the single point of time in which he stands at each moment, but carrying along with him also the whole transacted past, and the whole believed future.

Love, again, true love of a thing unseen and hoped for, is a grasping, realizing love. Love lives on the objects of its love ; in proportion as it is intense, it does so more. But the realizing is not one moral condition or process, and the loving another ; still less is the realizing a precious thing, and the loving comparatively a vile one. To realize is a property of true love, as it is of true hope, as it is of true zeal, as it is of any earnest and deep feeling.

Again, if it be said that faith is the reposing or relying upon the merits of the Lord, the trusting ourselves and placing all our hopes upon what He has done for us, I should again reply, that reposing, relying, trusting, placing hope, are all moral acts—acts of a virtue,—acts wherein (the mind intellectually believing the great doctrines of Christian revelation) a divinely enlightened conscience crushes and destroys the risings of self-complacent, self-relying emotions, and directs to their due objects those of gratitude and hope.

Grasping, realizing, appropriating, when accompanied with feeling, reposing, relying, trusting, &c. are all moral acts,—acts of virtue,—acts of virtue grounded on belief. To represent them as well-pleasing to God *in themselves* is to incur the condemnation of a law of works ; to speak of them as well-pleasing to God in Christ, as done by the influence of His Spirit, is to speak of them truly, and to speak of them as all other Christian activities, inward and outward, may be spoken of with no less truth.

There is not a word in the argumentative portions of the Epistle to the Romans which can legitimately be brought to prove that there is any difference in acceptableness before God between Christian faith, supposed to be trust and reliance

on God, and Christian deeds. St. Paul does in no place distinguish them, if indeed they are capable of being distinguished. He is not occupied with any argument which requires them to be distinguished. It is therefore simple confusion to apply to a distinction of modern times expressions in that Epistle which are used in respect of a very different distinction.

The meaning of St. Paul appears to come out very clearly from the following verses of the third chapter.

“ Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight ; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the Prophets ; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe ; for there is no difference : For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God ; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness ; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then ? It is excluded. By what law ? of works ? Nay, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.”

What is St. Paul distinguishing ? Plainly, as it would seem, the notion of *purchasing* salvation from that of *receiving it of grace*. “ To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.”

Against whom is St. Paul making this distinction ? Plainly against the Jews. What then did the Jews maintain ? A salvation purchased by obedience in doing the works of the law. What does St. Paul oppose to this ? A salvation freely

given of God to faith. "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace." Did then the Jews maintain the meritoriousness of *Christian* deeds against Christian faith? Not at all; they neither made nor could make such a distinction: and therefore such a distinction would not have been at all relevant to the argument held against them. Who can suppose that St. Paul, arguing against the meritorious value of unsanctified Jewish works, and the idea of salvation purchased by them, would conduct that argument by drawing a distinction between the comparative value of the inward and outward activities of the sanctified Christian heart?

But does he not say that the Christian scheme offers the justification of God to *faith*? and if so, what is faith? An important question, doubtless; and a natural one in this stage of the inquiry; but one to be answered, not out of the distinctions of these chapters, but from the general use and manner of speaking of the Holy Scriptures. The distinctions of these chapters refer to the question whether *these men* are justified by *faith through the grace of God*, or *those* by *inherently deserving deeds of their own*; they do not refer to the metaphysical nature of faith as distinguished from something else ensuing from faith *in the same man*.

But again, may not the argument of St. Paul, though primarily directed against the supposed meritorious works of the Jews, be in a secondary manner directed against supposed meritorious works of Christians? Does not the analogy of the cases make his statements as strong against these as against those?

Most undoubtedly it does. If any baptized man thinks to purchase salvation by the value or merit of his deeds, or his words, or his thoughts, or of any thing else that is his, he is, *pro tanto*, a Jew, looking for salvation to some law of works, deserting and abandoning the salvation freely given of God by Jesus Christ.

Only let it be remembered, that the condemnation is as strong and as unequivocal against those who rely on their

inner as on their outer acts,—against those who prize the conscious inward graspings which they call faith, as against those who set a value on their outward and visible deeds, which are, on the same theory, called works.

THE END.

