

ABSTRACT OF THESISName of Candidate Joseph Donald FryDegree Ph.D in the Faculty of Divinity Date May 31, 1958.Title of Thesis The Doctrine Of Grace In The Caroline Divines (1625 - 1685)

The crucial issue of the doctrine of grace in the formative period of the Church of England's life and thought constitutes the theological thought and historical background of this thesis. This work represents, through an examination of primary source material, an attempt to place the Church's thinking at this period within the continuity of Reformed thought with particular reference to the doctrine of grace.

The Method by which this attempt is carried through is set forth in the first two chapters. By a critical examination of the works of some of the leading bishops the distinctive element in their thought concerning the doctrine of grace is presented. This element, the eschatological dimension of grace, is an internal framework indigenous to the thought forms of the Caroline writers. The attempt to let the writers speak their own words is a conscious part of the method employed.

The period under consideration abounded in some of the greatest controversies ever to confront the Church of England; the everpresent struggle with the Church of Rome from without, the Puritan conflict within and the numerous heretical opinions given vent to by a growing rationalistic spirit. These controversies centred around some of the fundamental doctrines of the Church and the bishops of the Church of England were fully involved in the continuous theological debates. The last four chapters of the dissertation examines the doctrine of grace in the light of the controversial issues and by this means a structure of Caroline thought has been erected.

A brief examination of the immediate pre Caroline period has been presented in the third chapter and a line of theological thought has been drawn from the Reformation era to show that the Reformed thought in the Church of England, though at times modified by a different historic situation, was maintained by the Caroline bishops. It is of course true, as pointed out in the thesis, that the Carolines did not speak with a unanimous voice but within the total structure of thought in the Church of England its Reformed heritage is unmistakeably seen.



**THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE
IN THE CAROLINE DIVINES (1625 - 1685)**

by

Rev. Joseph D. Fry, BA. BD.

**A Thesis presented towards the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of Edinburgh, Department of Theology.**



CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DIMENSION OF GRACE . .	30
III. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	60
IV. THE MOVEMENT OF GRACE: THE TRINITY AND THE INCARNATION	93
V. SIN AND GRACE	137
VI. THE ATONEMENT AND GRACE	185
VII. THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY OF WORD AND SACRAMENT	270
BIBLIOGRAPHY	357

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The sphere of inquiry for this thesis is the period of the Caroline kings, encompassing the reigns of Charles I and II - 1625 to 1685 - including the interregnum. These sixty years were extremely important for the structure of modern life and thought in England. For the most part this was a period of bitter struggle and violent reaction radically affecting the civil and ecclesiastical forms of society. These were formative years when many of the existing principles of modern English life and thought were forged in the midst of strife and in the heat of battle. "It is to the seventeenth century that the politician and the constitutional lawyer refer for the decisive events out of which the British Constitution finally emerged. As with the state so with the Church."¹ "The seventeenth century determined the singular religious constitution of the British people. Then the two established Churches received their present form, and then, not less the great Nonconformist denominations took shape."²

A group of Churchmen who rose to prominence in the Church of England during this period is the object of our inquiry. These men,

1. H. H. Henson, Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century (London: John Murry, 1903), p. 1.

2. Ibid., preface XIV.

collectively termed the Caroline Divines, were the leading Churchmen of the seventeenth century. They were the inheritors of the Reformation and they carried on the work of reform, endowing the Church of England with its own unique character. The Caroline Divines were not conscious of themselves as a homogeneous ecclesiastical society or school of theological thought. It is true that they had certain common concerns; the distinguishing factor which bound them together was their claim to be loyal sons of their mother, the Church of England. Within this common loyalty were many differences indeed and one would be hard pressed to show that these Churchmen agreed on all doctrine and ecclesiastical forms. There was a wide sense of agreement among them on certain subjects but even on the most important questions shades of differences can be observed.

They worked not as a team for in fact they saw little of each other; but each in his own way - by personal sanctity, by scholarship, by poetry, by the dedicated life - made his own contribution to the life of the Church and gave it that self-confidence and inner strength which enabled it to rise again after the disasters of the Civil War. --1

The Carolines were very conscious of the historical continuity of the Church. When taunted by their Roman opponents as to the "presence" of the Church of England before the Reformation, they answered with the first Reformers that their Church was now where it had always been. It was still the same Catholic Church but now it was reformed. It was the same garden, said Bishop Bramhall, but now it had been weeded of its errors.

1. J. R. H. Moorman, A History of The Church of England (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953), pp. 233-4.

Our religion is the same as it was, our Church the same as it was, our Holy Orders the same as they were in substance; differing only from what they were formerly, as a garden weeded from a garden unweeded; or a body purged from itself before it was purged. --1

This was the same sentiment expressed by Bishop Jewel many years before when engaged in controversy with Harding, his Roman opponent, who charged the Church of England with schism. The Church of England, said Jewel, had forsaken the errors of Rome and had returned to the true Catholic Church of Christ from which the Roman Church had departed.² The reform of the Church was necessary both in England and on the Continent, said Bramhall.³ Jewel's comment was similar when he justified the works of Luther and Zwingli.⁴

The Caroline Divines asserted that the Church of England was a part of the Catholic Church and they considered themselves to be Catholics but not in opposition to being Protestants. They never thought in those terms. In claiming to be Catholics they claimed nothing more than that they were Protestants which term signified for them that they were Catholic and Reformed.⁵ "Their's was an

1. The Works of John Bramhall, D.D., (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842), I, p. 199.

2. The Works of John Jewel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1847), The Second Portion, p. 175.

3. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., p. 207. See also The Works of William Laud, D.D., Conference With Fisher (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1849), II, pp. 150; 156.

4. Jewel, op. cit., p. 213.

5. N. Sykes, The English Religious Tradition (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1953), p. 4. See also The Works of The Right Reverend Father In God John Cosin (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843), VI, p. 167. See also Laud, Works, op. cit., II, p. 328.

attempt to get back to the early Church before the accretions of the Middle Ages which the reformers had been so anxious to get rid of." ¹ This, of course, was the express intention of the earlier Reformers both in England and on the Continent and the Carolines followed in their understanding of the Church.

The national character of the Church of England was a feature that most of the Caroline Churchmen cherished almost as much as its Catholic continuity. The former thought they inherited from the sixteenth century for the national character of the Church was an important factor in the Reformation itself. The Caroline Divines always thought of the Church as intimately joined with the state under one supreme head - the Christian Prince. One of their favorite expressions in speaking of the unity of the Church and state, while still maintaining a necessary distinction, was to refer to the Church as the 'twin' ² of the state. The union of the Church and state as symbolized in the Christian King made these Churchmen completely unsympathetic to any notion of a Church or Churches separate from the national Church established by the law of the realm. To set up another Church within the Establishment was not unlike raising a sedition.

It is important to understand their stress on the Catholic nature and national character of the Church of England for both these concepts had as their source the English Reformation itself. The assertion of these concepts and the manner in which they were asserted

1. Moorman, op. cit., p. 234.

2. The Works of The Right Reverend Joseph Hall, D.D., (Oxford: At The University Press, 1863), V, p. 284.

in the seventeenth century caused great havoc to both Church and state.

Apart from the Scandinavian Kingdoms and Scotland, England was the only independent national state which formally adopted the Reformation. It was in method and not in doctrine that the Reformation in England distinguished itself from its Continental counterpart and it was this factor which exerted itself in the seventeenth century. It is unfortunate whenever the English Reformation is stressed either as a political revolution ¹ or a religious reformation when in fact it was both. "The Reformation took the form of a protest, not merely against the doctrines of the Roman Church but also against foreign supremacy." ² The Act of Supremacy, by Henry VIII and his parliament, was the logical conclusion to a process which was begun by the famous Mortmain Act in Edward I's reign. ³ The Act of Supremacy was also the decisive act which marked the commencement of the Reformation in England. ⁴ It was in itself both a political and religious reform. "For the Papal supremacy was itself a doctrine, and what is more, had become in the Western Churches such a keystone of doctrine, that the removal of it endangered at once the dissolution

1. M. MacColl, The Reformation Settlement (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1899), p. 333.

2. J. Hunt, Religious Thought in England (London: Strahan & Co., Publishers, 1879), I, p. 45.

3. Wm. Fitzgerald, Lectures On Ecclesiastical History (London: John Murray, 1885), II, p. 161.

4. J. J. Tayler, Religious Life in England (London: Trubner & Co., 1876), p. 14.

of the whole arch."¹ Rome's great apologist, Bellarmine, showed what store the Roman Church had put on the Pope's supremacy when he claimed that upon this one point the very sum and substance of Christianity depended.² The political action taken by Henry VIII and his Parliament had definite theological ramifications.

There were many and varied influences at work which helped to shape and fashion the English Reformation.³ But undoubtedly the key to the most distinctive features was the assertion of the Royal Supremacy.⁴ It was this act by king and parliament that both effected and affected the Reformation in England. It placed the King in an unparalleled position in relation to both Church and state which became twin spheres of royal sovereignty.⁵ "The union of Church and Monarchy was the most salient feature of the Tudor Reform."⁶ This union of Church and state was not necessarily something that was forced upon the Church. The early Reformers of the Church of England saw this as their means of implementing their program of reform.

1. Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 166.

2. The Theological Works of Isaac Barrow, D.D., (Oxford: At The University Press, 1830), VII, p. 21.

3. Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 167.

4. H. H. Henson, The Relation of the Church of England to the Other Reformed Churches (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1911), p. 14.

5. Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 170-1.

6. H. H. Henson, The Relation of the Church of England to the Other Reformed Churches, op. cit., p. 14. See also Sykes, op. cit., pp. 16; 18.

Reformation of the Church from within its historic structure was impossible with a pope who was hostile to every suggestion of reform. "The Reformers latched to the King as their only hope of deliverance¹ from the supremacy of the Pope."

Though very little actual reformation of doctrine was accomplished during Henry VIII's reign, the ground was nevertheless well prepared. The authority to have the entire Bible translated and circulated throughout the country was a very important event in this reign in its influence of the Reformation though it is true that very little actual change had taken place in the structure of Church life and thought. The forms and content of worship were still very much as they had been.

At the close of Henry's reign - notwithstanding the strong Protestant tendencies of Cranmer - the Mass was still celebrated in Latin; the authorized confession of faith differed in no essential particular from the ancient creed; and the papal canons were still in force; - in other words, the Church, though it had changed its head was in doctrine, ritual and discipline as Romanist as ever and much less free. --2

In so lamenting this situation it is obvious that Tayler had minimized, as is too often done, the extremely important and fortunate position in which the Church of England was placed during Henry's reign. When the reform movement in England began in real earnest in the next reign the Reformation was able to take place within the existing ecclesiastical structures of the Church. In England the Reformation was not placed outside the ancient framework of the Church because those in authority, both civil and ecclesiastical,

1. Hunt, op. cit., p. 6.

2. Tayler, op. cit., p. 39

were in favour of the Reformation. Her Church orders were preserved intact because it was the bishops who were pressing for reform. Thus, standing within the existing Church-structures the Reformers were able to preserve and make new use of what Rome had often corrupted. They did not discard things simply because they had been misused by Rome. This was especially true with regard to Church Orders. Cranmer rightly insisted on the retention of episcopacy because it was a tried and proved system. There was no violent opposition from the bishops; therefore, there was no need to reject episcopacy as a whole; it could be made to serve its true purpose.

The Act of Supremacy rendered the pope at Rome powerless to put the Reform movement outside the existing ecclesiastical structure and the Reformers were thus able to use the forms that were at hand. Since no extremely oppressive methods had been used to thwart the path of the Reformers the reaction against certain Roman forms was not violent. This was especially true in the reign of Edward VI when the Reformation made its first great strides. But it was Henry VIII's action that first removed the power of the papacy from the Church in England thus allowing it the freedom to reform itself. When this is contrasted with the method of reform that the Continental Reformers were forced to use the favourable situation in which the Church of England was placed by Henry's action cannot be over-emphasized. Bishop Hall, prominent in the Caroline period, pointed this out to the Puritans. He saw with clarity the situation in which the Reformers on the Continent were placed and how this had affected the Reformation. ¹ on the continent. The difference in

1. Hull, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 156.

historical situations between the Church of England and the Reformed Church on the Continent was to play an important part in the future relations of these Churches.

On the Continent and in Scotland where the Reformation was bitterly opposed by the existing hierarchy of the Church the Reformers found it necessary to reform the whole ecclesiastical framework of the Church in contrast to the existing one. They were in fact placed outside the ancient structure of the Church and could not reform from within as had been done in England. The bitter opposition which they encountered created in turn severe reactions. England had a short and bitter taste of this during the reign of Queen Mary. Therefore after her death the returning exiles and those who had remained in the country suffering persecution, put the English Reformation in a more aggressive mood. The exiles had come into contact with the Reformers on the Continent, at Frankfort and Zürich, where they witnessed the advance of the Reformation and the bitter opposition of Rome. When these exiles returned to England many of them sought to completely eradicate everything that was Roman in appearance.

Three fairly distinct groups emerged in the Church of England¹ at the close of Henry VIII's reign. A conservative element desired to go no further than the change of supremacy from the pope to the king. A middle group was bent on reform but it was of a cautious nature which planned on moderation; reforming within the existing form of the Church. This reforming element was prepared to use many of the forms of service which the Church had used while under Rome,

1. Tayler, op. cit., p. 93.

claiming that the abuse of forms did not therefore make them unlawful. "They wished to retain of the ancient doctrines and formularies whatever was not inconsistent with indispensable reform, and to shun the extremes of both the bigoted Papists and of the ultra Protestants." ¹ The third group was the radical element. It wanted to purge the Church of every last symbol of Romanism and was prepared to sweep all away, convinced that one could never break quickly enough or depart far enough from Rome. This latter group was to emerge as the more radical Puritan movement. It was very largely the second group, however, which predominated in the English Reformation. They preserved for the Church of England much of the past and endowed it with a love for order which is preserved in the liturgy of the Church.

There is not the slightest doubt that in the early years of Elizabeth's reign the Reformers planned to carry the Reformation of the Church of England further than they did. In many of the letters of Bishop Jewel to Peter Martyr, Bullinger and others, there are definite signs of impatience at the slow procedure. ² Jewel revealed that the measures he had in mind were to be more radical. There had been a time for caution, said Jewel,

but now that the full light of the gospel has shone forth, the very vestiges of error must, as far as possible, be removed together with the rubbish, and as the saying is, with the very dust. And I wish we could effect this in respect to that linen surplice; for as to matters of doctrine, we have pared every thing away to the quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a hair's breadth; for as to the ubiquitarian theory there is no danger in this country. --3

It is clear from this letter to Peter Martyr, dated February 7, 1562,

-
1. Ibid., p. 41.
 2. Jewel, Works, op. cit., Fourth Portion, p.1200.
 3. Ibid., p. 1247.

that Bishop Jewel proposed to go further in purging the Church of those forms which Rome had used. That these intentions were never carried through is now recorded history.

A definite halt was drawn to the reform movement in the early years of the reign of Elizabeth. "That a stoppage did take place is manifest, and let us not be ashamed to own it."¹ The Queen herself was reluctant to go further and the Act of Uniformity expressly forbade others to do so. The claim of the crown to be supreme in all matters civil and ecclesiastical greatly irritated the Puritans who

disclaimed all foreign jurisdiction over the Church, as much as their brethren, but could not admit of that extensive power the crown claimed by the supremacy, apprehending it unreasonable, that the religion of a whole nation, should be at the disposal of a single lay person. --2

Bishop Jewel, thoroughly Protestant, was convinced that the Church was now reformed in doctrine and was willing to comply with the Queen's injunction.

He was one of the most learned men among the reformers, a Calvinist in doctrine, but for absolute obedience to his sovereign, in all things of an indifferent nature, which led him not only to comply with all the Queen's injunctions about the habit, when he did not approve them, but to bear hard upon the conscience of his brethren, who were not satisfied to comply. --3

Preaching at Paul's Cross, Jewel sought to reconcile the people to the habit saying that "he did not come to defend them, but to show that they were indifferent and might be complied with."⁴ Again, in a letter to Archbishop Parker in 1568, Jewel showed that the question

1. Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 221

2. D. Neal, History of the Puritans (London: Robinson and Son, 1811), I, p. 90.

3. Neal, op. cit., p. 153.

4. Ibid., p. 111

regarding ecclesiastical habit was no longer an issue with him.

There were many, however, who were not prepared to stop until there had been a reform of discipline, government and ceremonies. Early in Elizabeth's reign these people who scrupled to comply in all things with the ritual and canons of the Church were called Puritans or Precisions as a term of reproach. The rise of the Puritan movement has been dated earlier by some historians. Tayler linked it with Wycliffe's attempted reformation.² Many of the Puritans suffered at the hands of the bishops during Mary's reign and those who had gone into exile favoured the reform measures which they had seen on the Continent. This group, containing elements of both moderate and extreme, existed as a severe criticism in its earlier stage and later a serious threat to the Established Church.

The rise of the Puritan movement formed an extremely critical period for the Church of England. The understanding of this movement and the effects it had on the national Church are very important for our consideration in the seventeenth century and especially in the Caroline period when the Puritans were at the height of their power. Here, in Elizabeth's reign, were the seeds of later strife and bitter reaction.

The development of the Puritan movement within the Establishment placed the Church of England in a very precarious position. For years she had waged a continued warfare against Rome. Bishop Jewel, the leading English theologian, had engaged his Roman Catholic ad-

1. Jewel, Works, op. cit., Fourth Portion, pp. 1274, 1275.

2. Tayler, op. cit., p. 5

versary in a series of disputes and had vindicated the Church of England's position. "Profoundly versed as Jewel was in the remains of ecclesiastical antiquity, he easily overthrew the specious but little solid arguments of his opponent Harding." ¹ At the point where there was some reason to feel secure dissension became apparent within. The Church of England was caught between two opposing forces which continued to bring increased pressure upon the national Church. Not until the overthrow of James II was there release from this situation.

Of course it must not be assumed that the Church of England was like a ship riding the turbulent storms of the seventeenth century for in point of fact the Church was part of the storm. After the Act of Uniformity was passed in Elizabeth's reign the Church took the position that she would go no further in the reform of rites and ceremonies. Neal complained bitterly that the "vigorous pressing of this act was the occasion of all the mischief that befell the Church for ² above eighty years." Jewel, as we have already seen, had desired to go further than he did but settled for the fact that the important points at variance in doctrine had been reformed. The Church brought forward her finest theologians to defend and articulate her position but this by no means silenced the Puritans.

It is very clear from all accounts that the early differences between the Puritans and the national Church were not in matters of doctrine. Indeed, it could not be since Archbishop Parker, successor

1. Jewel, Works, op. cit., Fourth Portion, Biographical Memoir, XXVIII.

2. Neal, op. cit., I, p. 88.

to Cranmer, was a thorough Protestant though a strict conformist and a rigid enforcer of conformity.¹ Whitgift, who in turn succeeded Parker, known chiefly as the great enemy of Elizabethan Puritanism, had in fact always been recognized as zealous in the cause of Protestantism.² The Lambeth Articles, which he helped to formulate, show that Whitgift had embraced the prevailing Calvinism of his day, though he did not adopt Calvin's discipline.³ In his controversy with Cartwright, Whitgift never treated him as a disciple of Calvin but rather as a restless and perverse innovator on ancient laws and customs.⁴ The controversy begun by Whitgift and Cartwright was carried on by Hooker and Travers but it did not end with them.

There was a branch of Puritanism which simply disliked any establishment of religion but would have been content with such reforms in the discipline and ritual of the Church as would admit of a conscientious conformity to it. But within the larger bounds of Puritanism there were more extreme groups who would settle for nothing less than the adoption of the Geneva system. In his "Directory of Church Government," Travers laid down as a fundamental position, "that, as the Presbyterian discipline is necessary for all times and authoritatively prescribed in Scripture, every other form of Church Government was unlawful."⁵ It was the Puritans who pushed the controversy

-
1. Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 42
 2. Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 52
 3. Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 229
 4. Hunt, op. cit., I, pp. 52, 53.
 5. Tayler, op. cit., p. 103.

into a doctrinal sphere when they insisted that Scripture contained, not only all things necessary for salvation, but also a divine form of discipline and government. Until then all that Jewel and Whitgift had argued for episcopacy was that it was permissible and not against Scripture, that it was ancient and allowable. ¹ "In general they regarded this as the original and the best, and as necessary to the well, or better being of a Church." ² Hooker, the great apologist, refused to make the same claim for episcopacy that the Puritans did for Presbyterianism. ³

The ground changed from the previous controversies when it was alleged that Presbyterianism was of divine right; it implied that episcopacy was contrary to Scripture. The Churchmen were not slow in answering such a claim with a counter one. Bishop Bancroft "proclaimed the divine right of government by bishops. The Conformists were amazed at the novelty of the doctrine. The Puritans were confounded with the boldness of the claim." ⁴ When both sides raised their claims to absolute heights a compromise of any sort became virtually impossible. The breach from this point began to widen and include other issues of a doctrinal nature. The increasingly excessive claims on one side drove the other to a violent reaction. This chain of reaction continued

1. G. G. Perry, The History of The Church of England (London: Saunders, Otley, and Co., 1863), I, p. 19.

2. Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 252

3. The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker (Oxford: Thomas Tagg, 1843), II, p. 306. See also Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 255. Also Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 86. Also Perry, op. cit., I, pp. 19, 20.

4. Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 86.

with increased bitterness and violence in the Caroline period until at last the Establishment was overthrown and episcopacy was abolished. The reaction to this severe measure was one no less severe - the 1662 Act of Uniformity.

Much of our evaluation and interpretation of the Carolines depends upon the continual awareness of the tension that existed throughout this period. From the Reformation onward, for more than a century, the English Churchmen engaged Rome in fierce controversy on doctrinal issues. From Elizabeth's reign throughout the greater part of the seventeenth century the controversy with the Puritans was carried on with equal vigour. The Roman controversy began with the most fundamental question and to a large extent this nature of the controversy was maintained. The disagreement with the Puritans at first concerned itself only with peripheral issues but as the controversy enlarged it became more theological.

The thought that at first displaced the Roman theology in the Church of England at the Reformation was that of Calvin.¹ Cranmer had been in close contact with Calvin as were his successors so that from the beginning of the reform movement Calvin's thought had an impact on the Church of England. Parker renewed the correspondence with Calvin and Whitgift, in his controversy with the Puritans, always spoke of Calvin with respect and appealed frequently to his judgment as to that of a truly great man to whom deference was due. In 1552, by order of Edward VI and his council, Cranmer and Ridley, assisted

1. A. W. Harrison, Arminianism (London: Duckworth, 1937), p. 122.

2. Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 54.

by Bucer, Peter Martyr and Cox, drew up forty two articles declaratory of the faith of the Reformed Church of England.¹ "The plain language of the articles themselves, no less than the known principles of the parties engaged in forming them, are conclusive evidence of the Calvinistic spirit in which they were framed."² However, it has also been shown that in formulating the articles of 1552 Cramer was chiefly indebted to the Lutheran Confessions, especially the Confession of Augsburg.³ This may well have tempered some of the language but the articles were essentially Calvinistic and they remained so in their revised form in 1562 as the Thirty-Nine Articles which were presented in convocation by Parker and Jewel.⁴ It is significant to note that in Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr, where he declared, "for as to matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the very quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a hair's breadth..." exactly synchronized with the adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles in 1562.⁵ We may conclude without any doubt that Jewel considered these Articles to be in keeping with the best of Reformed thought.

1. E. Browne, An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles (London: Longman, Green Reader, and Dyer, 1874), pp. 6, 7.

2. Tayler, op. cit., p. 54.

3. Browne, op. cit., pp. 6, 7.

4. Tayler, op. cit., p. 54

5. H. H. Henson, The Relation of the Church of England to the Other Reformed Churches, op. cit., p. 20.

However great Luther's influence was on the English Reformation and there is much evidence to believe it was considerable, his own views on the eucharist were not adopted.¹ The eucharistic understanding was much more in keeping with Calvin's thought. It was Bishop Ridley who induced Crammer to renounce the doctrine of transubstantiation.² In separating from the Church of Rome the Church of England and the Continental Reformed Churches clearly stated that they were by no means separating from the Catholic Church. At the Reformation the English Reformers appealed to the early Church Fathers to vindicate her action and to show that they were at one in doctrine with antiquity. Ridley relied heavily upon the Fathers for his understanding of the eucharist.³ He quoted at length from their writings to show that they never understood the bread and wine of the sacrament to be transubstantiated. Yet Ridley always maintained a real presence of Christ in the Sacrament and he explained this as a presence by grace.⁴ The bread was the body of Christ and the wine was his blood but since the eucharist is a sacrament Ridley rightly maintained that it must be understood sacramentally.⁵ The difference in the Roman and Reformed understanding of the eucharist is clearly seen in Ridley's disputations. Rome conceived the presence of Christ after the flesh while Ridley

1. Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 207.

2. Browne, op. cit., p. 7 See also Laud, Works op. cit., II, p. 331.

3. The Works of Nicholas Ridley (Cambridge: The University Press, 1843), pp. 200, 201.

4. Ibid., pp. 232, 235, 237, 238.

5. Ibid., p. 15. See also Calvin, John, The Institutes of the Christian Religion (Glasgow: Alexander Irvine, 1762), 4:17:20.

understood the same presence by grace.¹ It was in this way that Ridley interpreted the very literal words of St. Chrysostom on the presence of Christ - always a presence by grace.² His adversaries charged that the interpretation of the presence of Christ by grace destroyed the miracle of the sacrament. Ridley answered that the presence of Christ in the sacrament by grace was precisely the miracle.³

It is significant for us to note at this point a difference in the pattern of the Reformation in England which distinguished it from that on the Continent. The establishment of a form of public service in 1549 preceeded the publication of the Articles of Faith in the Church of England, a procedure contrary to the practice of the Continental Reformers.⁴ It was the liturgical form which distinguished the Church of England from the Reformed Churches on the Continent but not its doctrinal content for since Crammer and Ridley were the chief compilers of both the Service Book and the Articles of Faith there was bound to be a very close relation between them in theological understanding.⁵

1. Ridley, op. cit., pp. 222, 225.

2. Ibid., pp. 202, 224. See also Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 27. See also Laud, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 239, 330.

3. Ridley, op. cit., p. 223

4. Tayler, op. cit., p. 42

5. Browne, op. cit., p. 7.

The nature of the eucharist as articulated by Cranmer and Ridley in the first Prayer Book is important for our consideration because it was the communion service which was substituted for the Roman Mass.¹ To understand the difference between them is to grasp something of the fundamental difference between the Roman Church and the Church of England. "The Reformers of the Church of England were guided by a rare instinct when they fastened on Transubstantia-² tion as the culminating heresy of the Church of Rome." All too often the importance of rejecting this Roman doctrine by the Church of England was minimized in the succeeding generations with drastic results for the Church. "That the difference between the Reformers and the Church of Rome was no narrow interval, but a great impassible gulf, was felt and acknowledged by both sides. It was not a mere difference in detail."³ The eucharistic service stands at the heart of the liturgy and in fact constituted the proper liturgy though the name has now been extended to every prescribed form of Common Prayer.⁴

During Elizabeth's reign Bishop Jewel was prominent in the restoration and revision of both the Prayer Book and the Articles of Faith. It was fitting that Jewel should be engaged in this work for he knew the thought of Cranmer and Ridley well, having acted as notary

1. Tayler, op. cit., p. 41. See also E. Cardwell, The Two Books of Common Prayer (Oxford: At the University Press, 1841), p. 266 and Preface IX. See also O. Shipley, Orby, M.A., The Liturgies of 1549 and 1662 (London: Joseph Masters, 1866), p. 2.

2. Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 1. See also Cardwell, op. cit. Preface, XXV.

3. Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 2.

4. Tayler, op. cit., p. 42

to them in their disputation in 1554.¹ Peter Martyr, a very close friend of Jewel's was one of the Continental theologians who assisted Cranmer and Ridley in their task of formulating the first Articles of Faith. Jewel spent his exiled years living in Martyr's house both in Strasburg and Zürich and on his return to England he carried on a continual correspondence with him. Jewel knew Martyr's thought and, as the extract from his letter has shown, he was at one with him in doctrine.²

The natural affinity between Cranmer, Ridley and Jewel is to be seen most clearly in their understanding of the eucharist. "Jewel's doctrine respecting the Sacraments is that of the Articles and the liturgy, which in this point closely sympathize."³ Most of Jewel's works were of an apologetic nature and a large part of them comprise an articulation of the eucharist. The controversy concerning the presence of Christ in the sacrament sharply divided the Lutherans and Calvinists. "The English Reformers, with scarcely an exception espoused the Calvinist⁴ side of that controversy."

The difference in the understanding of the eucharist between the Reformers of the Church of England and Rome is a difference in

1. Jewel, op. cit., Fourth Portion, Biographical Memoir, XI. See also Ridley, op. cit., p. 194.

2. See pp. 10, 17.

3. Tayler, op. cit., p. 56.

4. H. H. Henson, The Relation of the Church of England to the Other Reformed Churches, op. cit. p. 21.

the understanding of the nature of grace. Ridley and Cranmer contended, as the Service Book and the Articles show, that the real presence of Christ in the sacrament was a spiritual presence but not a spiritualized form. They asserted that the bread was the body and the wine was the blood of Christ given to us for our redemption. When the Reformers rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation they repudiated that understanding of grace which converts the existing structures of this age into the divine thus destroying the forms of our history. Rome's understanding of grace tends to reverse the direction of the incarnation. The great truth that Ridley saw when he declared that the real presence of Christ in the sacrament was by grace was that God did reveal Himself in the existing, sinful, fragmentary forms of this age. This is precisely what the incarnation tells us - the Word became flesh. But the flesh, the humanity of Jesus, was not "transubstantiated" into the divine; Christ is flesh of our flesh. God comes graciously to us in Jesus Christ. He comes to us full of grace and truth but His coming to us does not destroy our historic existence. The Word becomes flesh of our flesh - full of grace. It is still the flesh of the world. The forms of the world do not pass away when God comes into our midst because his coming is the coming of grace. The human forms remain and yet we are allowed to say by the Holy Spirit, that the bread is the body of Christ and the wine is the blood of Christ given for us. The real presence of Christ in the eucharist is the miracle of grace.

The Roman understanding of the Faith partakes of her misunderstanding of grace. That is why the Virgin Mary is acclaimed by the Church of Rome to be a sinless person. She too is "transubstantiated",

as it were, out of this age. The influence of Duns Scotus at Oxford has never been too far removed from the Church of England. The implications of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception can be traced in some of the concepts of the English Church even though the Carolines rejected, almost to a man, that particular understanding of Rome. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception lies at the heart of any attempt to arrogate to finite things the possession which belongs only to the living God. The claim to infallibility for the pope partakes of the same thought. The limitations of mere sinful man are set aside completely when the pope speaks ex cathedra. The Church of Rome no longer stands under the cross, sharing in the divisions and the brokenness of this world but she arrogates to herself the claim that she is the truth, and as such she cannot err. She has "transubstantiated" the militant Church into the triumphant. Rome confuses the doctrines of grace and glory.

The understanding of the eucharist by the Reformed Church of England was the first articulation of its position. This explains why the eucharist held such a prominent place in the Church of England and also why the Service Book, with the liturgy at its heart, was held in such reverence. It was the Service Book, even more than the Articles alone, which became the doctrinal articulation of the Church of England, and to a large extent has remained so. This certainly helps us to understand better why the Service Book became such a controversial issue in the Caroline period and why also the eucharist, so central to its content, is important for us in our formulation of the doctrine of grace in the Caroline Divines.

In the writings of Bishop Jewel, especially in his disputations

with Harding, and indeed with most of the writers of the Anglican Communion when disputing with Rome, a marked sympathy can very often be noticed with the Greek Church.¹ The emphasis on Greek Patristic thought was, in some ways, quite a natural development in the Church of England. The Reformers definitely felt an affinity with the East in its controversy with Rome.² The greatest impetus given for the revival of Greek Patristic thought came from the Reformed theologians, Calvin, Bucer and Peter Martyr, all of whom had great influence on the English Reformers. Reformation of the Church meant for Calvin the restoration of the primitive face of the Church.³ It was this understanding which greatly contributed to Patristic studies. This new learning based on Greek Patristic thought found a zealous patron in Bishop Lancelot Andrewes.

Great care must be taken in placing the thought of Andrewes in proper relation to the other currents of thought in the last decades of the sixteenth century. It would be quite erroneous to term Andrewes' emphasis on Patristic learning as simply a reaction to the Calvinistic spirit since this was precisely the direction of Calvin's concerns. There can be no doubt that there was a definite reaction to the prevailing Calvinism by Andrewes and other bishops but this has to be seen in relation to the existing Puritan controversy. Andrewes' thought definitely stands as a reaction to the dogmatism of the pre-

1. Tayler, op. cit., p. 68.

2. Sykes, op. cit., p. 39.

3. T. F. Torrance, The Eschatology of the Reformers, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 2. pp 36-62.

vailing Calvinism of his day but it does not stand at variance with the thought of Calvin himself. The reaction in the Church of England was against the misunderstanding of Calvin by the Puritans. It is indeed unfortunate that even today this distinction has not been properly thought out by the Church of England. It is true that Andrewes did not concern himself with the writings of Calvin or the other Continental Reformers but this has to be seen in the light of his vast knowledge of the Fathers and especially the Greek Fathers.¹ It is also true that possibly no man did more to influence the study of Patristics than did Calvin. Bishop Cosin, a close associate of Andrewes, paid Calvin the highest tribute in this regard. "His words in his Institutes and elsewhere are such, so conformable to the style and mind of the ancient fathers, that no Catholic protestant would wish to use any others."² It is in the light of this common concern that Andrewes stood in harmony with Reformed thought.

The thought that we see exerting itself most clearly in Andrewes is by no means an addendum to the Reformed thought of the Church of England. It was inherited from the earliest exponents of the Reformation in England; Cranmer, Ridley and Jewel who were certainly in harmony with Reformed theology. Failure to see this clearly has often resulted in that most unfortunate situation whereby a complete bifurcation between the sixteenth and seventeenth century is made thus severing the continuity of Reformation thought in the Church

1. Harrison, op. cit., p. 125.

2. Cosin, Works, op. cit., p. 167.

of England. Refusal by MacColl to acknowledge this fact, or his failure to see it, prompted him in his error. "It is to the divines of the seventeenth century, therefore, rather than to those of the sixteenth, that we must look as the representative exponents of the doctrinal position of the Church of England."¹ MacColl claimed that the returned exiles of Elizabeth's reign left no theology to the Church. Thus dismissing Jewel he severed one of the important links between the early Reformers and the seventeenth century divines. It is most obvious that MacColl, writing as he did in the fervour of the Tractarian movement, sought to isolate the Caroline movement as much as possible from the Reformation. Professor Woodhouse, commenting on such tendencies in his recent book, has wisely suggested that the Church of England must once again examine the rock from which it has² been hewed.

The name of Lancelot Andrewes is one of very considerable importance for us. Andrewes was the father of the Caroline movement and through him flowed the main stream of the Reformation as formulated by Bishop Jewel and Hooker.³ Andrewes was thoroughly Protestant in his doctrine but his extensive use of Greek Patristic thought forms have caused great misunderstanding about him. It was thought that his language made him appear out of harmony with the principles of the Reformation.⁴ "In words he agreed with the doctrines of the

1. MacColl. op. cit., p. 120.

2. H. F. Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547 - 1603, (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), p. 13.

3. Moorman, op. cit., p. 235.

4. Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 125.

Church of Rome, in meaning he was a whole world separate from them. He made the Church of England to resemble the Church of Rome, but it was only as a shadow, without the substance."¹

The reference here was obviously to Andrewes' concept of the eucharist. In articulating the doctrine of the Lord's Supper he spoke very literally of the presence of Christ in the sacrament but it was a sacramental presence; a presence of grace. Andrewes utterly rejected the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation. He has, nevertheless, been severely criticized for his view regarding the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. It has been claimed that this view was at variance with the first Reformers who conceived it in the Calvinistic spirit.² In his criticism of Andrewes, Tayler obviously misunderstood his concept of the real presence which he claimed "differed by a scarcely perceptible shade from the Roman theory."³ However, Tayler elsewhere showed that he was prepared to accept the statement that ultimately there were only two views of the Lord's Supper; Zwingli's and that of Rome's, all others being nice definitions only.⁴ When Tayler asserted that the eucharistic understanding as first formulated in the Church of England was in the spirit of Calvin he was under the impression that the Reformer had made the presence of Christ dependent on the faith of the recipient. Tayler misunderstood Calvin at this point. Calvin never equated faith with Christ. Faith was

1. Ibid, p. 126.

2. Tayler, op. cit., p. 126.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid, pp. 45, 46. See also Laud, op. cit., II, p. 329.

like the empty vessel which received the treasure. Tayler also misunderstood Andrewes' concept of the real presence. Like Calvin, Andrewes believed that the presence of Christ in the sacrament was not dependent on the believer or the faith of the believer. It is an objectified presence but it was for the believer. The presence of Christ had no meaning apart from the purpose for which it was ordained. The presence of Christ in the eucharist was for Andrewes dependent, not on the faith of the participant but on the Holy Spirit. Andrewes' concept of the eucharist stood within the Reformed tradition.

Many of the most notable names in the history of the Church of England are to be accounted among the Caroline Divines. They guided the Church through the bitter storms of the seventeenth century which almost destroyed the Church of England.

No Church in Christendom, during any period of its history, can exhibit a finer array of great names, illustrious for intellectual power, massive learning, and saintliness of character, than the Jacobean and Caroline Bishops: Andrewes, Barrow, Bull, Bramhall, Beveridge, Hall, Jeremy Taylor, Cosin, Overall, Ken, Ussher, Waterland, Mountague, Wilson, Pearson and the like. --3

Most of these men and others not named here form the basis for our inquiry in determining the doctrine of grace in the Caroline Divines.

1. Calvin, op. cit., 3:11:7. See also, R. S. Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1953), p. 211 ff. See also Laud, op. cit., II, p. 328. "For the Calvinists, at least they which follow Calvin himself, do not only believe that the true and real Body of Christ is received in the Eucharist, but that it is there, and that we partake of it, vere et realiter,..."

2. Andrewes, Lancelot, Ninety-Six Sermons (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1865), I, p. 172.

3. MacColl, op. cit., p. 116.

A word of caution may well be in order at this point. There is a sense in which we may speak of the Carolines collectively, as has already been said, but it is erroneous to think of these men as expressing in a unified voice the thought of the Church of England at this period of its history. One senses that MacColl laboured under this false impression. Their writings reveal varied strains of thought as an examination will prove.

In seeking to formulate the understanding of grace in Caroline thought an attempt will be made to see these men in relation to their time, ever keeping in mind the extremely controversial nature of that period. The method used to elaborate the thought of the Caroline Churchmen on this particular doctrine will be to examine those tenets of the Faith that best enlighten the nature of grace. The greatest need for our consideration is to hear once again the very words of the Carolines that they might dispel the false impressions associated with their names and may teach us correctly concerning their thought.

CHAPTER II

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DIMENSION OF GRACE

The necessity of presenting the characteristic element in the thought of a group as varied as the Caroline Divines presents no small problem. The benefit of such a presentation is obvious, for it enables us to have a continual frame of reference by which we may evaluate their thought, not only in itself, but also in relation to the other currents of thought contemporaneous with their own. The task, however, is not as difficult as it may at first seem for there is a point at which, almost without exception, the thought of the Carolines converged.

Whenever the nature of grace is under discussion in the Caroline writers it will be noticed a very close relation is maintained to the concept of glory. The two doctrines of grace and glory were continually associated in Caroline theology. It was this association, when kept in proper tension, which gave the Caroline doctrine of grace its eschatological nature and its most distinctive component. This particular consideration of their thought played a most important part in Caroline theology and an understanding of it will greatly illuminate our discussion of their doctrine of grace.

Antecedent to an eschatological understanding of grace is the primary necessity of grounding the doctrine of grace Christologic-

ally. If grace is not Christological it cannot be truly eschatological. All grace, said Bishop Beveridge, one of the important Caroline figures for our discussion, is the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. Beveridge was most emphatic about this. Grace, he said, is always the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and "there is none but what is in him, and we can have none, but what comes from Him and by Him."¹ Grace is so inexorably bound up with the person of Christ that it was brought, as it were, into being by Him.² We cannot go behind Jesus Christ to receive the grace of God. All the grace that we receive from God "we receive it only by Jesus Christ, out of the fulness of it that is in Him. It all flows to us only through His blood."³ The grace of Jesus Christ is the grace of God. It is the grace of the Most High God made man.⁴ This is the essential meaning of grace; God himself coming into our midst mighty to save. "And: it is by Him that grace came into the world at first, and it is by Him only that it comes to any one now."⁵ The grace of God is Jesus Christ Himself.

Though there is a close relation between grace and glory, in that they involve one another, yet there is never a complete identity. Bishop Andrewes, the father of the Caroline movement, was very clear on this point. The mystery of God's coming to man was twofold for

1. The Theological Works of William Beveridge, D.D. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1850), II, p. 60

2. Ibid., p. 110.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 59.

4. Ibid., p. 224.

5. Ibid., p. 59.

Andrewes. At the opening of the mystery, the incarnation, the grace¹ and love of God appeared to man. The doctrine of the incarnation played a most significant part in the thought of Andrewes. The incarnation which revealed the grace and love of God did not exhaust its own mystery.² It pointed ahead to a consummation of the mystery. "You look to hear of a consummation of it too; and consummate it shall be, but not yet; not till the days of the voice of the seventh Angel."³ This reference of Andrewes to Revelation is of course to the consummation of time itself. The seventh Angel heralds the end of the age; 'that there should be time no longer.'⁴ At that time the mystery of the incarnation will be consummated. "When He that was this day 'manifested in the flesh,' shall manifest to the flesh the fulness of this mystery, His eternity, glory and bliss."⁵ The veil of the flesh has already been rent at the incarnation and the second veil, the veil of heaven, will be rent when we shall be received with Him in glory.⁶ Jesus Christ, as our forerunner, has already entered the second veil for us and stands triumphant at the right hand of God.⁷

Both the relation and the distinctiveness of grace and glory

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 40.
 2. Ibid., p. 43.
 3. Ibid., p. 43.
 4. Rev. 10:6.
 5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 43.
 6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 43, 44. See also I Tim. 3:16.
 7. Hebrews 6: 19, 20.

are to be seen in the Person of Jesus Christ who is the grace and glory of God. Bishop Andrewes was very insistent that the incarnation did not reveal certain things about God but God's own Self.¹ Not the *ἀπαυγάσματα* was revealed "but the very character of His substance, the very Nature and Person of God. This is a great mystery."² The grace and glory of God was revealed in Christ when the Word became flesh. When Moses desired to see the face, the glory of God, he was told that man can never behold the glory of God and live.³ In Jesus Christ man beholds the glory of God and the grace of God also and he lives, or rather is given new life. What Moses desired to see upon one mountain the three disciples saw upon another; even the glory of God.⁴ The great glory of God is seen in Christ "as He is the Word made flesh, God and man in one person, as such, He is full of grace and truth."⁵ We see the glory of God veiled in grace. God comes to man graciously. "Glory of itself terrifies and makes stand aloof," said Andrewes, "grace invites; and His glory is such as is full of grace."⁶ God comes fully and graciously to man in Jesus Christ.

In Caroline thought grace and glory are but two aspects of the one Christ. There is a twofold appearing of our Lord; the one is

-
1. Andrewes, op. cit., I, p. 36.
 2. Ibid., See also Heb. 1:3.
 3. Exodus, 33: 18-20.
 4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 55. See also Matt. 17:2-5. 2 Pet. 1:16, 17.
 5. Beveridge, op. cit., p. 55
 6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 96.

the appearing of His grace and the other the appearing of His glory.¹
"His first coming was with great lowliness and humility; the second
will be with great majesty and glory."² This was the grace of our
Lord Jesus Christ, that He impoverished Himself to enrich us; He
came down to earth to advance us to heaven.³ The grace of God is
intimately bound up with atonement. The coming of Christ in the
fulness of time 'full of grace and truth' was the beginning of the
full manifestation of His glory. These are not two distinctly separ-
ate happenings for they are bound together in the person of Christ.
The Christ of grace is the Christ of glory. There is but one Christ
the same forever; "here we put him on in grace, there in glory."⁴

The second coming, to which we will all be eye witnesses, will
be the coming of Christ full of glory, which is the fulfillment of
grace, when all things being accomplished and man's redemption finalized.
The life of grace and glory is the life of Jesus Christ, said Bishop
Hall. He addressed our Lord directly in these words: "a life of
thine own, yet made ours; a life begun in grace and ending in eternal
glory."⁵ The glory of God penetrates the kingdom of grace even now.
By those whom God is pleased to send and empower, to publish and make
known His promises to the world, His glory is set forth and displayed
in the world, said Beveridge.⁶ The glory of God's grace in the making

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 271.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 260.

4. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 569.

5. Ibid., p. 136.

6. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 350.

and the glory of His truth in fulfilling these promises is in His Son without whom grace and truth would never appear. The full glory of God will be ushered in when Christ returns again. "At which time, to manifest His great power and glory to all the world, He will do these things, which we shall all be then eyewitnesses of, and not only we, but all, both angels and men."

The movement of grace is to glory but both grace and glory proceed from God to God. Bishop Thorndike bound these two concepts together in this way: "God's glory is the only end as well of the grace as of the glory which God giveth. God's glory is the end of effectual grace. For God intended the effect which His grace attaineth." This understanding of the movement of grace was expressed by Andrewes also. Heavenly grace, he said, was glory inchoate. All increase in grace was a proceeding towards glory. So said Bishop Tayler also whose works we shall consider in detail.

The Carolines, in general, thought of the Christian as participating in three states or kingdoms: the kingdom of nature or sin, the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory. Jeremy Taylor

-
1. Ibid., p. 59
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 271.
 3. The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844), V, p. 167.
 4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit. I, p. 109.
 5. The Whole Works of the Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D.D. (London: J. Moyes, 1828), XI, p. 229.
 6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 403.
 7. Ibid., p. 404. See also Hall, Works, op. cit. VII, p. 565.
 8. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V., p. 405.

expressed it this way:

Now between these two states of natural flesh, and heavenly spirit, that is the powers of darkness, and the regions of light, the miseries of man, and the perfection of God; the imperfection of nature where we stand by our creation and supervening follies, and the state of felicity, whither we are designed by the mercies of God, - there is a middle state, 'the kingdom of grace'; wrought for us by our Mediator, the man Christ Jesus, who came to perfect the virtue of religion, and the designs of God, and to reform our nature, and to make it possible for us to come to that spiritual state where all felicity doth dwell. —1

Taylor placed the Christian in the middle kingdom, the kingdom of grace, upon which the kingdom of glory was dependent. "He hath chosen me to be a disciple of Christ's institution; he hath elected me to his kingdom of grace; and therefore, I hope, also to the kingdom of his glory."² Taylor, however, did not always keep the concepts of grace and glory in their proper tension. His tendency was to make them too distinct from each other because his understanding of grace was not thoroughly Christologically formulated. This criticism will become more apparent in the rest of our discussion.

However, this was definitely not true regarding Bishop Andrewes. He saw both the kingdom of this world; the kingdom of sin, and the kingdom of glory impinge upon the kingdom of grace. The redeemed belonged to this latter kingdom but still they waited for their final redemption to which they were even now sealed. The seal to the kingdom of glory was the sacraments by which the grace of the Holy Spirit was given to us.³ Grace and glory fully involve one another in the

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 172.

2. Ibid., p. 192.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 223.

partaking of the sacraments. The growth and increase in grace "even to the consummation of it, which is glory - glory being nothing else but grace consummate, the figure of this stamp in his full perfection."¹ As the Christian was united to Jesus Christ he, even now, entered into the kingdom of glory. The understanding of the incarnation and ascension were of extreme importance for Andrewes in this regard. In Jesus Christ the throne on the right hand of God is already possessed by One in our nature.² "Even now, we sit there in Him, and shall there sit with Him in the end."³ In Jesus Christ grace and glory are one. The baptized in Christ are incorporated into this fullness.

Bishop Barrow followed close to Andrewes on this point by stressing the relation of the Head to the members. Where the Head is there is the body also for they are inseparably connected and the honour conferred on the Head is also extended to the members.⁴ "We also are by our Lord's glorification advanced and advantaged, in that his being so glorified is a sure pledge and an earnest of that glorious reward which all good Christians shall receive."⁵ The actual possession of the pledge, Almighty God vouchsafes to bring us, by the grace

1. Loc. cit.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 115.

3. Loc. cit., See also John Calvin, Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul The Apostle to the Hebrews (Translated and Edited by The Rev. John Owen, Edinburgh: Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, 1853), p. 154.

4. Barrow, Works, op. cit., V, p. 502. See also Heb. 2:7; 1 Cor. 12:26.

5. Barrow, op. cit., p. 502. See also Rom. 8:17; Eph. 1:11.

of His Holy Spirit through the merits of Jesus Christ. We are placed in the state of grace by God and are brought to the state of glory by His grace, but even now in the age of grace we sacramentally partake of glory.

All men belong to the state of nature simply by being born of the likeness of Adam. Those who are reborn after the likeness of Christ belong to the state of grace. "A double birth there is," said Bishop Pearson, "and the world consists of two, the first and the second man."² Only those who in this life have lived in the state of grace can look for the kingdom of glory. The kingdom of grace is a pledge to us of the kingdom of glory.³ All good things, both in this life and in the next, are of God's grace, said Beveridge.

And as I shall be bound to thank God for the perfection of glory in heaven, so also for the beginning of grace on earth; it being of his own infinite mercy that he fill our hearts with grace in time, and of his own infinite mercy too that he crowns his own grace with glory to eternity. —4

This was Bishop George Downname's understanding also. The redemptive act of Christ bound grace and glory together. Downname was assured "that Christ hath purchased, not only a liberty of grace in this life, but also of glory for our souls against the end of our life, and for our bodies also, against the day of judgment."⁵ This is the mighty assurance by which Christians are called to live and die.

1. Barrow, Works, op. cit., V, p. 584. See also Acts, 10:42.

2. John Pearson, An Exposition of the Creed (Oxford: At The University Press, 1857), p. 48.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V., p. 415.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 295.

5. George Downeham (Downname), The Christian Freedom (Oxford: William Webs, 1635), p. 155. See also Heb. 10:19, 20.

The movement of grace is always toward the kingdom of glory but in such a way that it is always from God. Andrewes was clear on this point. The Word became flesh but flesh does not become the Word.¹ The movement of the incarnation cannot be reversed. The kingdom of glory likewise comes with Christ.

The things we pray against are the kingdom of Satan, darkness and sin that they depart from us, and that the inward kingdom of grace may take place in our hearts; but the principal kingdom that we desire is the kingdom of glory, whereof our Saviour said, 'Behold I come quickly.' —2

Our proceeding to the kingdom of glory is Christ's coming to us as the risen glorified Lord.

The Christian now lives in the kingdom of grace, having been redeemed from the kingdom of sin by the atoning work of Christ. While the Christian lives in the kingdom of grace he is still beset with sin but even now can look God in the face with an awful boldness, said Bishop Hall.³ The forms and structures of sin do not pass away in the age of grace but they no longer have power over us. The reason that sin has no dominion over us, said Beveridge, "is because we are not under the law, but under grace, the grace of Jesus Christ."⁴ In the age of grace we are sealed to the promise of glory. For the present we are children by adoption, said Bishop Taylor, "sealed with his spirit, renewed by generation, justified by his grace, and invited forward by more glorious promises, greater than we understand."⁵

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 70.
 2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 405.
 3. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, pp. 144, 145.
 4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 60.
 5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIII, p. 229.

The kingdom of grace is the first-fruits of Christ's ascension¹ which is the life of glory. The concept of the 'first-fruits' was directly related to baptism in Caroline thought and we shall consider this aspect in greater detail at a further stage in our discussion. The life of grace is termed, by many of the Caroline writers, as the first resurrection or the resurrection of the soul. This first rising to righteousness from the state of sin and the resurrection of the body are both bound together and are directly dependent on the resurrection of Christ. Andrewes worked out this understanding in his sermon on John 2:19. Christ's resurrection is the means of our resurrection;

our raising first, to the life of righteousness, to the estate of Temples here in this world, and after, of glorious temples in the world to come, which is the excitabo when all is done. What time they and we shall be loosed as now from sin, so then from corruption; and raised and restored, as now to the estate of grace so then to the state of glory, and glorious liberty of the sons of God. --2

Andrewes thought of these two states as already ours in Christ through baptism.

Bishop Pearson carried through the understanding of regeneration as having a twofold aspect in relation to grace and glory. Regeneration is, as it were, a second creation.³ The soul "which after its natural being requires a birth into the life of Grace, is also after that born again into a life of Glory."⁴ The final act and

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, pp 222, 223.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 367-8.

3. Pearson, op. cit., p. 48.

4. Loc. cit.

fulfillment of regeneration was related to the resurrection of the body by Pearson. He likened it also to a second birth. "The resurrection of our bodies is a kind of coming out of the womb of the earth, and entering upon immortality, a nativity into another life."¹ Pearson, like Andrewes, related the life of grace and glory to the person of Jesus Christ. The first resurrection from sin to the life of righteousness is related in Caroline thought to baptism which was also the seal of the life of glory - the second resurrection.

The movement of grace follows the direction of the incarnation. Beveridge related grace directly to the person and being of Christ. The coming of Christ into our midst has a backward and forward reference which impinges itself upon us now. It is thoroughly eschatological. Christ's coming fills up the promises made by God in the Old Testament. Grace comes into our flesh when the Word became flesh but this same grace of Christ was given to the people of the Old Testament by promise even as Christ was given to them by promise. That is how Beveridge understood Christ as the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. The sacrifice of Christ looks backward as well as forward gathering² up the sins of all mankind. God spoke to the fathers of the Old Testament by the ministry of the same second person of the Trinity who became flesh, said Thorndike. That is why Christ is called the Word of God.³ The Carolines were careful to show that the continuity of God's revelation was in God Himself. In the incarnation the promises of the Word of God are filled up by the fulness of Christ; the fulness

1. Loc. cit.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 153.

3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt.1, pp. 208, 209.

of God. The promised age of grace is fulfilled by Christ who is full of grace and truth of God. If the overtures of grace and life were made in Christ to those under the law as well as to us under the gospel, said Beveridge, it follows that the same promises were made to both. ¹ "For the same Christ was promised to them as was given to us, and they had as much cause to believe he would come, as we have to believe he is come." ² Any concept of progressive revelation in its primary form would have been quite foreign to Beveridge's understanding.

The age of glory is dependent on the ascended Christ. The continuity of the incarnation is seen here for the Christ of glory still wears our humanity.

You shall not only behold Christ clothed with your own nature, but you shall likewise behold God Himself unveiling His face and discovering His glory and perfection to you. For here we see as but through a glass darkly; but there, face to face. —3

This of course is St. Paul's thought; even now in this age we are able to see the future age. This is the miracle of grace. By His face, said Beveridge, we are to understand His essential glory. ⁴

The forward reference of grace is the promise of glory. This must be thought of in direct relation to Christ for it is the same person who will come again in glory. At the second coming of Christ all things shall be fulfilled all in all. The age of grace is full with the promise of His coming in glory.

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 218.

2. Ibid., p. 220

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 279.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., V, p. 98.

There are three degrees of sonship corresponding to the three kingdoms. Bishop Pearson explained it in this manner:

There is a degree of sonship founded on creation, and that is the lowest belonging unto all, both good and bad: another degree above that there is founded upon generation, or adoption, belonging only to the truly faithful in this life: and a third above the rest founded on the resurrection, collation of the eternal inheritance, and the similitude of God, appertaining to the saints alone in the world to come. —1

The Christian, living in the age or kingdom of grace participates in all three degrees of sonship. As Pearson said, all men belong to the first simply by their generation from Adam. The man redeemed by Christ is brought from the kingdom of sin into the kingdom of grace which is the first resurrection. This is given in this age by baptism. While the Christian lives in the life of grace he still participates in the life of nature for in the kingdom of grace sin still exists. Even those who are exalted as saints in the life of grace are still subject to sin and sin still lives in them but even now the Christian is ransomed from its dominion and sin does not reign in him.² In the age of grace man still stands under the cross. Downname strongly emphasized in the 'Covenant of Grace' that the redeemed man is fully involved in the fallen age of Adam. On the other hand the Christian even now participates in the life of glory.

At our new birth, said Beveridge, when a man is truly regenerated, or born of God, and made His child by adoption and grace, then the Holy Spirit of God is breathed into him, and becomes the principle of eternal life in him: by which means he shall not only have it hereafter, but he already 'hath eternal life'. —3

-
1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 102.
 2. G. Downname, The Covenant of Grace (Dublin: Society of Stationers, 1631), p. 37. See also Rom. 6:14.
 3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 192, 193. See also John 6:47.

This surely is the true meaning of grace in its eschatological dimension, that even now we have what we shall fully have hereafter. And Beveridge was insistent "that this life is to be had in Christ Jesus, and in Him only." ¹ Beveridge's understanding of the life of grace was very Christocentric at this point. All things relating to this 'eternal life' are grounded in Christ "as the sole author, root, origin, and foundation of it. It is He that purchased life for us: it is He that hath promised it to us: it is He that prepares it for us and us for it: and it is He, that after all bestows it upon us." ²

The Holy Spirit sent after the ascension of Christ brings the finished work of the atonement to us. Without the Spirit, said Andrewes, the work of Christ is of no avail for us. ³ The Holy Spirit works into us the work which Christ did for us. These are Andrewes' words:

To this we aspire, and to this in the fulness appointed of every one of our times Almighty God brings us by Him, and for His sake, That in this 'fulness of time' was sent to work it for us in His Person; and work it in us by the operation of His blessed Spirit.—⁴

It is the Holy Spirit who keeps us in the life of grace and who seals us to the life of glory. This is once again related to the sacraments in Andrewes' thought.

The tendency in Caroline theology was to make a distinction between the concepts of Justification and Sanctification. When these doctrines were held in proper tension it again emphasized the eschato-

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 193, 194.

2. Ibid., p. 194.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 214.

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 63.

logical dimension of grace. The atoning work of Christ was done once and for all but the man who is justified does not possess his own justification since man is never fully sanctified in this life. Beveridge was aware of this distinction.

Not as if these two were several or divided in their subjects; no, every one who is justified is also sanctified, and every one that is sanctified is also justified. But yet the acts of justification and sanctification are two distinct things: for the one denotes the imputation of righteousness to us; the other denotes the implantation of righteousness in us. And therefore, though they be both acts of God, yet the one is the act of God toward us, and the other is the act of God in us. --1

This understanding directly attacked any notion of inhering grace for even the justified man is continually pointed beyond his justification to the full sanctification which is the resurrection of the body at the second coming of Christ.

Bishop Joseph Hall absolutely rejected Rome's doctrine of inhering grace. Considering the nature of righteousness he pointed to the person of Christ and away from man.

It is the main care of our lives and deaths, what shall give us peace and acceptation before the dreadful tribunal of God: what but righteousness? - what righteousness, or whose, ours or Christ's? Ours, in the inherent graces wrought in us, in the holy works wrought by us? or in Christ's in his most perfect obedience and meritorious satisfaction wrought for us applied to us. The Tridentine faction is for the former, we are for the latter. --2

The Scriptures and antiquity showed, said Hall, that the Church of England was right in this claim.³

The eschatological dimension of grace is in direct opposition

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 289.
 2. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 219.
 3. Ibid., p. 220

to the Roman doctrine of inhering grace. It refuses to allow us to think of grace as earth-bound and man-possessed. Grace belongs always to God even when given to man. The distinction that Beveridge made between justification and sanctification always places grace in the hands of God. Something else must be noted from Beveridge's understanding. The distinction between justification and sanctification continually points us to the 'objective' act of our redemption, that is, an act done wholly apart from man's doing though fully related to man. The unity between justification and sanctification reveals the 'subjective' nature of the drama of salvation, that is, even though the 'event' is done wholly apart from man it is nevertheless 'an act of God in us', one done "in the flesh or nature of man",¹ in which 'THE WORD of God suffered' for the sin of the world.' This is something that both the ultra-Calvinists and the Arminians often failed to understand. The act of grace is completely God's but at the same time man is not ignored / rather fully involved. This shall be referred to in the process of our discussion.

Sanctification is not an addendum to the act of justification nor is it an act which man does by the means of grace though we do find this latter thought appearing in Bishop Taylor and some of the other bishops. In Beveridge, however, sanctification is the act of justification continually renewed and re-enacted in the believer by the Holy Spirit who is ours for the sanctification of our natures.²

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 58.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 286.

Beveridge does use the term 'inhesion' of grace to convey the notion that the objective act of our atonement, done once and for all, is done into man. This was important for it showed that God's grace is for man's salvation. That is an essential meaning of grace. Speaking of the merit of Christ's death Beveridge elaborated:

By this merit it is that we are accounted righteous before God; where we may take notice by the way, how our being justified is here expressed by our being accounted righteous, and not by our own being made righteous: for it is not by inhesion of grace in us, but by the implantation of righteousness to us that we are justified; as it is not by the imputation of righteousness to us but by the inhesion of grace in us that we are sanctified. --1

Here sanctification is the act of justification done into us. Beveridge never allows us to think of grace as some 'thing' that is given to us by Christ which we possess apart from Christ Himself.

Bishop Barrow rejected the theory of Bellarmine, the great Roman apologist, who asserted that the imputation of Adam's sin was inherent in man and therefore Christ's righteousness or grace should also be inherent.² In objecting to any notion of inherent grace Barrow still maintained an ontological reality to grace but he interpreted Scripture to show that our justification by the grace of Christ was a renewing by the Holy Spirit.³ Barrow, interpreting St. Paul on this issue, related justification to baptism.⁴ Barrow unfortunately did not always use words that best distinguished between ontological and saving grace. The rationalistic tendency in Barrow

1. Ibid, p. 287.

2. Barrow, Works, op. cit., IV, pp. 377, 378.

3. Barrow, Works, op. cit., VII, pp. 383, 384. See also Tit. 3:5,6,7.

4. Ibid., pp. 387, 388. See also Rom. 3:25; 10:10.

continually asserted itself. He was fond of using such expressions as the 'principles of Christian life' when referring to the work of grace.¹ Here he followed in Jeremy Taylor's misunderstanding. The following quotation, however, showed Barrow at his best in this matter. "I might adjoin that Christian men do become the sons of God by the intervention of our Saviour, assuming our nature, and conforming himself to the likeness of men," and it is the conjunction of our nature with Christ which is our union with Him and it is by this act that we are sons.² The act of God's intervention in our history by uniting our humanity with Himself, is the act of grace. This intervention in its primary form is from God's side but the full nature of man is completely involved and redeemed.

Bishop Hall, as we have already seen, left no doubt as to where he stood in the question of inherent grace. He, like Barrow, refused to identify completely justification and sanctification which prevented the former from becoming simply an ontological concept. Man was fully justified, Hall left no doubt about that, but the justified man was still a man of this age and thus never free from the kingdom of sin. But Hall was most emphatic in holding at the same time that the man who had been justified was no longer a sinner before God. That is the Christian's confidence; the certain hope that is set before him.

We are sanctified in part, according to the weakness of our receipt: we are justified thoroughly, according to the perfection of thine acceptation: were we fully sanctified here, we should be

1. Ibid., p. 505.

2. Ibid., pp. 506, 507.

not

more than man; were we/thoroughly justified, we should be no more than sinners, we can have no peace. Let others trust in the chariots and horses of their own strength, we will remember the name of the Lord our God; The work of thy justice shall be our peace. —1

Justified man can never look to himself and what he possesses. Rather justification itself points to the Justifier.

Bishop Barrow maintained the eschatological nature of grace when he spoke of justification. The Christian was justified now but he waited for his final redemption which was yet to come. Barrow divided the aspects of justification under the division of grace and glory.

Now whereas this state has two degrees, or the persons under it two conditions; one here present upon earth, in transition and acquisition; the other hereafter, or residence and fruition in heaven; (one like that of the Israelites, travelling in the wilderness, the other like their possessions of Canaan;) in this case we may well understand both, but chiefly the first, (the kingdom of grace here,) wherein immediately this power is executed, although its effects do finally refer and reach to the other, (the kingdom of glory hereafter.) —2

We have our justification, of that Barrow was assured, but it is not by way of possession. Justification in this age of grace moves on to its fulfillment in the age of glory.

Bishop Andrewes' thought on this subject was similar; holding in eschatological tension the incarnation and the second coming of Christ in relation to our redemption. "What He is appeareth; what we shall be doth not yet appear, but shall at the second appearing."³ The incarnation and passion of Christ tell us that the veil of His

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 220. See also Isaiah 32: 17.

2. Barrow, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 52.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 43.

flesh has already been rent and we see what God has done for us in
our flesh.¹ But we also have a certain hope in the second coming
for which we wait. The ascension of Christ into heaven veils the
mystery but "our hope hath cast anchor, even within the veil, mean-
ing Heaven itself."² Christ, who wears our humanity in heaven is the
anchor within the veil. There can be no more certain hope than this
for it has already taken place and is enfolded in the eschatological
dimension of grace. This certainty is brought to us by the Holy Spirit.

Jeremy Taylor, though rejecting the doctrine of inherent grace
used thought forms that did not differ essentially from the Roman
Church's position. He often confused the grace of Christ with graces,
the gifts of grace. In many of his concepts Taylor differed consider-
ably from his fellow bishops. In some respects Taylor stood closer
to the rationalistic spirit of the Renaissance than he did to the
Reformation. He did not understand the proper eschatological nature
in grace because his thinking was centred in graces rather than the
fountain of grace, Christ Himself. Perhaps Taylor, more than any of
the other bishops of the Caroline period was in danger of abstract-
ing grace from the person of Christ. This has to be said with certain
qualifications, however, for at times Taylor grasped a far deeper
meaning of grace. The Christian, he said, experienced a liberty of
grace in this life which was freedom from sin.

There is yet another liberty called 'the liberty of glory' or
the 'glorious liberty of the children of God;' that is, the
'redemption of our bodies' from disease and pain, from death and

1. Loc. cit.

2. Loc. cit.

corruption: for what Christ is by generation and proper inheritance, that we shall be by adoption, if we belong to him. —1

Taylor failed to relate these two concepts properly; often relating them through the fulfilling of moral conditions on the part of man.

Bishop Andrewes saw that the true relation of grace and glory was in the person of Christ and not in man. As we have already seen in this matter the incarnation and the ascension gave the proper distinction and union to the concepts of grace and glory. "The day wherein He was restored to the perfection of His spiritual life, the life of glory, is the best for us to be restored in the first fruits of that spiritual life, the life of grace."² Grace came to mankind in its flesh when Christ the Word became flesh. The ascension was the glorification of Christ still in our humanity and we share in that glory now in the life of grace. The first-fruits of Christ's glory are given to us at our baptism.

The sacraments belong to the age of grace and they present us with participation in the future age. In the Caroline articulation of the eucharist we see the relation of grace and glory expressed with clarity. Like the Reformers of the Church of England, the Carolines utterly refused the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and they carried on the controversy which they inherited from the previous century. Richard Hooker had insisted that the sacraments were only for this life and by them we taste of the life to come.³

By baptism we are incorporated in Christ and by the eucharist we,

-
1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIII, p. 255.
 2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 222, 223.
 3. Hooker, Works, op. cit., II, 5:67.



as children of God, feed on the body of Christ and are sustained in Him.

Whereas therefore, in our infancy we are incorporated into Christ and by Baptism receive the grace of his Spirit without any sense or feeling of the gift which God bestoweth, in the Eucharist we so receive the gift of God, that we know by grace what the grace is which God giveth us, the degrees of our own increase in holiness and virtue we see and can judge of them, we understand that the strength of our life begun in Christ is Christ, that his flesh is meat and his blood drink, not by surmized imagination but truly, even so truly that through faith we perceive in the body and blood sacramentally presented the very taste of eternal life, the grace of the sacrament is here as the food which we eat and drink. —1

Hooker and Andrewes, and those who followed in this tradition stressed the eschatological nature of the sacraments as means of grace. The grace given in the sacrament is Christ and by receiving Him who has been glorified we now taste the age of glory. Hooker and Andrewes asserted a real presence of Christ in the sacrament but the bread and the wine, the forms of this age, remain.

The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation violates the distinction which the Carolines made between grace and glory. The two ages are confounded and the structures of the age of grace disappear. Rome says that the bread is no longer bread. The Carolines asserted that the bread remained bread but by the grace of God the Christian received the body of Christ..² Bishop Pearson showed that the Roman doctrine is a misunderstanding of the incarnation: Eutyches had confused the natures of Christ and transubstantiated the humanity of Christ into His divinity, thus reversing the movement of the incarnation.³ The assertion of transubstantiation in all its aspects destroys the

1. Loc. cit.

2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, pt.1, p. 6.

3. Pearson, op. cit., p. 288.

eschatological understanding of grace and rules out the work of the Holy Spirit.

In the sermons of Andrewes and Cosin the movement in the service of worship is very noticeably ^{directed} to the participation of the eucharist, the word made flesh. "No fulness there is of our Liturgy or public solemn Service without the Sacrament.¹" There can be no full thanksgiving in our service of worship without the eucharist for it is thanksgiving itself.² The eucharist was a means of grace and therefore involves the meaning of grace. Bishop Andrewes' concept of the eucharist provides us with a true eschatological understanding.

There is a further matter yet behind; for as this feast looketh back as a memorial of that already past and done for us, so doth it forward, and is to us a pledge of another and a better yet to come, the feast of the marriage of the Lamb here That is our Passover, where whosoever shall be a guest, the Angels pronounce him happy and blessed for ever. --3

Andrewes showed that the sacramental feast was grounded on what had already been done for us in Christ. The celebration of the eucharist now, points back to what has been done for us and gathers it to us now while at the same time it points forward to the consummation of that act. But sacramentally we already partake of that to which it points.

In which cup is the blood not only of our redemption, of the covenant that freeth us from the Law and maketh the destroyer to pass over us; but of our adoption, of the New Testament also which entitles us and conveys unto us testamentwise or by way of legacy, the estate we have in the joy and bliss of

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 62.
 2. Loc., cit.
 3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 312.

His Heavenly Kingdom whereto and with Him of both these His benefits. --1

At the eucharist we drink of the Holy Spirit who seals us to the future
2
age.

We receive the eucharist in such a way that it lifts our eyes beyond to His coming again. We grow in Christ and we grow in grace as we partake of Him in His sacrament.

And so growing from grace to grace, finally from this 'fulness' we shall come to be partakers of another yet behind, to which we aspire. For all this is but 'the fulness of time'. But that, the fulness of eternity, when time shall be run out and his glass empty, 'et tempus non erit amplius', which is at His next sending. For yet once more shall God send Him, and He come again. --3

The time of grace is the time of waiting for that which we now have by the Spirit of Him who shall come again. The age of glory will come in fully when Christ comes again at which time we shall receive the fulness of our redemption, the redemption of our bodies, which we now have by adoption but then we shall have as inheritance. 4 The age of grace is that 'fulness of time' in which the work of Christ is worked into us by the operation of the Holy Spirit. 5 Now we taste that which we shall then have in full fruition; the fulness of God, the fulness of glory. 6 Then we shall see face to face.

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 62.
 2. Loc., cit.
 3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 63.
 4. Loc., cit.
 5. Loc., cit.
 6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 327.

The eschatological concept of grace can also be seen in relation to the understanding of the Church. The terms 'militant and triumphant' were favorite expressions with the Carolines to convey the twofold aspect of one reality.¹ The militant Church belongs to the age of grace.² It is still the Church under the cross sharing in the divisions and brokenness of this world. The Church triumphant belongs to the kingdom of glory.³ It is the Church as the one glorified body of Christ now ascended over all the divisions of this age. There is only one Church, however, the body of Jesus Christ. There is an involvement of the Church militant and triumphant. The Church throughout the ages shares in the fulness of Christ. This, said Downname, is the manner in which the Apostles understood "the universal company of the Elect: Which is the body of Christ, containing not only the Militant Church, but also the Triumphant: and not only the Church after the ascension of Christ, but also before from the beginning of the world."⁴ The Church is the body of Christ yet it distinguishes itself as a body of sinners. "So that though grace in this life may take away the strength, it cannot take away the life of sin. But though a saint may not live in sin," said Beveridge,⁵ "still sin will live in him." Grace allows us to say both at once; that the Church is the body of Christ and also a

1. Ed. W. Benham, The Prose Works of the Right Reverend Thomas Ken, D.D., London: Griffeth, Farran, O Kenden & Welsh, 1889), p. 125.

2. Ibid., p. 175.

3. Ibid., p. 176.

4. G. Downname, A Treatise of Justification (London: Nicholas Bourne, 1639), p. 325.

5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., Vii, p. 267.

body of sinners. This is analogous to our understanding of the eucharist when we say bread and yet the body of Christ. As Ridley pointed out the presence of Christ in the eucharist was by grace and it was a miracle.

The militant Church of grace now shares with her Head that state of glory. Discussing the nature of the Church Bishop Downame drew from Augustine's definition, that the Church is called glorious¹ even now because she waits for the coming of Christ in glory. The militant Church in its visible form on earth as well as the Church² triumphant in heaven is called the kingdom of God, said Beveridge.

Bishop Downame carried his understanding of justification and sanctification into the discussion of the nature of the Church. Like Barrow, he rejected Bellarmine's identification of the two doctrines and he went on to show that St. Paul thought of the Church as being continually sanctified in this life by the work of the Spirit in the ministry of the word and sacrament; that at the marriage of³ the Lamb the Church may be presented to Christ, a glorious Church. The distinction made by Downame regarding the Church showed that in this age the Church does not possess her justification. This understanding cut at the error of Rome which confused grace and glory and destroyed the distinction between the bread and the body, between the Church militant and the Church triumphant, arrogating to herself all the pretensions of infallibility.

1. Downame, A Treatise of Justification, op. cit., p. 93.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 178, 179.

3. Downame, A Treatise of Justification, op. cit., p. 93.

The concept of grace expressed by Bishop Andrewes and the Carolines that followed in his thought stood in opposition both to Roman doctrine and to the tendencies of the radical Puritan sects. The Roman Church transubstantiated the forms of grace into glory while the extreme Puritan sects tended to reject the use of forms altogether, relying on the immediate movings of the Spirit. This tendency in Puritanism was a violent reaction against the hyper use of forms in Roman worship. This has been pointed out by Geoffrey Nuttall in 'The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience',

It is not possible to understand this disuse of something which in historic and orthodox Christianity has been considered of quite primary importance, nor indeed many other Puritan tendencies, of which this is only the most startling, unless we realize that many Puritans believed themselves to be living in a remarkable age, a new age, perhaps the last age, and that their conception of history was quite different from any conception to which we are accustomed today." --1

It was as if the age of glory had now been fully ushered in. The historic forms of this age were set aside. Nuttall points out that the assertion of the full liberty of the Spirit in Puritan thought was accompanied by a powerful eschatological consciousness. This concept of eschatology, however, was spiritualized and unearthly. It tried to press beyond this world ignoring the fact that it was into this world of fragmentariness and sin that the Word had come full of grace. The incarnation bids us use forms but it also reveals to us that the forms of this world do not become the Word.

Transubstantiation of forms and rejection of them violate the

1. G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), p. 102.

2. Ibid., p. 108.

true nature of grace. The Carolines, following in the tradition of the Reformers, repudiated the Roman doctrine but they did not cease to use what had been misused by Rome. Their eucharistic understanding maintained a real presence of Christ. Christ was in the midst of His people full of grace and truth. All that Christ had done was continually given afresh in the Lord's Supper. The eucharist pointed to that act of atonement accomplished in our history and it also pointed to Christ's coming again.

Whenever the Carolines were most conscious of the unity of grace to the person of Christ they maintained a powerful eschatological element in their doctrine of grace. Christ had been promised as redeemer. He had come full of grace and truth; He is still to come in glory. Both these concepts must be kept in proper tension. The second advent keeps the doctrine of grace open to the coming of Christ in glory. The proper relation of grace and glory in Caroline thought, whenever it was kept, ransomed their doctrine from absoluteness. The forms of grace did not arrogate to themselves a self enclosed reality. Christ was still to come. The age of grace was open to His coming.

It was most unfortunate that in some aspects of their thought the Carolines did not always maintain the eschatological element in their doctrine of grace. Even in their writings on the Church one notices a tendency to rigidity. The point at which their doctrine of grace verges most from its eschatological understanding is in their discussion of holy orders. There a marked difference can be noted in some of the Carolines and indeed strange contradictions in the same person.

Two strands of thought were manifest in the Caroline tradition

when the nature of the ministry was debated. Continually asserting itself was the doctrine of holy orders worked out in the eschatological dimension of grace while at the same time the reaction to the Puritan movement set up an opposing concept. The direction of thought in the Carolines inclined more to absolutism as the political pressure from the Puritans increased. The bishops arrogated more power into their own hands in an effort to stem the tide of the Puritans and to counteract the extravagant claims which were made for the Geneva system. When the Carolines adhered to the proper relation of grace and glory they were prevented from absolutizing their claims for episcopacy.

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The seventeenth century witnessed a great attack by the Arminian theology against the prevailing Calvinistic thought. In the latter years of the previous century Arminius, a Dutch theologian, called into question Calvin's doctrine of predestination, reprobation and free grace. There is a most unfortunate factor in this controversy; both the Calvinists and the Arminians failed to understand Calvin. The extreme Calvinists, such as Gomarus who became their spokesman at Dort, pushed Calvin's thought to a logical extreme. In considering predestination and reprobation these Calvinists made a bifurcation between the 'eternal decrees of God' and the incarnation so that election in Christ, the central theme in Calvin's thought, was largely excluded. Such an interpretation inevitably tended to a mechanical determinism.

Arminius' concerns were ^{partially} mainly right when he challenged the prevailing Calvinism of his day. He saw that by emphasizing a rigid predestination the Calvinists had ruled man out of the picture. They made of God's election an arbitrary and mechanical determinism. It was as if God had declared in eternity that every thousandth man born would be saved and there was absolutely nothing that anybody could do about it; neither the saved nor the damned. It is obvious that this

1

was not Calvin's thought.

Arminius was concerned to show that man was not determined either to salvation or damnation. He sought to restore man as a responsible being and not just some 'thing' that was arbitrarily acted upon by grace. Arminius used an analogy to illustrate his point. The gift that a rich man gives to a beggar does not lose its free nature simply because the beggar reaches out his hand to receive it. This was like God's free grace; it still remained free even though man's hand reached for it. What Arminius wanted to make clear was that God's grace is not irresistible as the analogy shows. It was most unfortunate that Arminius choose to rectify the extremes of the Calvinists by such an analogy. It introduced a fruitless controversy of grace and works which could never answer those issues which it first brought into question. The best attack against the Calvinists would have been the thought of Calvin himself. Had Arminius known Calvin's thought better he could have stressed even more than Calvin that predestination is essentially Christology.³

As it was, the Arminian controversy raged in extremes and split the Protestant ranks much to the joy of Rome. Because Arminius had declared that God had not yet divorced the Church of Rome his enemies were quick to charge him with popery. The Arminians reacted

1. Calvin, Inst., op. cit., 3:21:1 - 7. In this chapter Calvin shows that in the matter of election God begins with Himself. But Calvin did not conceive of Predestination as a static point in the past. It had eschatological content and would be revealed at the last judgment.

2. A. W. Harrison, The Beginnings of Arminianism (London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1926), p. 122.

3. Calvin, Inst., op. cit., 3:22:1.

against the dangerous antinomianism of the ultra-Calvinists. Though they did not go to the lengths of the Jesuits in declaring that man's free-will was not extinguished by the fall of Adam yet there is little difference on the subject of free-will between the Arminians and Roman doctrine on this issue.¹ This stress of free-will can be noted in some of the Carolines and will be dealt with in a later chapter. The accusation of Romanism that was made against the Arminians was given added ground when Peter Bertius, a close friend of Arminius who preached his funeral sermon, went over to Rome.² The accusation of Romanism was continually made against the Carolines by the Puritans.

The association that did more harm to the Arminian cause was its relation to the Socinian heresy. These two movements arose quite independent and from different sources but there was an attraction between these two groups that drew them together. When Socinius left Italy he was warmly received by the Arminians and it was a further affirmation of the Socinian influence in Arminianism when Vorsitius, a follower of Arminius, was called to the Academy of Lublin in Poland which was noted as a stronghold of Socinianism.³

The Arminians were continually charged with heresy on the subject of the Trinity. Episcopus, another follower of Arminius, stressed a subordination in the Trinity.⁴ It was on the subject of the atone-

1. Harrison, The Beginnings of Arminianism, op. cit., p. 318.

2. Ibid., p. 139.

3. Ibid., p. 166.

4. H. Watkin-Jones, The Holy Spirit From Arminius To Wesley (London: the Epworth Press, 1929), pp. 58, 59.

ment in its relation to the divinity of Christ that the Arminians were closer to the Socinians. Vorsitius felt the attractiveness of much of the Socinian teaching on the Atonement. He held that it was impossible for Christ to mediate for us before He was incarnate and became the God-man. "He felt that it was possible for God to forgive sins without any scheme of propitiation, and the moral influence of the cross appealed to him as an explanation of its power rather than the dogma that it was a divinely appointed sacrifice duly carried out."¹ Bishop Cosin attacked the Socinians for questioning the atoning work of Christ. What Christ did, said Cosin, had to be done. "For neither we nor all the world besides, were able to do that; so that done it must be, or we must have been all undone, one of these two."² Cosin was very critical of the Socinian denial of Christ's satisfaction and their claim that there was no need for it.³ He pointed out that the divine necessity of the atonement troubled the Socinians.⁴

It is important for our consideration to keep in mind the nature of the Arminian and Socinian movements for they both played a considerable part in the religious life of England, particularly in the period under discussion. The full tide of these two movements was to sweep across England with all their fury.

England officially entered the Arminian controversy when King James I attacked Vorsitius for holding heretical opinions. The King

1. Harrison, The Beginnings of Arminianism, op. cit., p. 185.

2. Cosin, Works, op. cit., I, p. 258.

3. Loc., cit.

4. Loc., cit.

took his title, 'Defender of the Faith', with all seriousness. It would seem quite natural at first to expect the King to side with the Calvinists since on coming from Scotland he considered himself to be a champion of the prevailing opinion of that country which was Calvinistic. However, at the Hampton Court Conference and in the following years of his reign he showed himself to be hostile to the Puritans who also claimed to have espoused the Calvinistic views. James revealed that he had a dread fear of Presbyterianism. The beardless boys, as he termed the Scottish preachers, did not hold James in the same awe and reverence as did the English bishops. Not the least surprising fact relating to the English participation at Dort was that the English divines, sent by the personal command of the King never signed the Dort document.

It is quite clear that James' relation to the Puritans was governed by political rather than theological motives. The high concept of kingship such as prevailed among the bishops, Andrewes for example, appealed to James. It is also quite possible that James did not regard the Puritans as really followers of Calvin. Whitgift never regarded Cartwright as such nor did Bishop Hall consider the Puritans as followers of Calvin. Speaking to the separatist element in the Puritan fold in relation to the Continental Churches he said: "I touch nothing common to them with you."² It is noteworthy how often the Carolines differentiated between the Puritans and the Reformed Church on the Continent.

1. Harrison, The Beginnings of Arminianism, op. cit., p. 378.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 40.

Bishop Hall who had been one of the English Divines at Dort was among the first to discern that the fire they had hoped to quench on the Continent was spreading into England. "Men, brethren, fathers, help. Who sees not a dangerous fire kindling in our church by these five fatal bonds? which if it be not speedily quenched, threatens a furious eruption, and shall too late die in our ashes." Hall felt a revulsion against bitter disputes and feared extremes. He stood with the Calvinists at Dort but he showed little sympathy for the Puritan sects which he termed "a miserable misguided zeal." It is important to note Hall's attitude to the Arminian controversy. It is obvious that he took his stand against the Remonstrants while in Holland and against Arminianism when it spread into England. But Bishop Hall, true to Caroline tradition did not really stand with the prevailing Calvinist thought. He pleaded for a middle way, the way of the Church of England. In presenting the Via Media Articles to King James in 1622, Hall expressed the hope that they might bridge the differences between the Arminian and Calvinistic thought. He warned the King of the approaching danger and the terrible results of a religious war.

There need no prophetic spirit to discern, by a small cloud, that there is a storm coming towards our church: such a one as shall not only drench our plumes, but shake our peace. Already do we see the sky thicken, and hear the wind's whistle hollow afar off, and feel all the passages of a tempest which the late example of our neighbours bids us fear. --4

1. Ibid., p. 497.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, Pref.LIV.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 488.

4. Ibid., p. 489.

Hall's reference was to the dreadful Thirty Years War which raged at that time on the Continent. Hall saw the devastation that was to come to England and James would have been wise had he listened more attentively and made better preparation in Church and state against the coming storms of the future. James died a few years later but Hall lived to see and feel the horrors of the Civil War.

In discussing the Arminian controversy in England a distinction must be made between the influx of Arminian thought from the Continent and the prevailing thought of Andrewes which came through Jewel. We have already noted the reaction to the prevailing Calvinistic thought in England but this reaction was quite distinct from the Continental Arminianism. This was definitely true in the earlier stages of the Caroline period. "Hooker at Oxford, Andrewes and Overall at Cambridge, must be regarded as the representatives of the new school of thought that was alive in England before the Arminians began to lecture at Leyden." ¹ The tendencies were the same but there was an important difference: in Andrewes there was a reaction against the extreme Calvinists of his day but never a repudiation of Calvin. It is true that the same claim could not be made for all the bishops who are generally regarded as followers of Andrewes in the Caroline tradition. The term Arminian was repudiated by all of them but there were very definite lapses into an Arminian or semi-Arminian position. At the same time, however, from Andrewes through the entire Caroline period we can see a strong current of Reform thought manifesting itself. Though the Caroline tradition became infected with Arminianism the real exponents of this thought were not the Caroline Churchmen but

1. Harrison, Arminianism, op. cit., p. 123.

but the Cambridge Platonists who in fact emerged as a reaction to the ceaseless theological inquiries and distinctions that were made by the Caroline Divines. They were the moderates and the rationalists and the theology of that movement became the expression of the Church of England in the latter years of the seventeenth century. Such a distinction must be made but it is also clear that there was a considerable over-lapping in thought.

Though the Puritans, in the main, were followers in the Calvinistic tradition the Arminian principles and their accompanying Socinian tendencies infected them as much as it ever did the Carolines and possibly with a more permanent effect. The rise of the Unitarian movement is evidence of that fact. As a general rule the further one went to the left ranks of the Reformation Churches the more extreme the theology became in its reaction to Rome. The exceptions to this rule were the Arminians and the Anabaptists who asserted a belief in free-will, espousing the Molinism of the Jesuits in the Church of Rome, and though not the Thomistic understanding.

It was Mountague, later Bishop of Winchester, who first drew the Puritan fire on the Arminian question. In his controversial writings against the Roman Church he set out to prove that the Church of England was a true branch of the Catholic Church whose doctrines were opposed to the teachings of the Church of Rome on the one hand and the thought of Geneva on the other. There was no mistaking this challenge to the Puritan theologians. Mountague traced the Church from the fall of Adam, through the prophets and patriarchs, through the early Church of Rome and finally to the Church of England. He

1. R. Mountague, Acts and Monuments of the Church, pp. 18, 19.

asserted in strong terms that the Church of Rome was a true Church though corrupt. At the same time he attacked the Calvinism of the Puritans. He rejected the Puritan understanding of irresistible grace though he wrongly attributed the doctrine to Calvin. The doctrine of irresistible grace is not really Calvinist but Augustinian and Thomist. "I never yet read in Antiquity of any prime, previous determining Decree, by which men were IRRESPECTFULLY denied grace, excluded glory, or enforced to salvation; as they must be that cannot perish if they would, nor can be saved though mostly they desire." ¹ This was the core of Mountague's objections. He interpreted the Calvinists to mean that the eternal decree of God regarding predestination had nothing to do with the person of man. On the other hand Mountague insisted that Judas was damned because of his sin and not because he had been decreed to damnation. Mountague rightly held that first there is a predestination by God unto life. ²

In seeking to rectify the extreme Calvinism of the Puritans that seemed to ignore the person of man in predestination and reprobation, Mountague stressed that God had regard for man's faith, obedience and repentance. ³ Mountague did not say because of man's faith. He sought to show that somehow man was involved in the drama of salvation. He denied the charge that he was one with the Arminians and Pelagians who made justification depend on free-will: "we teach, that the Will doth not cooperate in the first point with grace, but in

1. R. Mountague, Appello Caesarem, A Just Appeal From Two Unjust Informers (London: Mather Lowes, 1625), p. 68.

2. Ibid., p. 51.

3. Ibid., p. 58.

progress of our Justification." ¹ Such a statement bristled with provocation and the Calvinists were up in arms.

Bishop Carleton, one of the Bishops who had been at Dort, severely criticized the 'Author of The Appeal'. He pointed out that Mountague's interpretation of predestination was not that of Calvin. ² Carleton also realized that what had happened in the history of this particular doctrine was that extremes had ruled; some had gone too far to the left while others, in their zeal to correct the extreme, had gone too far to the right. ³ He saw the weakness of those Calvinists who spoke of predestination only in relation to the eternal decrees of God without relating it to election in Jesus Christ. He, like Calvin, stressed the Pauline conception of predestination and election in Christ. ⁴ This was the much needed corrective. One has to say, as Carleton did, that predestination is only by the will of God but it must be consciously and directly related to the incarnation for the will of God is Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh. Unless predestination is worked out Christologically it tends to exclude the person of man and there was something of this in Carleton's thought. This was most noticeable when he interpreted Paul on Romans concerning this point. ⁵ He maintained, and rightly, that there was absolutely

1. Ibid., p. 84.

2. G. Carleton, An Examination of Those Things Wherein the Author of the Late Appeal Holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and the Arminians, to be the Doctrines of the Church of England (London: William Turner, 1626), p. 14.

3. Ibid., p. 15.

4. Ibid., See also Eph. 1:4,5,11. See also Calvin, Inst., op.cit.,3:22:1

5. Carleton, op. cit., p. 18.

nothing in man which deserved the grace of God. He pointed out to Mountague that faith, obedience and repentance were the effects of a man's calling and not the cause of it.¹ The primary form of election is in God Himself. This of course must always be maintained. But when Carleton spoke of predestination and reprobation one does get the distinct impression that he limited salvation in Christ or even the possibility of it to the certain few who had so been decreed from eternity, almost as if Christ was never really offered to all men. A more thorough understanding of the incarnation was necessary in many of the Calvinists if the concept of the eternal decrees of God was not to be divorced from the revelation of Jesus Christ. It was Mountague who saw this tendency in the Calvinists and he pointed out 'that all mankind have interest in Christ, more or less.'² Carleton, on the other hand, tended to keep the same stress on the will of God in both predestination and reprobation. The predestined are taken out of the corrupted state of mankind but

the rest are left in their sinnes; and in the end justly condemned for sin. But why some are left in their sinnes, others delivered from their sinnes by Predestination, Vocation, Justification, of this no cause can bee given, but the will of God. —3

Though Carleton did acknowledge that the reprobate was damned for his sin he did not vitally relate the will of God in the concern of predestination to the incarnation and the ~~understandable~~ though unfortunate impression that he left with the anti-Calvinists was that the reprobate is never really confronted with the will of God in the

1. Loc., cit.

2. Mountague, Acts and Monuments of the Church, op. cit., p. 71.

3. Carleton, op. cit., p. 18.

incarnate Christ.

It is apparent, however, that Carleton was desperately trying to avoid any surrender whatsoever to the tenets of Pelagianism or Arminianism of which he accused Mountague. Nor did he succumb to them. But finally he was not able to hold the tension in affirming that predestination was the will of God while at the same time expressing the other truth, or rather the same truth, that in Jesus Christ salvation is offered to all men. The reason that Carleton and others were unable to do this was partly the presence of the Arminian danger which allowed them to go only up to a point in articulating their doctrine. Carleton feared that to maintain that God wills the salvation of all men would by necessity violate the sovereignty of God's will, since what God wills must come to pass. He reasoned that since it was all too obvious that all men were not saved, therefore, all men were not called, they were not predestined. He failed to consider seriously that the primary form of God's will is always for life. This is made very clear in the incarnation; Christ comes to redeem the lost; to redeem the whole world which, however, does not necessarily mean a universalism in salvation, rather it stresses the utter mercy of God. The sovereignty of God is not violated in such an understanding for it must be maintained that God is even sovereign over our rejection of His will. The terrible judgment of God falls upon the disobedient, upon him who says no to God's word of life which is the primary form of salvation. But the terrible-ness of the judgment is precisely because God is sovereign over the No of the reprobate. The fact that all men are not saved shows at once the terribleness of man's sin and the absolute sovereignty of God over

sin. On the one hand God wills all men to be saved but he forces none. On the other hand it is God who gives us over to a reprobate mind but he does not create us in order to place us in damnation.

Carleton's concerns were right in his criticisms of Mountague. The latter did not understand Calvin's thought in this matter. But finally Carleton was not able fully to answer Mountague's objection to those Calvinists who made predestination an act which did not totally involve the person of man. The reason for Carleton's failure is evident. Though Carleton saw that predestination had to do with election in Christ he never worked out his understanding Christologically. He continued to define grace almost entirely as the power of God without closely relating it to the person of Christ.¹ That is, he did not relate God's eternal decree to God's eternal word - made flesh. The incarnation and its relation to grace were never really bound together in his thought. This certainly was Carleton's weakness. The grace of God from all eternity never became incarnate and it was precisely because he failed to relate grace to the Word made flesh that his understanding of grace and predestination seemed to exclude the total involvement of man.

Bishop Cosin, who held Calvin in very high respect, was offended by those who preached the doctrine of 'Irrespective Decrees' in such stark nakedness that it vitiated both God and man. Adam and Eve, said Cosin, were not punished in an arbitrary manner, they were pronounced guilty by God because they had sinned against God.²

1. Carleton, op. cit., p. 53, and especially pp. 102 ff.

2. Cosin, Works, op. cit., I, p. 224. See also Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 491.

As he did here at first, so He will be sure to do even after; to be no acceptor or condemner of persons, as they are persons, but as they are persons well or ill disposed, and qualified by well or ill using the grace that He has given them. --1

This statement is indicative of Cosin's position; he sought to show that God's judgment was no arbitrary act but it was an act that involved in its primary form God's grace. The rejection of grace is nothing less than a rejection of God's election in Jesus. The rejection of grace is a rejection of God's Word of life. But God is absolutely sovereign over His grace, His self-giving in Jesus Christ, thus God is also sovereign over man's rejection of grace, sovereign over man's sin. Cosin did not repudiate Calvin's understanding but he chafed under those Calvinists who taught the doctrines of Calvin with more boldness than understanding.

It was Bishop Hall, however, who best understood the relation of the emphasis which Mountague and Carleton were making separately. In restating the Via Media Articles he gave the proper stress to both the election of God in Jesus Christ and man's sin.

Every son of Adam, he insisted, was included in the promise of salvation.² Every living soul is invited to share in Christ's forgiveness of sins.³ This must always be said first of all in a consideration of predestination and too often the Calvinists never said it. This omission led to grave misunderstanding concerning this doctrine. Forgiveness was extended to all men because all men are guilty of sin but those who continue in their sin were guilty of

1. Cosin, Works, op. cit., I, p. 224.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 490.

3. Ibid., p. 492.

damnation and stood upon their own deserts in the state of damnation. Hall placed the stress of man's rejection of God upon man but he saw that even the sin of man was subject to the sovereignty of God. Those who persevere in a true and living faith do so 'by the inoperation of God.'² Here Hall shifted the stress from man and placed it upon God's grace.

Bishop Hall rejected as Pelagianism the concept that God gave faith to those whom He foresaw would receive it by the exercise of their own free wills and so improve the powers of their nature.³ Hall refused to consider salvation as in any way determined by the action of man. He equally repudiated the understanding which held that

faith is so the gift of God, as it is therefore only not given to all, because all will not receive it, for that God calleth all and gives unto all men sufficient helps to believe if they will and goes no further; and therefore that according to the prevision of our free co-working with this sufficient grace his decree determines of us, is but somewhat better than Pelagian. --4

Again Hall rejected this emphasis on the part of man in the act of salvation. The stress had to be placed on the act of God and that is precisely where Bishop Hall placed it.

To hold that grace is so the gift of God, as that He doth not only give common and sufficient helps to men whereby they are made able to believe if they will, but so works in them by his grace that they do by the power thereof actually believe and conceive the true faith in their soul - this is fair and orthodox. --5

-
1. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 496.
 2. Loc., cit.
 3. Ibid., p. 502. See also Calvin, Inst., op. cit., 3:22:1, 2.
 4. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 502.
 5. Loc. cit.

There can be no doubt whatsoever where Hall stood in the Arminian controversy; he stood in the continuity of the reformation.

Joseph Hall made it clear that Calvin thought of the elect as those chosen in respect to Christ and faith in Him. This is extremely important to note for it was on this issue that so much misunderstanding arose concerning predestination, both with the Calvinists and those who opposed them. But Hall understood Calvin clearly on this point and as part of the Via Media Articles they represent the reformed thought of the Church of England. Election had to do with those in Christ for God wills and says all through ¹ Him.

Bishop Beveridge conveyed the same thought. The grace of God and the person and work of Christ could not be separated.

I say, the grace of God doth not so bring salvation as to exclude the satisfaction of Christ for our sins, and not so as if our salvation was to be ascribed wholly and solely to the free grace and mercy of God, without any respect at all to the death and sufferings of Christ. --2

The safeguard that Beveridge sought to introduce was to show that the free grace of God is incarnate in Christ and that grace includes the whole Christ-event. The infinite grace of God is in Jesus Christ and thus our salvation is still ultimately resolved into God's grace. ³

The wiser counsel of Hall did not prevail in the controversy which marked the first years of our period. Andrewes took no active part in this controversy and he was to live only another year. The

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, pp. 504, 505.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 229.

3. Ibid., pp. 231, 233, 264.

controversy passed into the hands of more extreme men on the Puritan side as well as with the bishops.

The situation between the Puritans and the Established Church had greatly deteriorated when Parliament sought to impeach Mountague. The political and theological lines were deeply interwoven by 1625. From the beginning of James I's reign the King and the bishops were arrayed together and when the Puritans found that they could make no headway with the crown they turned to Parliament. This proved to be a very important move in the history of the Puritan struggle. James had alienated a large part of the nation by his policies and his successor heightened the tension by making the ties between the Church and state even more binding. When Laud was made primate the Church became identified with a monarchical system that was ^{Laud's} completely out of sympathy with the feelings of the people.

The doctrinal and political Puritans became united in a common cause; the reformation of things civil and ecclesiastical. It was a curious development in some ways for it showed the tendency, even in reaction, to unite Church and state. The two strands of Puritanism, political and theological, were not always kept clearly defined. It was evident in the trial of Laud that the theological charges of Romanism could not be sustained but they were pressed with the political arm of Parliament. The Puritans fell victim to the very charges that they criticized in Laud; they used the power of the civil arm to enforce religious issues even as Laud had used royal prerogatives in carrying out his plans for religious conformity.

The Puritans greatly feared a return to Rome on the part of some of the bishops. Charles I had married a French princess who ^{had} embraced the Roman faith. The articles of the marriage favoured the

King's Roman subjects. They heard Churchmen like Manwaring preaching the King's prerogatives in an outlandish fashion. Mountague's books openly acknowledged the Church of Rome to be a true Church to the horror of the Puritans while at the same time they attacked certain tenets of Calvinism which the Puritans espoused. To their great consternation the Puritans saw such men advanced in the Church. They felt the heavy hand of both Church and state seeking to suppress their activities. Laud's extensive use of elaborate liturgical form was partly a reaction to the Puritan barrenness in worship but here as in most things Laud showed lack of discretion and adequate theological understanding of the use of forms. The Puritans were very uneasy in the early years of Charles I's reign.

The policies which Laud enforced did not originate with him. He was not an original thinker, politically or theologically. The union of the Church and state was indigenous to the English Reformation but in this union Laud raised the claims of both Church and state to dizzy heights. Bishop Andrewes had a high concept of kingship; the king was the anointed one of the Lord, but Andrewes did not set the king above the laws of the realm. Laud tended to ascribe arbitrary powers to the prerogatives of the king and he used these powers to enforce his plans for conformity. Again, Andrewes held a very high doctrine of the ministry but nowhere did he make such absolute claims for the episcopacy as Laud.

Bishop Andrewes, we know, placed the communion table otherwise and the eucharist was very central in his thinking. His sermons continually pointed to the participation of the Word made flesh.

1. See especially his sermons on the Nativity, Works, op. cit., III.

This movement in the service of worship was thought out theologically by Andrewes and it was backed by a sensitive spirit. Laud had neither the astuteness of mind nor the sensitivity of Andrewes' spirit.

In rejecting the formalized structure of worship in the Roman Church the Puritans placed greater emphasis on the inward acts of worship. Though recognizing the validity of both these expressions Laud was more concerned with the latter. This was his reasoning:

It is true, the inward worship of the heart is the great service to God, and no service acceptable without it; but the external worship of God in His Church is the great witness to the world, that our heart stands right in the service of God. --1

His concerns were certainly right on this point. He sought to justify his insistence on uniformity of worship by claiming that worship was an act which pointed men who were outside the Church to God.² Laud was also greatly concerned with the decency of public worship. He persuaded Charles to enter the royal chapel at the beginning of the service and there was to be no interruption in the service if the king came in late. It had been the custom to begin the sermon when James I entered the chapel. Laud maintained that external actions were necessary and hence forms were needed to give direction and uniformity to worship. These thoughts, he said, informed his actions in the demand for conformity

and no other, which have made me labour so much as I have done for decency and an orderly settlement of the external worship of God in the Church; for of that which is inward there can be no witness among men, nor no example for men. --3

He criticized those in the Reformed Churches who rejected the use of

-
1. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, preface XVI.
 2. Loc., cit.
 3. Loc., cit.

forms simply because Rome had abused them by her superstition.

Laud's position here can be substantiated. Too often the Puritans rejected the service of the Church of England for negative reasons rather than proceeding from a well formed theological understanding. Laud, however, must come under his own criticism also because his use of forms were not always governed by a theological foundation. His bifurcation of the word and sacrament shows this to be true. We shall deal with this fully in a later chapter. The tendency on the part of some of the Caroline bishops to place a greater emphasis on the eucharist than on the preaching of the word came not through Andrewes but Laud.

Notwithstanding the Puritan cries of popery at Laud and the High Churchmen there was never any deliberate attempt on the part of the Carolines to make the pilgrimage over to Rome. In fact their writings, including Laud's, reveal an intense struggle with Rome throughout. Their action also bear this out. If there had been any desire to return to Rome there were ample opportunities in the reigns of Charles II and James II but history records precisely the opposite. Laud refused the cardinal's cap from Rome and his controversy with Fisher the Jesuit shows Laud's position in this matter. It must be admitted, however, that there were some tendencies in Laud that made many Protestants uneasy.

In conjunction with Laud's absolutizing of the king's power was his insistence of an equally absolute claim for episcopacy. These two went together in Laud's mind. But this did not mean that there was a rigidity of doctrine enforced in the Church by Laud. On the contrary, there is an abundance of evidence in the writings of the

Carolines to show that there was no move on the part of Laud or his followers toward theological exclusiveness. Even in Bishop Hall's works there is a marked difference from Laud's thought on the vital subject of episcopacy. And this notwithstanding the fact that Laud was most influential on Hall in this matter. Jeremy Taylor, selected for preferment by Laud, showed he agreed in very little with Laud. Nor could Pearson, Beveridge or Andrewes be put in the same category with Laud and Taylor. "The High Church party never exhibited intolerance of theological differences in the Establishment, or showed an inclination to regiment the clergy into acceptance of a particular doctrinal system."¹

It is clear that Laud was determined to have 'one' national Church under 'one' king with 'one' form of Church government with 'one' unified form of liturgy. His insistence that those Reformed Churches which had sought refuge from persecution on the Continent be incorporated into the Establishment exhibits the same tendency of mind. The unfortunate incident of forcing a liturgy on the Scots is yet another example of the mania that Laud had for conformity. Had such conformity been reached by theological discussion and prayer Laud's desire would have been more commendable.

The grand idea of a comprehensive national Church as elaborated by Laud did not come into being at the restoration. In fact, the Savoy Conference and its results must be viewed not as the ultimate success of the Laudian movement, as MacColl claimed,² but rather as

1. R. S. Bosher, The Making of the Restoration Settlement (London: Dacre Press, 1951), p. 271.

2. MacColl, op. cit., p. 120.

an acknowledgement of its defeat. The last great opportunity of restoring the wholeness to the Church of England failed at the Savoy Conference. It was a loss to be greatly regretted. The real effect on the structure of the Church, by Laud and his followers, may be measured by their effect on the Prayer Book. Boshier points out that in the whole of the Prayer Book, as finally revised, the Laudian influence is barely apparent.

The failure of the Savoy Conference was followed by another one when the alliance between the king and bishops was broken in 1689. It refuted the axiom of James I 'No bishop no king.' While a Christian prince of the Protestant Catholic Faith sat on the throne the bishops pressed for a high doctrine of kingship and upheld the royal prerogatives but when the king was a suspected member of the Roman Church the bishops hesitated and when in the person of James II an open affirmation of the crown's allegiance to the Church of Rome was made the grand alliance was broken. "The Church, like the Commons, came at last to remember that her liberties might be endangered not only by a Papal but a Royal tyrant." The king 'de jure' was rejected but the bishop stayed. The Non-Jurors, those bishops who felt they could not give their allegiance to the king 'de facto' showed the danger of absolutizing non-absolute forms. Their departure must be regretted. The Church again was divided on non-theological issues.

The exclusive claims that were made for episcopacy must always

1. H. H. Henson, Studies in the Religion in the Seventeenth Century, op. cit., pp. 246, 33, 34.

2. Boshier, op. cit., p. 246.

3. Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 174.

be seen in the light of the Puritan controversy. There is no evidence whatsoever that the Reformers retained episcopacy because it was necessary to the constitution of the Church.¹ The Reformers never made the validity of the sacraments dependent on episcopal ordination.² At first all that was contended was that episcopacy was permissible and not against Scripture; that it was ancient and allowable. Jewel chided Rome for putting her faith in an external succession. "It is not sufficient to claim succession of place: it behoveth us rather to have regard to the succession of doctrine."³ It is interesting to read what Laud had to say in this matter. In his controversy with Fisher, Laud rejected the Roman claim of a personal, uninterrupted succession in a particular Church, Roman or otherwise, nor could Rome prove that such a succession was necessary in any one particular place.⁴ For a visible, continued succession as conceived by Rome Laud had this to say:

It is a great happiness where it may be had 'visible' and 'continued', and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the ancient Fathers, that makes 'local, personal, visible' and 'continued succession' a 'necessary sign', or 'work' of the 'true Church' in any one place. —5

Bishop Cosin, during his long years of exile on the Continent, was in full communion with the French Reformed Church and he was not slow in recommending the same procedure to others.⁶ Cosin did not maintain

1. Hunt, op. cit., I, p. 14.

2. G. W. Bromiley, Thomas Cranmer, Theological (London: Lutterworth Press, 1956), pp. 49-52.

3. Jewel, Works, op. cit., Fourth Portion, p. 349.

4. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, p. 421.

5. Ibid., p. 422.

6. Cosin, Works, op. cit., IV, pp. 401 ff.

that without episcopal ordination there could be no sacramental
1
grace. Jewel did not venture to urge the exclusive claims of
episcopacy or relate it to the validity of the sacrament. 2
Neither
did Hooker assert that episcopacy was indispensable to a Church, or
3
that without it there could be no sacramental grace.

This is not to say that the question of the ministry was not
an issue with the Carolines. It was and we shall examine this ques-
tion in its relation to their doctrine of grace. A few things should
be kept before us at this stage, however. As the claims for episco-
pacy were pressed to their extremes, we find the ordination of the
non-episcopal ministers being brought into question and the validity
of their sacramental ministrations doubted. But here a distinction
must ever be kept in mind. Even when the Carolines spoke of non-
episcopal ministers they were almost always consistent in making a
distinction between the Puritans who separated from the Church of
England and the other Reformed Churches. They usually confessed that
a problem did exist with the non-episcopal ministers but their open
repudiation was reserved for the former.

The reason for this distinction was quite obvious. The Re-
formed Church⁴⁵ on the Continent and the Church of England had separ-
ated from the corruptions of Rome; it was a just separation. But the
Carolines maintained that the Puritans had separated themselves from
a Church already reformed and therefore the separation was unjust.

1. Ibid., p. 408

2. Perry, op. cit., I, p. 19.

3. Ibid., pp. 19, 20.

Bishop Hall was very critical of those Puritans who separated from the Church on non-essential, non-theological issues.

Alas my brethren, while we do fully agree in all these, and all other doctrinal and practical points of religion, why will ye be so uncharitable as by these frivolous and causeless divisions to rend the seamless coat of Christ? Is it a title, or retinue, or a ceremony, a garment, or a colour, or an organ-pipe, that can make a different Church, while we preach and profess the same truth? --1

The need for the Puritans and the bishops to carry on a conversation was unfortunately not forthcoming.

It must be kept in mind also that the exclusive claims for the ministry were not all made by the Churchmen. It was in fact the Puritans who first brought into question the lawfulness of episcopacy. Calvin never exalted the discipline to the importance of a mark of the Church in the same way that the word and sacraments were marks of the Church. Again it was Bishop Hall who pointed this out to the Puritans.

I blush to see so wilful a slander fall from the pen of a Christian, that all reformed churches renounce our prelacy as antichristian; what one has done it? Yea, what one foreign divine of note hath not given to our clergy the right hand of fellowship? --2

He named Bucer, Martyr, Calvin, Beza and Bullinger as substantial proof that the Puritan charge was false. Bishop Bramhall was of the same opinion as Joseph Hall. Hall showed that he understood that the method of the Continental Reformation had to be different from that in England because the Continental Reformers were forced outside the structure of the Roman Church by the superstitious and unsympathetic papal tyranny. We have already noted something of this in our intro-

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, pp. 295, 292.

2. Ibid., p. 61

3. Ibid.

4. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., III, p. 243

5. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 156.

duction.

The controversial nature of the Caroline period determines the framework in which we seek to understand the doctrine of grace in the Caroline Divines. The Arminian controversy, with its Socinian accompaniment raised those issues which make it vitally important for us to consider the meaning of grace in relation to the Trinity without which doctrine we can have no adequate understanding of the nature of grace. The whole meaning of grace and its relation to the atonement was also involved and so we must likewise consider this aspect. The meaning of grace itself raised the question of sin, as it always must, for it can only be understood in the light of grace. The doctrine of sin is again important for our consideration of Caroline thought. The continued controversy with Rome primarily over the issue of transubstantiation and the aspect of sacrifice makes it imperative for us to concern ourselves with the sacraments. The sacraments could not possibly be left out of our consideration of the Caroline doctrine of grace. The Puritan controversy forced the issue of the nature of the Church and its ministry continually into the foreground. These, therefore, must be our main concerns.

In their writings the Carolines continually referred to the trilogy of Scripture, Fathers and Reason. In keeping with the other Reformed Churches they took their stand against Rome on the Scriptures as the faithful witness to the Word of God. Laud was assured that salvation could be had in the Church of England because she was true to the Scriptures and the voice of the primitive Church.

And sure I had reason of this confidence; for to believe the Scripture and the Creeds, to believe these in the sense of the ancient primitive Church, to receive the four great General

Councils so much magnified by antiquity, to believe all points of doctrine, generally received as fundamental in the Church of Christ, is a faith in which to live and die cannot but give salvation. --1

The extreme Puritans tended to make the interpretation of Scripture an individualistic one. Laud referred to this particular phase of the Puritan struggle in his Epistle Dedicatory of his dispute with Fisher.

And while the one faction cries up the Church above the Scripture and the other the Scripture to the neglect and contempt of the Church, which the Scripture itself teaches men both to honour and obey; they have so far endangered the belief of the one and the authority of the other, as that neither hath its due from a great part of men; whereas, according to Christ's institution, the Scripture, where it is plain should guide the Church; and the Church, where there is doubt or difficulty, should expound the Scripture; yet so, as that upon just and farther evidence she may not revise that which in any case hath slipped by her. --2

It was all too obvious that the Church no longer spoke with one voice but the Carolines looked to the time when she did. In the unity of the early Church the Carolines saw the pure Church which had as yet not been overlaid by the corruptions of the later ages. The English Reformers had shown great reverence for the Church Fathers. "They be interpreters of the word of God", said Jewel.³ But he warned; "Yet may they not be compared with the word of God. We may not build upon them: we may not put our trust in them. Our trust is in the name of the Lord."⁴ The Puritan sects tended to disregard all tradition, including the early Fathers. The Carolines, pressed by the Romans on one side and the Puritans on the other were inclined to interpret

-
1. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, Preface.
 2. Ibid., Preface XV, also p. 117. See also his reference to Irenaeus and his concept of Church and doctrine, p. 205.
 3. Jewel, Works, op. cit., Fourth Portion, p. 1173.
 4. Loc. cit.

Scriptures through the Fathers rather than with their help. Jewel's sound advise^c was not heeded as carefully as it might have been and a subtle criterion was introduced by which Scripture became secondary in the matter of interpretation. This produced drastic results in the Church of England. By the latter half of the seventeenth century a static concept of Scripture was prevalent in the Church. The bishops of the later Caroline period were content to pile quotation upon quotation from the Fathers without engaging in a restless struggle with Scripture. When the tension between the Scriptures and the Fathers was so resolved the emphasis was shifted to reason as the criterion for interpretation.

With some exceptions the Carolines did not mean natural reason when they appealed to reason. The concept of reason in their trilogy was the reason of faith, or as Bishop Cosin said, reason that had been baptized. To the natural man the truth of God would be unreasonable, "though it would not be so with us, who are already baptized, instructed,¹ and believe the Scriptures to be the revealed word of God." The man who is regenerate by grace "hath also a new faculty and a new light of reason given him, whereby he believeth the mysteries of religion out of another reason than as a mere natural man he believed natural and moral things before."² The mystery of the faith is to be found and heard only in the schools of the Prophets and Apostles, said Cosin. He limited this to Holy Scripture and "therefore the masters of natural reason, that had served their apprenticeship only in the philosophical

1. Cosin, Works, op. cit., I, p. 285.

2. Ibid., p. 287.

schools, and walked no further for their sanctuary than to Aristotle's gallery, can never be brought to apprehend it."¹ Cosin's statement represented a repudiation of the rationalistic spirit which became predominant in seventeenth century theological thought and deeply penetrated the later Carolines. Cosin was always careful to add that the mysteries of faith, while above the grasp of natural reason was not contrary to reason.² Archbishop Laud was of the same opinion as Cosin in this matter: the reason is illuminated by grace and "when it hath made reason submit itself, clears the eye of reason, it never puts it out."³

The rationalistic tendency of the age did make its appearance in Caroline theology unfortunately and by the end of the seventeenth century the theology of the Church of England was almost completely dominated by the rationalistic spirit of the age. The great Trinitarian controversy of that period clearly shows the effects of rationalistic thought by those who defended and those who opposed the Trinitarian concept. Both sides had accepted the rationalistic premise.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor stood firmly in the rationalistic spirit of the period. For reasons that we shall examine later, Taylor was inclined to retain the free-will of man after the fall. This is basic to the rationalistic understanding. However, Taylor had certain qualifications to make at this point. He never attributed to the reason of natural man the capability of discerning the things of the Spirit.

1. Cosin, Works, op. cit., I, p. 309.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 87, 88, 89, 280.

These things he said are taught and perceived by the aids of God's Spirit, that is, reason is aided by revelation and grace.¹ In Taylor's thought grace was something added to nature rather than a rebirth that involved nature. Taylor's thought at this point stood in the continuity of Roman Medieval thought formulated with Aristotelian concepts. Taylor vacillated in his position regarding the capabilities of natural reason regarding the mysteries of the faith. He maintained that only reason that had been illuminated could discern the things of God.² Natural reason of itself could not inform us of the will of God until God Himself had declared that will.³ However, in order to assert man's responsibility Taylor believed that no man could pretend ignorance of the will of God because he had enough reason⁴ put into his heart by which the will of God could be read. This latter statement is most indicative of Taylor's position and shows clearly a break with Cosin's thought and an affinity with the spirit of rationalism.

Though Bishop Thorndike disagreed with Taylor on many issues we find their thought on this matter rather similar. His position is not much more than this: reason is aided in its understanding. Without the use of reason, said Thorndike, the evidence of Christianity is not made "though not by that which the light of nature discovereth, yet by those helps which reason employeth."⁵ Probably Thorndike,

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XI, pp. 459, 460.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XI, p. 460.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIII, p. 91.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIV, p. 364.

5. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., II, pt. 1, p. 18.

more than the rest of the Carolines, leaned most heavily on the authority of demonstrable rational proof: "And he that alleges God's Spirit, for what we cannot shew sufficient reason to believe otherwise, may thank himself, if he perish by believing that, which he cannot oblige another man to believe."¹ We can see Thorndike reacting strongly against those Puritan sects which claimed a knowledge of truth dependent only on the Spirit apart from the voice of tradition and often Scripture itself. Thorndike used the arguments of the Fathers and Scripture as the outward proofs of the Christian Faith. Unconsciously rational grounds for believe were introduced. "Therefore neither the truth of Christianity, nor the Scripture is admitted upon the dictates of God's Spirit, but supposing the reasons which convict us that they are to be believed."² The rational grounds for belief in Thorndike were not attributed to the individual reason but to the Church. It is the Church which gave the reason why the truth of Christianity and Scripture is to be accepted. Thorndike's division between 'the dictate of God's Spirit' and the authority of the Church was an unfortunate one since it is the same Spirit who bears witness of the Truth of God in Jesus Christ to the Church. But Thorndike felt that the emphasis had to be placed on the authority of the Church in order to counteract the Puritan claims. He interpreted Augustine in the light of his own understanding declaring that only those whom the Church has commissioned had the authority to move men to believe the gospel.³ It is the Church alone which teaches the

1. Ibid., p. 17.

2. Ibid., p. 40.

3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., II, pt. 1, pp. 52, 53.

¹
faith, but in this particular question it was the Established Church which alone had the authority.

Thorndike's interpretation of authority subtly removed the judgment of Scripture upon the Church so that the creative tension of the Church ever struggling with the faithful witness of Holy Scripture was resolved. As a result of this tendency a continual fresh apprehension of the gospel was lost. Scripture of course was still quoted in abundance and documented the works of many of the Carolines such as Thorndike but the creative conversation with Scripture and the Fathers degenerated into a monologue. The Church of England was far too concerned with preserving its life in the struggle of the seventeenth century and was in great danger of losing it.

The Carolines relived the early centuries of the Church. They saw the Church of England as a replica of primitive purism; standing as the guardian of the faith against the assaults of schism and heresy. For the Carolines the Church of England was the staunch advocate of unity amid division; the Romans and the Puritans were the enemies who were trying to destroy the true faith.² "Did the primitive Christians suffer martyrdom from Rome?" asked Bishop Beveridge,

So did our first Reformers. Hath the Catholic Church been all along pestered with heretics and schismatics? So hath ours. Have they endeavoured in all ages to undermine, and so to overthrow her? In this also ours is but too much like unto her. --3

A careful and sympathetic consideration of the struggle in which the Church was engaged explains much of the misunderstanding of

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., II, Pt. II, p. 900.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 416.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 126.

this period and is undoubtedly a factor which will open the doors wider between the different communions that conversation for unity might again take place.

CHAPTER IV

THE MOVEMENT OF GRACE: THE TRINITY AND THE INCARNATION

In attempting to understand the doctrine of grace in Caroline thought we are involved in relating the meaning of grace Christologically. The New Testament is consistent in this relation. In tracing the movement of our salvation from God to man and from man to God in the person of Christ we are able to discern the movement of grace.

John Biddle, like Socinius revived the Arian heresy which brought into question the person of Jesus Christ in His relation to God the Father. They both maintained that Jesus Christ was the Son of God but they inverted the whole movement of the incarnation and thus destroyed its essential meaning. In their thinking the Word did not so much become flesh, rather the flesh became the Word. It was through the humanity of Jesus Christ that He became the Son. Essential to the biblical understanding of grace is the confession that Jesus Christ is the incarnate God and no lesser being.

The Carolines were continually answering those heretical opinions which arose in alarming numbers during the seventeenth century. "In the first stage of the Trinitarian controversy, John Biddle and his Socinian retainers more than met their match in the famous expositor of the creed." ¹ Bishop Pearson's 'Exposition of the Creed'

1. Watkin-Jones, op. cit., p. 134.

was one of the finest expositions and represents the most systematic treatise of the Caroline period. The Caroline Churchmen were conscious that the orthodox faith was being challenged and had to be defended.

If men be allowed a latitude of opinion in some unnecessary verities, it may not be endured, that in matters of religion every man should think what he lists, and utter what he thinks, and defend what he utters and publish what he defends, and gather disciples to what he publisheth. This liberty, or licentiousness rather would be the bane of any church. --1

Bishop Hall often compared the Puritan sects and the Church of Rome. "The Romanists are all for blind obedience; the Romanists therefore go away with peace without truth; ours, under pretence of striving for some truth, abandon peace."² In order to combat the heretical thought Hall advocated that the Church catechise its people; "when the souls of the Christian people are so hard laid at, not only Popery, Anabaptism, Antinomianism, Pelagianism, but the confounding and hellish heresies of Socinianism, Antitrinitarianism, Ne-arianism;" which not only threaten the peace of the Church but threaten the complete destruction of Christianity.³ It is difficult for us to understand the fear that such heretical opinions had for the Carolines unless we can capture something of the horror that Socinianism had for the seventeenth century orthodox Christian. The Carolines sought to combat this movement of heretical opinion in its incipient forms.

The doctrine of the Trinity not only involves the doctrine of grace but is absolutely essential to it. The Trinity is the source

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 612.

2. Ibid., p. 622.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 653.

and essence of grace.

Against those heresies which threatened the biblical understanding of the Trinity the Carolines articulated their doctrine in much thoroughness though they fully realized that the mystery of the Trinity could never be exhausted. They sought to put into words the mystery of the Trinity, "But it would be the height of impudence and presumption, to offer at explaining the incomprehensible mystery of the most glorious Trinity; how Three distinct Persons subsist in the same individual nature, so as to be all one and the same God."¹ The Trinity is antecedent to a doctrine of the incarnation.

Bishop Bull, a contemporary of Beveridge, rightly pointed out that the great difficulty which prevents people from properly understanding the doctrine of the Trinity arises chiefly from the mistake of trying to measure the divine nature with a human ^{standard} measurement.² The Trinity is precisely that which can have no adequate human analogy or counterpart. All antitrinitarian concepts fail to understand this. Bull elaborated his thought on this matter.

For in truth, as concerning the specific unity of Persons in the blessed Trinity, such as is the union of substances, or persons amongst things created, (for instance, of three men, Peter, Paul, and John, which are distinct from one another, and do not any way depend upon each other as to their essence,) this the Fathers of the first ages never dreamed of. They acknowledged a very different union of the Divine Persons, such as that there is no pattern of it, no likeness whereby to illustrate it to be found in the whole creation. --3

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 210.
 2. Bull, English Theological Works, p. 374.
 3. Bull, op. cit., p. 413.

Bishop Pearson used the same language with regard to the consubstantial unity of the Father and the Son.¹ What these men asserted was that God the Son was God and no lesser being than God. This was true also for the Caroline tradition.

If there can be no human analogy, no counterpart in all creation of the Trinity, any understanding that we can have of the Trinity involves revelation. Revelation speaks of Trinity in unity together. So Beveridge understood it:

Which Trinity if rightly understood would give us great light into what we ought to believe concerning each Person; and how we ought to receive our faith upon all and every one of Them, according to the discoveries which They are pleased to make of Themselves. --2

Beveridge acknowledged that the bible witnessed to the Triune God revealing Himself in the creation drama. He considered it significant that the Hebrew word אֱלֹהִים appears in the plural but is joined to a singular verb.³ This was important for Beveridge's consideration of the doctrine of the Trinity for

in the Hebrew, where there is likewise a dual, three is the first plural number; ...on purpose to put us in mind of the Trinity in unity, that He is Three in One, and that every one of these Divine Persons is to be adored and worshipped alike. --4

However, the real importance for Beveridge was not the claim that this was a proof text but rather that the incarnate God, Jesus Christ, is the same God who created the heavens and the earth. There was Divine continuity. The distinction in the unity was acknowledged by Beveridge

-
1. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 244, 250.
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 211.
 3. Ibid., p. 212.
 4. Loc. cit.

but in the unity the emphasis was of God; God the Father, God the Son and God the holy Spirit. Thus in their understanding of the incarnation, so important to their thought, the Carolines confessed Jesus Christ to be the Incarnate God.

Bishop Pearson was of a similar mind and he gave expression to this in his 'Exposition of the Creed.' He was most concerned to show that there is Trinity in unity and unity in Trinity. At considerable length he expounded the unity in Trinity and the opposition to any rationalistic understanding can be felt at every point in his discussion. Pearson insisted that no one person in the Trinity could be thought of as greatest. The Father cannot be so conceived that He is thought of as first in the Trinity in opposition to the Son nor is He first in the Trinity in the sense that he comprehends the whole Trinity.¹ There is distinction of persons but no separation; there is unity but not in the sense that distinction ceases.

Bishop Beveridge was very concise on this point also. He emphasized the unity and distinction within the Trinity by maintaining

that God the Father should be One perfect God of Himself, God the Son One perfect God of Himself, God the Holy Ghost One perfect God of Himself", but in such a way "so that One should be perfectly Three, and Three perfectly One, that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, should be Three, and yet One; but One and yet Three. --2

When Beveridge thus referred to the Son and the Holy Spirit as being 'God of Himself' he was stressing the fact that we could attribute to each person the name and essence of God: God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost.

Having emphasized the unity in Trinity Pearson proceeded to

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 212.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 164.

show the distinction involved with the Trinity. Here we begin to sense the movement within the Trinity in his thought. The Father's identity is unique to Himself as Father never having been a Son.¹ So also, the Son's identity is unique to Himself, never becoming Father in reference to the same kind of generation.² Within the distinction Pearson stressed the consubstantial unity of the Father and the Son.³ The priority of the Father does not consist in this; "that the essence or attributes of one are greater than the essence or attributes of the other," but in this; "that the Father hath that essence of himself, the Son by communication from the Father."⁴ The Son is God of God the Father. The whole Self of God is given in this eternal relation. The mode and being in the Trinity reveals the unity and the distinction of the persons three. The essential nature and the movement of grace lies within the Trinity in the eternal relation of the Father and the Son in the unity of the Holy Spirit.

Beveridge was also careful to note the complete self-giving of the Father in the eternal, equal relation; "That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, these three are one Being, one Jehovah, one God: that the Father is of Himself, the Son of the Father, the Holy Ghost of the Father and the Son," but this relation is always co-eternal and co-equal.⁵ This is the movement of the Trinity; the Son from the Father by the Holy Spirit. Bishop Andrewes saw this movement within the Trinity as

-
1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 58.
 2. Loc. cit.
 3. Loc. cit.
 4. Pearson, op. cit., p. 59.
 5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 210.

one from God to God; "So the Son of God, and the Spirit of God, do
1
from God: God of God either."

If the movement within the Trinity is from God to God then there is involved the complete self-giving of God in the eternal relation. Then the act of God in creation and recreation is God Himself and no lesser being than the eternal God. This is precisely what Beveridge stressed in his understanding of the unity in Trinity.

For that 'One' and the 'same God' made, redeemed, and sanctified us: for whatsoever is said in the Holy Scriptures to be done by any of these Divine Persons, the same, in other places, is said to be done by God. But there is only 'One' living and true God; and therefore, although we must believe in each Person distinctly, contemplate upon what He hath done, and upon occasion, address ourselves to Him as such, yet we must still keep close to the Unity of the Divine Essence or substance, which, if it were divided or divisible, would not be divine. --2

This was Beveridge's constant emphasis, to show us that it is the One God who always acts. If the action or person of one in the Trinity is at all less than the others, if there is subordination in terms of the essence of God, then that particular act by that particular person would be less than the act of the One Eternal God. But Beveridge could never think in such terms. The action of Christ or the Holy Spirit is in fact the action of the One Almighty and Eternal God and no lesser being "who whether He acts as Father, Son, or Holy Spirit,
3
it is still one and the same God that doth it." This concept of the Trinity permeated his understanding of grace. That is why Beveridge affirmed that the grace of Jesus Christ was the grace of the most
4
High God made man. This is the primary understanding of the nature

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 191. See also Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 284.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 434.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 436.

4. Ibid., p. 224.

of grace. Andrewes, who stood at the beginning of the Caroline Divines had been of the same persuasion as Beveridge's thought indicated above. It was this understanding of the Trinity which informed his comment, that revelation of God in the person of Christ was not the¹ revelation of a part of God but the very nature of God.

Beveridge's sermon on the Pauline Benediction in the name of the Trinity clearly shows how he thought out the relation of grace to the Trinity. He pointed out that the grace of Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost involves completely the One Almighty God. The being and essence of each person in the Trinity cannot be separated one from the other. "They being all one and the same God, in whom all properties also are one and the same property; and therefore cannot be divided, nor belong to one more than another,² as they are in Him." There can be no division made in the essence or God-ness of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit but in the act of revelation, said Beveridge,

when the Almighty Being, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is pleased to operate upon things without Him, and so exert and manifest Himself to us, there is something particular attributed to one of these Divine Persons more than to another. --3

It is most plain that it was not the Father nor the Holy Ghost but God⁴ the Son who became incarnate and took upon Himself the nature of man. Thus in a particular way grace is said to belong to Jesus Christ. Grace has to do with God's redeeming activity which is Jesus Christ.

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 43.
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 219.
 3. Loc. cit., See also Browne, op. cit., pp. 49 ff.
 4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 219.

Therefore grace belongs peculiarly to the Person of Christ since He is the reconciler; He reconciles man to God and God to man; He alone reveals to us the love of God which is the sole motive for our ¹ salvation.

Beveridge noted the importance of the change in the order of the Trinity made by St. Paul in this particular benediction. Paul placed the grace of Jesus Christ first because it is in and through Him that we know the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit. We cannot have either the love of God the Father or the communion of God the Holy Spirit except by the grace of God the Son.² The act of God revealing His love in complete self-giving to sinful man is precisely an act of grace. From the very extensive use of the word, grace, in the New Testament, Beveridge concluded,

that grace is to be had only by Jesus Christ; that His grace is the greatest blessing that can be desired; and that where the grace of Christ is, there is also the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost,

and whenever the grace of Christ is mentioned it is to be understood ~~that they also are present.~~³ that they also are present. The thought in Beveridge's sermon moved to the incarnation where God's redeeming activity, His love and His communion with man are thrust into our historic midst.

At all times Pearson was most concerned to show that the sending of the eternal Son was the highest act of love that God could render. He based his discussion on the consubstantial unity of the Father and the Son.

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 220, 221.

2. Ibid., p. 221.

3. Ibid., p. 222.

If then the sending of Christ into the world were the highest act of love of God which could be expressed; ...then it is absolutely necessary to believe that Christ is so the only-begotten Son of the Father, as to be of the same substance with him, of glory equal, of majesty co-eternal. --1

Pearson saw the extreme importance of the relation of the Father and the eternal Son in specific reference to the drama of salvation. The nearer the relation of the Son to the Father the greater is the love shown to us for whose sakes He was sent. Pearson left no doubt as to the nearness of this relation. The sending of the eternal Son by the Father is the self-giving of God; God coming to man and no lesser being. The love of God in Jesus Christ is the complete self-giving of God. This is the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the writings of the Carolines there is a continual refutation of any form of Socinianism. Bishop Bull recognized that the Unitarian doctrine of Christ acknowledged Him to be God "but a made God, such as is a mere creature, such as had no existence before His² birth of the Virgin." Any such concept of Christ means that grace also originated in time and is not the gift of God the Son from God the Father. There can be no subordination in terms of God-ness in the Trinity. The Father in giving the Son does not give anything less than Himself as God. The priority of God the Father, as Father, does not imply subordination of the Son, as God. Both Pearson and Bull were of one mind in this matter. Pearson grounded the congruity of the divine mission upon the pre-eminence of God the Father as God of Himself.³

-
1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 255.
 2. Bull, op. cit., p. 421.
 3. Pearson, op. cit., p. 62.

None of the Churchmen who stood in the tradition of Andrewes ever questioned the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity even though they did not always understand the implications that such a doctrine had for the doctrine of grace. Andrewes always was careful to point out that God the Father and God the Son were equally God. Thus relating the Son and the Word rules out the objection that the "Father may have had a being before the Son. For the mind's conceiving and the mind cannot be severed a moment; if one be eternal, both are. So then as the Son He is consubstantial, as the Word He is co-eternal." ¹ The Word that became flesh can be nothing less than the incarnate God, full of grace and truth. The union of the Father and the Son as one God is the very foundation of our religion, said Beveridge, take this away and our redemption falls to the ground. ² The essential meaning of grace is to be seen in the unity of the Father and the Son as one God.

The Father, said Pearson, is the Father of all but His essential Fatherhood must be seen in relation to the eternal Son. ³ The Father begets the Son from eternity and He is the beloved One, being loved of the Father eternally and loving Him eternally. Pearson quoted from Origen where the latter referred to Christ as the Son of His Father's love. The very essence of grace, said Andrewes, the greatest grace that can be, is the acknowledging of the Son by the Father to be the Son. ⁴ Thus grace is grounded on the hypostatic union of Christ and comes not

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 274.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 274.

3. Pearson, op. cit., p. 73.

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 298. See also Ps. 2:7.

from man but from God as man. Bramhall pointed out that the hypostatic union of the two natures of Christ was fundamental to the faith.¹ Andrewes showed that the fountain of grace could not stand outside the union of God.

For seeing in the humanity of Christ, there was not, there could not be, any possibility of merit, to deserve the unity itself, or the being assumed into the Godhead; to be so assumed and so united, was that grace we term the grace of union.—2

Not even in speaking of the humanity of Christ would Andrewes allow us to think of grace as not coming from above. Only in the relation of the hypostatic union can we think of Christ's action as deserving merit.

The fountain of grace is rooted in the eternal relation of the Father and the Son. This was the understanding of grace that Downname expressed when commenting on 2 Tim. 1:9. By grace he understood the gracious love and favour of God in Christ, given to us in Him before time itself.³ The relation of the Father and the Son is an eternal one. In eternity the grace of God is given to us in Christ. The ground and source of grace in the Word made flesh is absolutely dependent on the eternal relation of the Father and the Son. As the incarnate Son is God, He is said to be full of grace. This was Andrewes' concept and he brought this understanding to his discussion of the incarnation where "the flesh with the Word, and by means of it the whole Deity, was 'anointed' all over, and by virtue thereof filled

1. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., II, p. 88.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 337.

3. Downname, A Treatise of Justification, p. 9.

with the fulness of all grace. It is the Spirit which anointed 'God the Son made man' and by thus anointing Him the eternal union is sustained in Him. Andrewes bound the grace of Christ and the Holy Spirit together. "All then of grace, proceeding from the Spirit: accordingly, the conception of Christ's flesh, and the sending it with the fulness of grace, or anointing it, is ascribed to the Spirit."² The concept of the Spirit, as the Spirit of grace, finds validity in the thought of Andrewes because it is the Spirit which bears the eternal Son into union with our humanity. This will be elaborated on in the latter part of this chapter.

Beveridge related his sermon on grace and its meaning to the Trinity, to the acts of creation and recreation. In both acts the infinite glory of the eternal Godhead is revealed. In the creation of the world, said Beveridge, we find three distinct persons specifically named by God Himself as concurring in this drama and each in a way peculiar to Himself.³ Not only at the creation of the world but at the two most crucial times of our redemption, the incarnation and baptism of Christ, the Trinity is particularly mentioned as concerned with it.⁴ The importance of Beveridge's concerns centres on the fact that God is active and no lesser being than God.

Barrow also considered the works of creation and recreation as the works of the Trinity and he related these to the meaning of grace.

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 289.

2. Ibid., p. 290.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 212.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 215.

We first should carefully study and duly be affected with that gracious consent, and, as it were, confederacy of that glorious Three in designing and prosecuting our good; their unanimous agreement in uttering those three mighty words of favour to mankind, 'Faciamus, Redimamus, Salvemus'; Let us make man out of nothing, Let us recover him from sin and perdition, Let us crown him with joy and salvation;...--1

Barrow rightly stressed that we could not know the Trinity as it is in itself but only as it has revealed itself to us.² The way that the Triune God has revealed Himself to us Barrow called the "wonderful methods of grace towards us."³ Creation, as Barrow has said in reference to man, is out of nothing and he sustained the movement in the redemption of man as being always an act of God.⁴ After every man's actions have been tried and weighed, no man shall appear guiltless or deserve to be acquitted, "but shall stand in need of mercy, or can in no otherwise be justified than by a special act of grace."⁵

The entire work of redemption was stressed Christologically by Pearson. It is true, he said, that we are delivered by Christ and is also true that the Father delivers us but we are not delivered twice "because the Father delivereth us by the Son."⁶ At this point in Pearson's 'Exposition' we begin to appreciate his elaborate treatment of the concept of the Trinity. The Trinity reveals that God does not do anything apart from the Son; Christ is the incarnate God. He has no secret will which works outside of Christ; God wills all

-
1. Barrow, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 207.
 2. Ibid., p. 187.
 3. Loc. cit.
 4. Ibid., p. 374.
 5. Ibid., p. 376.
 6. Pearson, op. cit., p. 229. See also Col. 1:13.

things in Christ. Pearson was anxious to make this emphasis in the face of existing misunderstandings on this very important issue. It was most unfortunate that some of the most ardent Calvinists, placing as they did their whole theological thought on the doctrine of predestination, tended to separate God's eternal decree from God's eternal Word made flesh. The Arminians on the other hand did not relate the incarnate Word to the eternal will of God. The Socinians completely cut the relation and destroyed any understanding of the Trinity. Pearson was careful to guard against all such divisions. There was but one will of God and that was revealed in the Word made flesh. "For though it is true, that the Father and the Son revealed to us the will of God; yet it is not true that the Father revealed it by Himself to us; but that the Son did so, it is.¹" The entire act of our salvation is wrought by God but it is through the blood of the incarnate Son.² Pearson's understanding of the Trinity eliminated any danger of a double line of salvation. God's eternal decree is identical with Jesus Christ.

It is the One God who decrees our salvation but it is necessary for us always to see the movement of redemption in a trinitarian relation. Our salvation is decreed in eternity by the Triune God "that the whole Trinity might be equally interested in the accomplishment of the work of our salvation, and it pass through all Their hands."³ It is God the Father who sends His only-begotten Son into the world by the act of the Holy Spirit. The act of redemption is the act of God through-

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 230.

2. Ibid., p. 229.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 358.

out. Bishop Downname bound the action of the Trinity together in this way:

The infinite and unspeakable love of God the Father, in giving his only begotten Sonne, and of God the Sonne in giving himself for us; and of God the Holy Spirit the Spirit of grace, in communication unto us the mercy and love of God, and the merits and vertue of all that Christ did or suffered for us. --1

It is the Trinity, it is the whole fulness of God that impinges upon Jesus Christ for our salvation. The body of Christ, said Andrewes,² is the Temple in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells corporally. Andrewes stressed the fact that God dwells in this human Temple in a unique manner from the way in which He dwells in us. It is by personal union and not as in us by grace.³ There is a radical concept of incarnation in the thought of Andrewes. It is God the Son who comes to redeem but it is God who comes. As it was in creation so it is likewise in the redemption of mankind; the world was made by the Word of God and it was redeemed by the same word,⁴ said Beveridge. It was God who created the world but He made all things by His Word. Beveridge explained that the Word of God was not some outward spoken word but by speaking 'in Himself' which is 'His essential Word'.⁵ This Word is His eternal and only begotten Son.⁶ Keeping in mind the Socinian presence, Thorndike also emphasized that the incarnation meant that the Word had become man which it was not before.⁷

-
1. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 43.
 2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 252.
 3. Ibid., p. 253.
 4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 215. See also Vol. II, p. 124.
 5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 213. See also John 1:1,2,3.
 6. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 213.
 7. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., II, Pt. 1, p. 242.

The act of redemption is a thoroughly trinitarian act. Only when we think in this way can we understand the real import of Mountague's statement that God becomes man but remains God: "For God becoming Man, runs upon no hazard of imparing his original state."¹ Therefore in the person of Christ it is God and no lesser being that comes to save. God cannot be divided, that certainly is the meaning of the Trinity. It is Christ who comes in the fulness of God so that we must also say that the Holy Spirit also redeems us.² Again it was Downname who asserted the action of the Godhead in the act of redemption. The Holy Spirit, he said, brought the benefits of redemption and applied them to us.³ "The Father redeemeth, as the gracious author and Donour; the Son, as the meritorious worker, the Holy Ghost, as the effectual applier."⁴ It must be noted that the whole movement from beginning to end involves God fully. And the whole act of redemption is the act of God done for us and it is this act which is the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. These are the words Downname used to express this:

The goodwill and love of God the Father is the...antecedent moving cause; the death and obedience of Christ is the...meritorious cause; the application of the Holy Ghost is the effectual cause; by which we are made actually partakers of redemption, which is the grace wrought by Christ, proceeding from the love of the Father, applied unto us by the communion of the Holy Ghost. —5

Though the entire emphasis of grace is put upon the act of God man is not ignored for grace is wrought by God as man.

-
1. Mountague, Acts and Monuments of the Church, op. cit., p. 25.
 2. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 42.
 3. Loc. cit.
 4. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 42.
 5. Loc. cit.

Beveridge's understanding of this was similar to Downham's. The fulness of God acts in man's redemption but it is through the incarnate God. It is God as man who has redeemed and who is said to be full of grace. The love which God the Father has for us is only in His Son and for His sake.¹ We are loved with an absolute and unconditioned love; the love that God has for God.

The relation of the Father and the Son is one of pure holy love. It is unconditional and from all eternity and it is a personal love for the Father and the Son are truly persons. This relationship of love is within the Trinity. Bishop Bull showed that it was the opinion of the early Fathers to consider the Holy Spirit as the relation of the Father and the Son.² He gave an example of such thinking by quoting an ancient doxology: 'Glory be to the Father and the Son in the unity of the Holy Ghost.'³ He also made reference to Augustine and the later Fathers in stressing this same thought for they held the Holy Spirit to be the love of the Father and the Son.⁴ God the Father loves God the Son with the fulness of Himself and the Son loves the Father in the same eternal measure for the Holy Spirit who is the holy eternal unity of love is also God. It is upon such an understanding that we can say that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God the Father and God the Son. This, said Pearson, showed that the Holy Spirit precedes from both the Father and the Son.⁵

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 221.
 2. Bull, op. cit., p. 376.
 3. Loc. cit.
 4. Loc. cit.
 5. Pearson, op. cit., p. 563.

Bishop Andrewes' articulation on the subject of the Holy Spirit affords us with the finest understanding in the Caroline writings. His words are of extreme importance to us. "Now then take the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of spirits, the third Person in Trinity; He is the very essential unity, love, and love-knot of the two Persons, the Father and the Son; even God with God.¹ That is, the interior union of the Trinity is the Holy Spirit who is the love between the Father and the Son and also the love-knot which eternally binds that relation together. Andrewes continued: "And He is sent to be the union, love, love-knot of the two natures united in Christ; even God with man.² In the person of Jesus Christ the interior relation of the Father and the Son is thrust into the humanity of man and sustained in Him. In the incarnation the Holy Spirit bears the eternal relation of the Father and the Son and brings it into our time and flesh. The eternal relation of love that the Father has for the Son and the Son for the Father is sustained in our humanity in Jesus Christ. God the Father loves Jesus Christ who wears our humanity, who is a man, with the same holy, absolute and eternal love. That is how God loves man. Andrewes' understanding showed great depth at this point. It reveals that the love of God for man and in man is God's love to God; the whole fulness of God. God loves sinful man with a complete self-giving love. The Holy Spirit who is God, who is the union of God and the love of God, is given to man in Jesus Christ. The most fundamental understanding of the origin and essential nature of grace is given to us here by Andrewes.

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 113.

2. Loc. Cit. See also Warkin-Jones, op. cit., p. 81.

Andrewes also carried this understanding of the Holy Spirit, as the union between the Father and the Son, into his discussion of the Church. The same Holy Spirit who is the union, love and love-knot between the Father and the Son, between God and man in the Person of Jesus Christ, was also related to Christ and His Church. The Holy Spirit is the hypostatic union of the Father and the Son, of God and man in Jesus Christ and ^{the communion between} ¹ of Jesus Christ and His Church. Barrow thought of the Spirit's relation to the Church in a similar way. He declared that the Holy Spirit bears the office of a soul to God's ² Church, informing, enlivening and actuating the whole body. This understanding of the Holy Spirit and the Church fills the concept of the Church as the body of Christ with the presence of the eternal God.

Andrewes' concept of the Holy Spirit was thorough. It was continually related to the person of Christ. The Holy Spirit makes alive for us the person of Christ. It is only by the Holy Spirit that we can say that Jesus is Lord. ³ This certainly followed from his understanding thus far. Therefore, where the name of Jesus is there is indeed the presence of God. Andrewes always maintained this holy union of the Trinity. And it would not have been Andrewes had he not related this understanding to the eucharist. "Where His name is I am sure, and more than His name, even the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and those, not without inestimable high benefits of grace attending on them." ⁴ It is through the work of the Holy Spirit

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 148.

2. Barrow, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 36.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 345, 346.

4. Ibid., p. 340.

that the fulness of Christ is present and manifested to us and where He is present there is also His grace.

The same understanding of the Holy Spirit can also be discerned in Pearson's thought though it is by no means as thorough for Pearson did not relate the Holy Spirit to the Church as vitally as did Andrewes. However, the relation of the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit is stressed by Pearson. The communion of the Father and the Son is the Holy Spirit and this is brought to us by the communication of the Holy Spirit.¹ Bishop Thorndike expressed similar thoughts in this regard. The Godhead is conceived and sustained in the humanity of Jesus Christ;

The Holy Ghost, overshadowing the blessed Virgin, not only works the conception of a Son, but dwells for ever, according to the fulness of the Godhead, in the Manhood so conceived; as, by the nature of the Godhead, planted in the Word, which then came to dwell in the Manhood so conceived. --2

This union, of the fulness of the Godhead and the flesh, in Christ was expressed by Thorndike as the hypostatic union, by reason of which Christ is called the 'image of God's glory and the express character of His essence.'³ The Holy Spirit is the hypostatic union and upon this union Thorndike grounded the expiation of our sin and the glorification of Christ to the throne of God to be worshipped as God.⁴

Our discussion has led us to a consideration of the incarnation: God coming to man as man in the person of Jesus Christ full of grace and truth. Relying upon what we have said thus far about the Trinity

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 623.

2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 253.

3. Ibid., p. 261. See also Hebrews 1:1,2,3.

4. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 261.

we can see that the incarnation, the sending of the only begotten Son by the Father in the unity of the Holy Spirit is nothing less than the utter self-giving of God in the mighty act of grace. The words of Beveridge on this issue are most inspiring:

It is the grace, the free undeserved favour and mercy; it is the grace of the Lord, the Almighty God, the Eternal and Only-begotten Son, of the same substance and glory with the Father; it is the grace of the Lord Jesus, the most high God made Man, and so becomes Jesus, a Saviour, to save His people from their sins; it is the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, of God our Saviour, anointed to be to us a Prophet, a Priest, and King, and so fully qualified, and able to do all things necessary for our salvation. --1

Everything that Beveridge says here about the nature of grace is related directly to God and in the person of Jesus Christ grace is related directly to man. There is no doubt whatsoever as to the movement of grace or to the nature of grace in Beveridge's thought as expressed here. Grace is the grace of the most high God made man; it is free and undeserved, mighty to save.

There is no trace of that Arminianism which holds that man can deserve the grace of Christ in the thought of Beveridge. At the same time Socinianism has no place whatsoever in his Christology. The Word of God which redeemed the world is the same Word which created all
2
things.

He who made all things at first was Himself now made of a woman; He was conceived in the womb of the blessed Virgin, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, and the power of the Highest overshadowing her. By which means, He who was the Son of God from all eternity, then became the Son of Man too; and from that time forward, always was, and ever will be, 'Immanuel', God and man in one Person. --3

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 224.
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 215.
 3. Ibid., p. 253.

Pearson as we have already seen was of the same opinion. Thorndike also referred to Jesus Christ as the Word of God which became man, signifying a definite incarnation, for the Word was not man before this particular time.² The theme that Jesus Christ was the incarnate God was repeated unceasingly by the Carolines. It was God who had come. This is the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It was in the act of the incarnation where Andrewes saw the self-giving of God with great clarity. "What was it that made the Word thus to be made flesh?"³ Andrewes stressed that the answer could only be found in God Himself since nothing outside of God could deserve His love. "Love only did it."⁴ This gracious act of God in self-giving for our salvation is the grace of Christ. If, said Bishop Cosin, there was anything in mankind that could bring God to come to man it could be only his sin.⁵ God gives Himself out of Himself; the Father sends the Son conceived by the Holy Spirit. The gift of Christ is a gift of God, from God and by God. "Again, it hath been observed", said Pearson noting Augustine at this point, "that by the manner of Christ's conception is declared the freedom of the grace of God."⁶ This surely is the essential meaning of free grace; it is given to man unconditionally in Jesus Christ. God does not give grace to man because he deserves it or in any way merits it. The very manner in

-
1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 224.
 2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 242.
 3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 92.
 4. Ibid., pp. 92, 93.
 5. Cosin, Works, op. cit., I, p. 214.
 6. Pearson, op. cit., p. 298.

which grace comes to man shows this to be true. Pearson elaborated this further:

For as the Holy Ghost is God, so is he also called the gift of God: and therefore the human nature in its first original, without any precedent merit, was formed by the Spirit, and in its formation sanctified, and in its sanctification united to the word; so that the grace was co-existent, and in a manner con-natural with it. —1

By placing the ground and nature of grace within the Trinity and hence before creation itself, Pearson ruled out completely any possibility of grace being merited by creation. The incarnation brought into our historic midst that grace which was eternally in the word that was with God and was God before the foundation of the world. The incarnation directly excluded the merits of men in general and it also rejected the possibility of merit in Christ's humanity.²

Pearson's great insistence that there is nothing outside God that merits or deserves His grace brings us to the consideration of another aspect of the incarnation. The Caroline Divines were very critical of the Church of Rome for the position she accorded the Virgin Mary in the Faith. Bishop Bull stated that the Church of England honoured her because she had been elected and chosen by God to be the instrument of bringing the long promised Messiah into the world.³ We honour the blessed Virgin, said Bull, "as a most singular elect vessel of God; as one in the highest degree of all mere mortals honoured by God; but therefore, we will not yield her any of that honour that is peculiar to God."⁴ He stated that the Church of England

1. Loc. cit.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Bull, op. cit., p. 69.

4. Ibid., p. 75.

would not go beyond the Scriptures and the early Fathers in their
praise of her.¹ He charged Rome with downright treason against the
person of Christ.²

We will not ascribe those excellencies to her, that she never
had nor could have; as, a fulness of habitual grace, more
grace than all the angels and archangels of God put together
ever had; that she was born without original sin, and never
committed any the least actual sin, and consequently never
needed a Saviour. --3

Even the blessed Virgin is to pass through the fire on the day of
judgment, said Bishop Taylor.⁴

The Carolines were quick to affirm that the Virgin Mary had
been an instrument of God but they rejected the claim that she was
chosen because she was worthy of such an honour. The Virgin Mary
was of the fallen race of Adam, a sinner, who herself needed to be
saved by Christ. Beveridge and Thorndike were critical of the Council
of Basel for declaring that the Virgin Mary was free from original
sin.⁵ Mountague cited Augustine in this matter, agreeing with him
that Mary was freed from actual sin after the birth of Christ and
that by grace, but not before, nor was she free from original sin.⁶
Mountague probably conceded more to Rome on this point than any of
the other Carolines but he expressed surprise that Rome had not made
the blasphemous claim for Mary that she was equal with Christ. Long

1. Ibid., pp. 77, 73.

2. Ibid., pp. 77, 78.

3. Bull, op. cit., p. 77.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., X, p. 149.

5. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, p. 609.

6. Mountague, Act and Monuments of the Church, op. cit., p. 530.

before Mountague's time Bishop Jewel saw that this was precisely what Rome did in her exaggerated claims for Mary. "Here you intrude upon Christ's office, and make the holy virgin a mediator, not only of intercession, as you say, but also of salvation."¹ Barrow also saw the same implication and utterly rejected it: "They ascribe to her the most sublime attributes of God, together with his most peculiar action of providence and protection over us, yea of redemption itself."²

The Caroline Bishops were correct when they saw that Rome's insistence on the sinlessness of Mary had opened the door for all evil to enter. What is implied in these claims is the assertion of inhering grace and the doctrine of merit. Pelagius also held that the Virgin Mary was sinless.³ This concept was a requisite to the elaboration of his heretical doctrines. It was on this false basis also that John Duns Scotus advocated the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.⁴ We cannot forget the influence that Scotus had on the Church of England and there is a lingering of his thought in that Church but in this particular period and on this issue the Carolines turned their backs on him. The Roman Church's understanding of the nature of grace is again seen in her doctrine on the Virgin Birth. Her understanding here is not at all unlike her view of the eucharist. Mary, who partakes of the fragmentariness of mankind is 'transubstantiated', that is, the Church of Rome has attributed to her divine

-
1. Jewel, Works, op. cit., Third Portion, p. 573.
 2. Barrow, Vol. V, op. cit., p. 333.
 3. Browne, op. cit., p. 346.
 4. Ibid.

qualities and perfection - a sort of communicatio idiomatum. The sinful structures of this age vanish. Thus the grace of God does not come through the sinful flesh of man but through the pure spotless being who by her nature deserves or merits the grace of God. The miracle of grace is the opposite of this. God uses the weak, sinful things of our age to reveal His unspeakable glory; God in the person of Christ, wearing our 'flesh of sin' reveals to us the fulness of God. The Carolines were of this mind. The influence of Athanasius on the Carolines can be noted in the absence of Mariology from their writings.

It is at this point that we must examine the issue of free grace which the Arminian controversy raised. The Virgin Birth reveals two things to us: that God out of His own fulness acts for our redemption and yet it is an act which does not exclude man. The former we have already noted in the writings of some of the bishops. In the person of the Virgin we see the role that mankind plays. The Carolines believed unanimously that the 'seed of the woman' in Genesis 3:, referred to Christ. The seed of the woman, said Beveridge, "is plainly meant one, who should be born of a woman without the help of man: which none ever was, but only Jesus Christ." ¹ Man as the active participant is set aside in the person of Joseph, said Pearson, and Jesus Christ is begotten of the Virgin Mary. ² But, he said, "we must not imagine that it was in the power of woman to conceive Him." ³ By her own words the Virgin Mary excludes herself and all man. ⁴ Barrow pressed the

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 380.

2. Pearson, op. cit., p. 293.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p.192. See also Luke 1:34.

positive content of this thought. It was the Holy Spirit who con-
ceived the Word in Mary 'without any active influence of man'.¹

This of course was Pearson's concern also; God was the sole worker
of our salvation.

God then it was who immediately and miraculously enabled the
blessed Virgin to conceive our Saviour; and while Mary, Joseph,
and all men are denied, no person which is that God can be
excluded from that operation. --2

This being said, however, Pearson insisted that Mary was truly and
properly the mother of our Saviour.³ Though she herself confesses
that she can do nothing yet her election does not violate her nature.
She is the handmaiden of the Lord, a willing instrument of God in
His purpose of salvation.

The election of Mary out of Israel followed the same pattern
that is evidenced at the choosing of Israel itself. Bishop Hall elabor-
ated this in relation to the election of Judah;

I find not many of Jacob's sons more faulty than Judah; who yet
is singled out from all the rest to be the royal progenitor of
Christ, and to be honoured with the dignity of the birthright,
that God's election might not be of merit, but of grace;...--4

The fact that we see ourselves as unworthy of our calling shows us
that grace is not our own.⁵ Election is the act of God from the
ground of grace, that is, of Himself, and does not involve man's
merit.

-
1. Barrow, Work, op. cit., V, p. 297.
 2. Pearson, op. cit., p. 293. See also Luke 1:37.
 3. Pearson, op. cit., p. 317.
 4. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 55. See also Gen. 38:
 5. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 87. See also Exodus chapter 3.

Nothing shows more forcibly, the fact, that grace comes from God and is essentially the coming of God for our salvation than does the incarnation. We have already noted something of its importance in Caroline thought. For Beveridge, grace was all that Christ was and did for us in reconciling us to God.¹ The incarnation was for Beveridge, as for Andrewes, all-important. It stated clearly that God had come into our history to accomplish our redemption. Beveridge viewed the incarnation as the first actual act done by God for our salvation.² But Beveridge saw that the incarnation was no isolated event in the history of salvation. From the very beginning of the world the Word of God undertook the redemption of fallen man and in all the ages of our history He has inspired men by His Spirit to speak to men in His name.³ The grace of Christ had been given to the people of the Old Testament and Beveridge interpreted the Hebrew 7Dn - mercy - to mean that grace.⁴ Mountague was also of like opinion; grace had been given to the Patriarchs and holy men who lived and died before the Word became flesh.⁵ Taylor also stressed this: the Holy Spirit had justified some men who lived before the time of Christ's days in the flesh under the law but it was not the law that justified, it was rather the Holy Spirit 'by way of Jesus Christ who was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.'⁶

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p.223.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 215.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., IV, p.127.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 222.

5. Mountague, Acts and Monuments of the Church, op. cit., p. 44.

6. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 138.

This justification was not by the works of the law but "by the same instruments and grace, by which Abraham, and all they who are his children by promise, were justified."¹ The incarnation had a backward reference, gathering up and fulfilling the promises of God that He made before the Word became flesh. God sent His Son, said Downname,

that hee might keepe his promise, and performe his oath; wee observe the immutable truth and fidelitie of God in performing his promises: 'For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us.'" --2

The faithfulness of God is shown to us in the incarnation, said Beveridge, as he considered the meaning of 'grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.' He suggested that 'truth', since it was the truth of God, could also mean faithfulness; that the grace of God came by His own faithfulness.³

So that we have more ground to believe in Christ for grace, and pardon, and eternal salvation, than we have to believe what we see, or hear, or understand; for our senses may deceive us, and so may our reason too: but God is of that infinite wisdom, that He cannot deceive Himself; and of that infinite goodness, that He will not deceive us. --4

The grace of Jesus Christ, understood from this interpretation of the incarnation, not only stands in the continuity of the history of salvation but is itself the continuity since grace is the act of God Himself for our salvation. The Word that created the heavens and the earth is the same Word of promise given to the prophets of old and it is the same Word that was with God and was God that became flesh in Jesus Christ.

1. Loc. cit.

2. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 6. See also 2 Cor.1:20. See also Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 258.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 52. See also John 1:17., Rom.3:3. See also Browne, op. cit., p. 300.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 266.

The incarnation of God in our human flesh was of great significance for Beveridge's thought. He interpreted the phrase from John 1:14 *καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν* to mean that God dwelt in our humanity and that is why Christ is called Immanuel, for He is the incarnate God. ¹

So He dwelt in us, in that flesh or nature that we are all of; He dwelt, or, as the word signifies, He pitched His tent or tabernacle in it: in allusion, I suppose, to that in the law, where He dwelt between the cherubims over the ark, keeping, as it were, His residence there; which was therefore called Shekinah, His habitation, His Divine presence, and His glory. —2

Thorndike also compared the incarnation with the presence of God in the Temple of the Old Testament. There the presence of God dwelt in the midst of His people by promise but in Christ, the fulfillment of that promise, God dwells among us bodily. ³ The Shekinah of the Hebrew people was the presence of God in their midst and thus, in the presence of our humanity, when the Word became flesh, we also beheld the glory of God, full of truth and grace. The grace of Jesus Christ is related directly to the incarnate God whose mission from the Father is born out of His love and for our redemption.

The incarnation fills up the promises of the past that were made by God and the essential meaning of these promises was the fact that He would come to save His people. The Word that was with God and was God and became flesh is both the promise and the fulfillment. "But how can these things be? How is it possible that the Word, the Essential Word of God, who Himself is God, should thus be made flesh? That God should become man?" ⁴ The incarnation is the mystery of God's

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 25.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 251.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 24.

coming to man and this movement is the mystery of grace; God who is God and not man becomes man that he might graciously save man. The mystery of the incarnation is the person who came, "Who was able and who was willing to do it;" said Cosin in referring to our redemption, "and That was Christ, in the mystery of His incarnation, which was this day made manifest to the world."¹

The incarnation points forward as well as backward. God who had become man ever remains in our flesh. The incarnation has eternal significance and our humanity is involved in this eternal quality. In Jesus Christ, said Andrewes, our manhood is taken up into God and this by grace.² Our humanity is taken into the heart of God in the ascension of Jesus Christ. This eternal quality of the incarnation was the great assurance for Andrewes that even now our humanity stood within the veil. Pearson also stressed this; Christ in our humanity, flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone, is seated at the right hand of God.³ Even now the first-fruits of our nature are ascended and the rest is sanctified.⁴

Pearson rejected in absolute terms any suggestion that in the incarnation our humanity was 'transubstantiated' into the divine nor would it be in any other time.⁵ The incarnation does not negate our humanity, rather it affirms it; it is the continuity of our humanity in Jesus Christ. Bishop Barrow rejected the thought that the incarnation meant a conversion of the divine into the human or that a tertium quid resulted in the union of God and man in Jesus Christ.⁶

1. Cosin, Works, op. cit., I, p. 314.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 289.

3. Pearson, op. cit., p. 482.

4. Ibid., p. 484. See also Heb.10:20

5. Pearson, op. cit., p. 288.

6. Barrow, Works, op. cit., V, pp. 301, 302.

Both these assertions deny the biblical claim that Jesus Christ is the incarnate God and hence destroy the movement of God's grace.

The hypostatic union is essential to a proper understanding of the incarnation and the nature of grace. Beveridge pointed this out:

He dwelleth in our nature by a hypostatic or personal union with it, such as makes it to be one and the same person with Him; as is implied also, in that He is said to be made flesh. --1

The hypostatic union involving our historic¹ existence is yet not a temporary union but an eternal one.² The Son of God who became the Son of Man is Jesus Christ and from the incarnation onward always was and ever will be God and man in one person.³ "The Word was indeed without either soul or body;" said Pearson, "but after it was made flesh, it was never parted either from the one or from the other."⁴ The importance of this emphasis on the hypostatic union for our consideration is obvious. Christ is forever the grace of God to man and He is ever sufficient for our salvation. The incarnation has eternal continuity.

This is precisely where the question of perseverance, which the Arminian controversy brought forth, should have been answered. It is in the person of Christ that God perseveres for man and in man. This union is never broken and is the ground of grace. Can man fall from this grace? - God is forever made man! To divide the act of grace into what God does and what man does is to divide God from man in Jesus Christ and this can never be. The humanity of man is held

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 25, 26.

2. Ibid., p. 26.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 253.

4. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 382, 380.

in an eternal embrace of holy love. This is the essential meaning of perseverance in grace so that we must look to Christ and not to ourselves when we are concerned with salvation by grace. To say, however, that man is excluded or ignored in the act of grace is to deny the reality of the incarnation or to confound the natures of that one person.

Beveridge saw in the incarnation the utter self-giving of God and the mystery of it completely overwhelmed him.

When I seriously consider these things, I am astonished and confounded at them. Oh the mystery of godliness! God manifest in the flesh! Oh the height, the depth, the length, the breadth of the love of God to mankind, that He should give His Word, His Son, His Only-begotten Son to be made flesh, and all that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life! That the eternal Son of God, whom the Heaven of Heaven is not able to contain, should come down and dwell among us poor mortals upon earth, and all that we might live with Him in Heaven! That He who is so full of grace and truth in Himself, should communicate it so freely unto us, that of His fulness we may receive, and grace for grace, even all things necessary to make us holy and happy both now and for ever. --1

In the light of such grace to man the natural question of man is given to us by the Psalmist - What shall we render to God for all His benefits? That is the question that Beveridge's proposes: "What shall we do for Him, that hath done all this for us?" Nor did the answer Beveridge gave differ from the Psalmist's: "All that we can do, is to receive the grace, and believe the truth that He hath manifested to us, and to praise and thank Him for it."² These words of Beveridge express most accurately the response that man can make to the free grace of Jesus Christ. To ask the question that the Psalmist asks without giving the same answer that he gave is indeed to ask the wrong question.

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 29.

2. Loc. cit.

In the face of such free grace freely given to man how can man do more toward his salvation. Out of man's response in thanksgiving the Christian lives the life of grace. This thought, however, was not sustained by such divines as Thorndike or Taylor as we shall see in a later chapter and the tendency in others was to subtly qualify this thought expressed by Beveridge.

We have already noted, to some extent, the importance of the Holy Spirit to the thought of Lancelot Andrewes. The sending of the Spirit was not an addendum to the grace wrought for us by Jesus Christ: "Christ was enough needs no supply; the Spirit comes not to do but to testify."¹ The Holy Spirit is Christ's witness in grace.² The Spirit speaks of Christ. He bears witness to the fact that Christ has come and has done all things necessary for our salvation.³ There is no variance between Christ and the Spirit. The Spirit and Jesus Christ agree.⁴ The chief requisite of a witness, said Andrewes, is that he be true and "the Spirit is so true, as He is the Truth itself."⁵ Both the Spirit and Christ are the one Truth; God the Holy Spirit and God the Son, one upholding the other. "The Spirit, Christ's Proof; Christ, the Spirit's."⁶ The Spirit, said Jeremy Taylor, speaks whatsoever He has heard from Christ.⁷ Laud spoke similar words. The limitation that is put upon the Holy Spirit is placed there by Christ. The Spirit comes to testify only to the person of Christ, what He was,

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 357.

2. Ibid., pp. 357, 359.

3. Ibid., pp. 357, 358.

4. Ibid., p. 358.

5. Ibid., p. 360.

6. Loc. cit.

7. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XV, p. 26.

what He said and what He did. Therefore, said Laud, the Holy Spirit leads us in all truth, that Truth which is Christ. He brings to remembrance all things concerning Him.¹

Andrewes always associated the Holy Spirit and the person of Christ closely together; a holy union, and he sustained this relation with regard to the Church. As the Holy Spirit had anointed Christ so He also anoints the Church: "Meet, that having once before been, and never but once, upon Christ the Head, it should be so once more on the Church, the Body."² The Head of the Church is Christ and the heart of the Church is the Holy Spirit who makes the body to live.³ Andrewes continually referred to the Spirit as the Spirit of life. The Holy Spirit as well as the Word participates at both the creation and the recreation of the world. Not only the Word was required, said Andrewes, but "the motion of the Spirit, to give the spirit of life, the life of nature."⁴ Andrewes never separated the Holy Spirit from the person and work of Christ. The Holy Spirit was concerned in the drama of redemption. In the incarnation it is the Holy Spirit that bears the Word to the flesh and the Holy Spirit is also given to the flesh to give life, "even the life of grace to the 'new creature'."⁵ The Holy Spirit makes alive the body of Christ and the work of Christ in us.⁶ The Holy Spirit who is the union and the love of the Father and the Son within the Trinity is extended to the flesh in the incarnate Son and also binds Christ and His Church together in an eternal union of love. The concept of the Holy Spirit permeated the theological thought of Andrewes. The breadth and depth of his understanding

1. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, p. 183.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 116. 3. Ibid., p. 124.

4. Ibid., p. 171.

5. Loc.cit., see also Gal. 6:15.

6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 171.

of the Holy Spirit is nowhere duplicated in the rest of the Carolines.

The act of Christ for our redemption is done once and for all¹ but without a seal or as a testator without an executor. Christ's coming is no coming and His work is no work without the Holy Spirit: "If the Holy Ghost come not, Christ's coming can do us no good; when² all is done, nothing is done." The Holy Spirit who brings the Word and conceives it in the flesh of Mary and makes it to live is also the Spirit who makes Christ and His work alive for us thus we can say that Jesus is Lord only by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit as the Spirit of Truth, bears witness to the Truth which is Christ. The Holy Spirit is the seal which God puts upon all that the Word has done for our redemption. Andrewes used this analogy: "A word is of no force though written, which we call a deed, till the seal be added: that maketh it authenticall."³ Andrewes insisted, however, that this was no mere human analogy. "God hath borrowed those very terms from us:" Christ is the Word and the Holy Spirit is the seal. "if the Seal come not too, nothing is done."⁴ Andrewes of course was not trying to divide the work of redemption but rather to stress that the coming of the Spirit intensified the assertion that in the act of our redemption it is God who accomplishes all.

At every point in the drama of our salvation the Holy Spirit is with the Word of God made flesh; the trinitarian relation is not broken in the incarnation of the Son; the hypostatic union is sustained by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit identifies the Word to be the only

1. Ibid., p. 214.

2. Ibid., p. 171.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 171.

4. Loc. cit.

beloved of the Father. At the baptism of Jesus it is the Spirit who identifies the Son and the Father speaks to the One on whom the Spirit descends.¹ The identification of Christ by the Holy Spirit is not so much for His benefit as it is for ours. "Indeed, His whole baptism is not so much His as ours."² Bishop Jewel, quoting from Chrysostom, spoke of Christ's baptism as the passion of Christ.³ This was Andrewes' understanding also.

The Holy Spirit makes Christ known at His baptism; He rested upon Him and abided with Him.⁴ This same Spirit is given at Pentecost. The Holy Spirit is poured without measure into the humanity of Christ at His conception and the ascended Christ is the cistern⁵ out of which the Holy Spirit is poured at Pentecost. We receive out of the fulness of Christ grace for grace. All that Christ is and all that He has done for us is committed to the Church at this time. The fulness of God's victorious love; the Word which has not returned void is poured upon the Church when the Spirit is given at Pentecost. The triumphant essential love of the Father for the Son is poured upon the Church.⁶ "And this day", God by His Holy Spirit "seals up all by giving us seisin of all He hath done for us, by His Spirit sent down upon earth."⁷ All that God has done for us in Jesus

1. Ibid., p. 261.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Jewel, Works, op. cit., Second Portion, p. 1101.

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 173. See also John 1:32.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 311.

6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 148.

7. Ibid., p. 149.

Christ is sealed to our possession by the Spirit of God. That is why Andrewes rightly referred to the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of grace, given to us.¹ This is why the word and the sacrament are dependent on the Holy Spirit in Andrewes' thought. There is no baptism, no preaching, no eucharist and no prayer without the coming of the Holy Spirit.² Unless the Spirit quickens the word it remains but a dead letter that kills and the eucharist without the Spirit is but flesh that can profit us nothing.³ The sending of the Holy Spirit by God emphasized, said Andrewes, that grace is from without.⁴ Without the Spirit we cannot live the life of grace, that is, a life in Christ and so consequently we can never come to the life of glory.⁵ The Holy Spirit is active in us from our baptism to our resurrection.⁶ In Andrewes' thought baptism can be seen as a sacramental union with Christ.

Though Andrewes attributed such a prominent part to the activity of the Holy Spirit he never abstracted it from the trinitarian relation. The whole Trinity was involved in the giving of the Holy Spirit; it was the act of the one eternal God and this of course followed naturally in Andrewes' thought. As the union of the Father and the Son the Holy Spirit is seen by Andrewes as the action of the one God. The Spirit as the essential love of the Father and the Son is the essential union within the Trinity. The giving of the Spirit at the conception and baptism of Jesus and at Pentecost is the exten-

1. Ibid., p. 210.

2. Ibid., p. 172.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., p. 313.

5. Ibid., pp. 193, 194.

6. Ibid., p. 195.

sion of the internal, eternal union of love into our flesh. Andrewes thought of the gift of the Spirit in His fulness as the free gift of God; the free gift of grace. "A free gift from the free Spirit; a gift of grace from the Spirit of grace." The gift of grace from the Spirit is union with Christ. Grace, as union with Christ, is the extension of the interior relation of love of the Trinity to man in faith. Andrewes brought his discussion on the Holy Spirit to a close by relating it once again to the Trinity. The eternal relationship of love within the Trinity is the ground and fountain of all grace. The movement of grace is from God to man in Jesus Christ but the full turn of grace is from God to God.

So we come about, and return again, to the first point we began with, that is, to the blessed Trinity. From Them are these; and if from Them, for Them: if from Their grace, for Their glory; the glory of Them that gave, ordered, and wrought; gave the gifts to us, ordered the places for us, wrought the works in us. If we the profit, They the praise: the rather, for that even the praise shall redound to our profit also, the highest profit of all, the gaining of our souls, and the gaining of them a rest in the Heavenly kingdom with all Three Persons!" --3

The origin and essential meaning of the nature of grace is to be seen in the Trinity while the fulness and completion of grace is man's incorporation into the Trinity. This understanding of grace is the ultimate meaning of atonement and will be dealt with in a later chapter.

The main contention of Andrewes' thought regarding the Holy Spirit can be recognized in Pearson's thinking though it is not as interrelated to the rest of his thought as it was in Andrewes. Pearson strongly emphasized that the Holy Spirit is more than an energy but

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 390. See also 2 Cor. 12:4-7.
 2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 399.
 3. Ibid., p. 406.

was in fact a person in the same sense that the Father and the Son
are persons.¹ Pearson had in mind those sects which made the Holy
Spirit to be a completely subjective principle and those heresies
which emphasized a subordination in the Trinity. He attacked the
Socinians who refused to recognize the Holy Spirit as the third per-
son in the Trinity; who claimed that the Spirit was simply an at-
tribute of God.²

Pearson related salvation by grace to the Spirit, The gift
of the Spirit was His working within us an assent to the Word of God
which was declared to us.³ Sanctification belongs also to the office
of the Spirit who gives us all things necessary for our salvation.⁴
It was upon this understanding of the Holy Spirit as sanctifier that
Downname made his distinction between justification and sanctification;
the one a deed done for us by Christ and the other the deed worked
continually in us.⁵ The Holy Spirit, said Downname, makes us to be
partakers of redemption which is the grace of Christ wrought for us.⁶

The Holy Spirit anointed Jesus Christ both at His birth and
at His baptism into the office of redeemer. As the Messiah He was
confirmed in His office as Prophet, Priest and King.⁷ Beveridge also
stressed a similar thought claiming that all three persons of the
Trinity were present at the Baptism of Christ when He was inaugurated

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 543.

2. Ibid., pp. 549, 551, 552.

3. Ibid., p. 576.

4. Ibid., p. 575.

5. Downname, A Treatise of Justification, op. cit., pp. 3, 4.

6. Downname, A Covenant of Grace, op. cit., pp. 42, 43.

7. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 178, 85.

into the office of Redeemer. The Father declared that Jesus was His Son and the Holy Spirit anointed Him "to be a Priest, a Prophet, and a King; who is therefore most properly called the Messiah, or Christ, the Anointed of God, and every way qualified to be our Media-¹tor and Redeemer." The Holy Spirit, said Beveridge, is united to² and always accompanies the flesh of Christ. The hypostatic union is eternally maintained. It was the Holy Spirit, said Barrow, who not only conducted God our Saviour into His fleshly tabernacle but remained with Him in His entire ministry on earth.³ Speaking further on the union of the Word and flesh, Barrow was emphatic that this union is inseparable and hence the same person never ceases to be both God and man. Pearson also saw that by the Holy Spirit the union of the Father and the Son is now inseparably united to the person of⁴ Christ who is the Son of God and the Son of man. The eternal unity now completely involves man eternally in the person of Christ.

Though Taylor dealt at some length with the sending of the Holy Spirit his thought did not follow closely to that of Andrewes. Taylor saw correctly that the giving of the Spirit was the gift of grace to the Church but his interpretation of this mighty event lacked the significance that it had for Andrewes. Taylor's understanding of the Spirit's coming and his concept of grace informed one another.

It is one of the privileges of the Gospel, and the benefits of Christ's ascension, that the Holy Ghost is given unto the church, and is become to us the fountain of gifts and graces. But these

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 216.
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 166.
 3. Barrow, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 161. See also Matt. 12:28. Acts 10:38. Rom. 1:4.
 4. Pearson, op. cit., p. 585. See also John 20:21, 22.

gifts and graces are improvements and helps of our natural faculties, of our art and industry, not extraordinary, miraculous, and immediate infusions of habits and gifts. --1

Taylor was correct in saying what grace was not but the positive understanding of grace falls far short of the essential meaning of grace that can be discerned in the writings of Andrewes. We do not find in Taylor's understanding of the gift of the Holy Spirit the complete self-giving of God the Redeemer. The Holy Spirit gives us graces, which are things of Christ added to our natures, but He does not give us the new humanity of the risen and ascended Christ.

The most formative concept of Taylor's understanding of the third person of the Trinity was to regard the Holy Spirit as that principle which enables us to live a holy life.² The stress on holy living was central to Taylor's concerns but this was largely interpreted in moralistic terms. His doctrine of grace was a corollary to this concern. This will be especially noted in relation to baptism and the atonement.

In this chapter we have stressed that the doctrine of the Trinity in relation to the mighty act of redemption determines to a large extent our understanding of the essential nature and movement of grace. But simply to assent to an orthodox or biblical view of the Trinity does not afford us with a biblical doctrine of grace. The doctrines must radically interpenetrate one another. A continual conversation has to take place within our theological understanding in order that this interpenetrating action might take place. The implications of an understanding of the Trinity, continually informed

1. Taylor, op. cit., VII, p. 352.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 422.

by Holy Scripture, must be relentlessly thought through in the logic of faith. Something of this systematic articulation can definitely be noted in Andrewes' understanding of the doctrine of grace in relation to the Trinity. This aspect, however, is almost lacking in entirety in Taylor's works. His primary concern was for the holy life, a noble concern, but in his consideration of the meaning of grace this was precisely his criterion and the movement of grace was subtly reversed.

CHAPTER V

SIN AND GRACE

The articulation of the Anglican doctrine of sin was a pressing problem for the Caroline Divines. The Arminian controversy brought into sharp relief the questions relating to sin and free grace. The doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting the retention of man's free-will after the fall was repudiated by the main Caroline tradition as Arminian. It equally rejected the doctrine held by the most radical of the Calvinists who applied the same stress to reprobation that Calvin had used in predestination thus making sin a determined act forced upon man from without. Almost without exception the whole weight of sin was placed upon man's act by the Carolines but the tension that Calvin maintained, by keeping even man's sin within the sovereignty of God, was largely lost by the Caroline Bishops.

The concept that man was ^{sanctified} created for sin found absolutely no place in Caroline theology. Man was created by God for life and communion with Him. Bishop Andrewes, considering the creation of Adam, interpreted St. Paul on this subject and held that man was created in a dual state. Man as creature possessed a natural life and intimately bound up with this was the purpose for his creation:

a spiritual life which was a life with God.¹ In the act of creation Adam had or was the first life, the life of nature or the living soul and when he fell, he fell from this state.² But Adam was also created for a purpose and this was an essential part of his creation. He was created for a spiritual life which would have been his had he lived according to the will of God. This life of purpose Adam also had not by way of possession as the first, but only as possibility and by promise though Andrewes regarded this as part of essential man.³ Adam's fall, therefore, was a total fall. He fell from both states; "Not only that he had in reversion, by not fulfilling the conditions, but even that he had in esse too."⁴ Andrewes did not seek to preserve the wholeness of man's nature after the fall; all that was man was affected and infected with sin, including his will.⁵

Perhaps Bishop Taylor, more than any of the other Carolines differed from Andrewes on this point. Taylor wrote at considerable length attempting to articulate the position of the Church of England on this subject. It is clear from Taylor's extremely varied discourses on the nature of sin that he thought of sin primarily as those individual acts concerned with moral behavior. Though Taylor spoke of sin as an act against God it would still be more true to say that he conceived of sin as a violation of a moral law. His doctrine of sin was fundamentally thought out from this concept of ^{will} sin. The grace of Christ, said Taylor, was the assistance that God gave to man that he might keep the new law of grace inaugurated by Christ. Though

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 220.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 57.

Taylor cannot be completely circumscribed by this definition it was, nevertheless, the formative element in his thinking.

Taylor believed that man was first created in a natural whole-¹ness and to his natural being God added supernatural grace. By this² grace Adam was able to do things above nature. Thus when man fell he fell from this supernatural grace but he did not fall from the wholeness of his nature.³ The discourses that God had with Adam after his disobedience reveals that God did not take away from Adam, or from us, any of the natural perfections of man but only His supernatural⁴ grace. The nature of man is not corrupted by the fall of Adam though it is imperfect as far as supernatural efforts are concerned.⁵ Taylor admitted that by Adam's fall this imperfect nature tends to sin and⁶ death. But he maintained that Adam's nature was not spoiled by the fall and was not wholly inclined to evil.⁷ His doctrine of the atonement shows that he thought of redemption as the addition of grace to nature, by which nature is raised to a higher state of being. The concept of Christ reforming our entire nature did not play a formative part in his thinking.

Taylor's great insistence in retaining man's nature from being totally involved in Adam's fall resulted in part from his conception of natural determinism. To say that our natures were corrupted by the fall was to make sin determinism.⁸ Since there was no absolute

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 41.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p. 330.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 184.

7. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 325.

8. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 209. See also Vol. IX, p. 50.

cure for nature we used the notion of a fallen nature as an excuse to sin, claiming that sin was a necessity of nature.¹ Taylor was anxious to maintain the complete responsibility of sin on the man who sinned now. He stressed emphatically that there is no sinful action to which we are determined. It is our own free choice that we sin.² "Truth is we intend, by laying load upon him, to excuse ourselves, and which is worse, to entertain our sins infallibly, and never to part with them, upon the pretence that they are natural, and irresistible."³ The fear of making sin a determined and necessary act partially explains why Taylor insisted on the retention of man's free-will after the fall.⁴

For Andrewes the incarnation revealed the redemption of the whole being of man.⁵ Every instant of man's life is involved in redemption and therefore must have been corrupted in the fall. The radical nature of sin is informed by the radical nature of grace. Andrewes believed that man fell totally; all that he was and all that he was meant to be. In Christ as the second Adam the total being of man is gathered up in Him.⁶ All men have an interest in Christ because in His incarnation He restores to the sons of Adam their whole nature, that is, all that Adam had at the time of his sin.⁷ As we

1. Ibid., p. 207.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 88.

3. Ibid., p. 50.

4. Ibid., p. 87.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 141.

6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 220.

7. Loc. cit.

shall see in our next chapter Andrewes did not believe in a limited atonement; the full humanity was atoned by Christ. The fall of man was not only a fall in nature; Adam had also fallen from what he was created for and this he had by promise; only as he walked according to the will of God. Not all men are restored to this second state¹ said Andrewes. All men participate in the former because the incarnation involves our common humanity but only those partake of the second who are in Christ.² Atonement is no mechanical act; Christ's act involves all men and all men are confronted with this act and called to accept it in faith. Those whom Christ calls as His children, who are incorporated into Christ, have a full interest in Him.³ This aspect of Andrewes' thought will be elaborated in the section dealing with atonement.

Taylor admitted that Adam's fall brought sin into the world and that in him we are all sinners.⁴ But he rejected the thought that sin was therefore inherent in us.⁵ Adam's sin was not formally ours, it was so only by imputation but not inherent in us.⁶ Original sin is only ours by imputation which leaves us still in our natural liberty though it has stripped us of our supernatural gifts.⁷ Thus by affirming that Adam's sin was ours by imputation, Taylor sought to hold each man fully responsible for sin, claiming that Adam's sin was

1. Loc. cit.

2. Ibid., p. 221.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 84.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Ibid., p. 85.

7. Ibid., p. 330.

not inherent in us. Adam's sin was reckoned to all but this does not make us guilty in the same sense as Adam.¹ Adam's sin brought sin and death into the world and the calamity of his sin passed upon us but it is for our own sin that we die.² Taylor thought of Adam's sin as the principle of evil that came into the world by his sin.³ Adam's sin is the occasion for our sin.⁴ In this respect Taylor did not involve the whole fibre of man's nature in the state of sin but relegated it to that principle which brought evil upon mankind. The corollary to this concept of sin made grace appear as a principle for good in Taylor's thought.

In explaining Rom. 5:12-14, Taylor endeavoured to show that St. Paul consciously limited the effects of Adam's fall:

By which discourse it appears, that St. Paul does not speak of all mankind, as if the evil occasioned by Adam's sin did descend for ever upon that account; but it had a limited effect, and reached only to those who were in the interval between Adam and Moses. --5

Taylor's reasoning behind this interpretation was related to the giving of the law. Until this time the full force had fallen upon mankind but once the law had been given Taylor believed that each man was judged directly for what he did himself. At almost every stage of his thought Taylor showed that he was anxious to place the full responsibility of sin on each individual man who committed sin. Taylor could not accept a radical understanding of the fall; one that vitiated the whole being of man because he felt that this would make all sin deterministic. Thus he limited the radical nature of sin but in so

1. Taylor, WORKS; Op. cit.; IX, p. 351.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p. 11.

4. Ibid., p. 85.

5. Ibid., p. 5.

doing he also limited the radical nature of God's grace.

There was another side to Taylor's thought, however, which did not attribute so prominent a place to his understanding of free-will in its relation to grace. Here we find Taylor affirming the activity of grace in bolder terms.

No disposition, or act of man, can deserve the first grace, or the grace of pardon: for so long as a man is unpardoned, he is an enemy to God, and as a dead person; and, unless he be prevented by the grace of God, cannot do a single act in order to his pardon and restitution; so that the first act which God does upon man, is so wholly his own, that the man hath nothing in it, but to entertain it; that is not to hinder the work of God upon him. --1

Taylor usually referred to the first act of God as baptism but in this particular statement Taylor thought of grace as a release from past sins and an infusion of a principle which strengthens our weakened natures to overcome sin in the future. Grace or the Spirit² is the new principle of life which produces a holy life.

For Taylor, grace as a new principle of life was an assisting power of God with which we co-operated. Grace is that which strengthens our weakened nature thus grace is the addition which had been lost. Man must always strive with the helps of grace to live the holy life. Man co-operates with God's grace. The following quotation is to the point:

But remember, that when Israel fought against Amalek, Moses' hand secured the victory, his prayer grew ineffectual when his hands were slack; to remonstrate us, that we must co-operate with the grace of God, praying devoutly, and watching carefully, and observing prudently, and labouring with diligence and assiduity. --3

-
1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 264.
 2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., III, p. 352. See also Works, op. cit., V, p. 156.
 3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 233. See also Works, op. cit., V, pp. 109, 422.

Taylor sought to preserve the natural integrity of man from the fall and therefore stressed grace in its secondary sense; that man, by the helps of grace, was able to do those things which enabled him to live in the state of grace. Taylor kept his eyes upon man and what man could do with the help of divine grace. The primary understanding of grace as the act of God for man in Jesus Christ was not Taylor's main concern. When Bishop Andrewes considered the above passage, Exodus 17:11, he emphasized not what man had to do to persevere but what God did. Andrewes stated that the uplifted hand of Moses has to be understood in the light of Jesus Christ whose hand upholds Peter, thus Peter is able to walk upon the water while Christ upholds him.¹ The comparison in the interpretation of this passage is a good indication where each man placed his emphasis.

Taylor's particular view of the fall placed him outside the main current of thought of the Carolines as formulated by Andrewes but Taylor's understanding did become normative when the rationalistic spirit of the seventeenth century penetrated the Church of England. Andrewes' doctrine of grace reflected to a greater extent the act of God in Jesus Christ while Taylor concerned himself with man's capabilities aided by grace. The incarnation signified for Andrewes that the whole nature of man is involved in redemption, from the very first instant of his creation. "To purge our sins He began this day, the first day, the day of His birth; wherein He purified and sanctified, by His holy Nativity, the original uncleanness of ours!"²

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, pp. 414, 415.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 114.

Christ purges us from our sin, which sin dwells in us and is from us
and of us. ¹ Unlike Taylor, Andrewes conceived of sin as involving
the whole structure of man which was in the state of decay through
the fall of Adam. ²

Bishop Hall did not qualify the nature of sin by limiting it
to part of man or something outside man's essential being. The whole
being of man is infected by sin and when it takes hold of one faculty
it permeates the whole man, body and soul. ³ Hall did not separate
Adam's sin from ours or make it simply imputative as did Taylor. All
mankind was in Adam in such a way that his sin is truly our sin. ⁴
Our natures are derived from the first Adam and as we sinned in him
so he lives in us. ⁵ Beveridge affirmed this also. "As a wolf begets
wolves not lambs; so a sinner begets sinners, not saints." ⁶ Taylor's
concept of sin as effecting only part of man's nature was foreign to
Hall's thought. Man does not only sin; he is a sinner, he is sin. ⁷
The old man of sin lies in the whole of our natures and therefore it
is the whole man that must be crucified. ⁸ The presence of grace in
our midst reveals to us the presence of sin in us. It is God's grace
that establishes the tension and the unquietness in man. ⁹

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 316.
 2. Ibid., p. 314.
 3. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 386.
 4. Ibid., p. 607.
 5. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 133.
 6. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 270.
 7. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 140.
 8. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 386.
 9. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 44.

Our own natures cannot reveal the presence of sin in us because nature which is sinful only agrees with itself.¹ Grace reveals sin and it is in the depths of our sin that the grace of God is seen most clearly; just as light is best seen in darkness.² The grace of God finds all men sinful. All men are equally without the possibility of God's grace by nature.³ We cannot look to man in the matter of redemption from sin for man possesses nothing which does not have to be redeemed itself. Man's state of sin is made different only by God's grace and calling.⁴

Bishop Bull's concept of the creation of man did not differ essentially from Taylor's. Bull claimed that man was first created in a natural perfection and in himself represented the likeness and image of God.⁵ The natural perfection of man consisted in man's intellectual powers, in his liberty of will and in his dominion over the created order.⁶ This natural foundation of man represented for Bull, as it did for Taylor, the essence of manness which was intrinsic to the make up of all men. Man in this natural state of perfection was not capable of a heavenly end, said Bull. To think that Adam in that natural state of perfection could attain the reward of heavenly perfection was the basis for Pelagianism which affirmed that man, endowed with natural perfections such as free-will, could on the strength of his natural powers reach the ultimate goal for which he was created. Bull's intention in articulating this particular doctrine of creation was, like Taylor's, an effort to show that their doctrine was free

1. Loc. cit.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p. 161.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Bull, op. cit., p. 489.

6. Ibid., p. 488.

from Pelagianism but it had the exactly opposite effect.

In order that Adam might attain to the goal for which he was created Bull believed that God endowed naturally perfected man with supernatural gifts; gifts of grace infused by the Spirit of God.¹ That part of the divine image which was related to the spiritual gifts of man was conceived by Bull to be immortality, grace, holiness and righteousness.² These gifts related man more closely to the likeness of God and the divine image was principally reflected in these graces.³ Therefore, it was in these gifts that the spiritual perfection of man consisted.⁴ In granting these gifts to Adam God ushered him into the covenant of grace in which he was able by his supernatural grace to attain his heavenly goal. Before Adam fell he possessed a natural innocence and rectitude and the gifts of grace by which he could fulfill the conditions of the covenant of grace and so attain his destiny. Bull termed this covenant, one of grace, because it was only by the gifts of grace superadded to the nature of Adam that he was able to carry out the conditions of the covenant. Apart from the grace so added to his natural perfection Adam he could never have been brought into the state of grace whereby he could attain to his heavenly reward. Adam perfectly represented in himself the Divine Image of God and to this natural perfection of his nature were added the perfections of grace.⁵ The implications of this doctrine of creation and the fall have massive ramifications in the doctrine of atonement and change the nature of

1. Bull, op. cit., p. 456.

2. Ibid., p. 488.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., p. 456.

5. Bull, op. cit., p. 489.

grace in its biblical understanding when these implications are theologically thought through. The fact is that they were not so thought out, but there were enough vibrations from such thinking which did in effect shift the ground of grace from its biblical foundations. Bull's doctrine of creation by-passed the Reformation understanding and lodged in the Medieval synthesis of an Aristotelian hierarchical structure of creation.

Bishop Bull worked out his doctrine of the fall in the framework of a dual perfection of creation. When Adam disobeyed the command of God he violated the covenant of grace and his fall was a fall from grace. Adam lost the supernatural gifts which God had bestowed upon him; he lost the hope of attaining the end for which he was created, the possession of heaven and the covenant of grace by which he could have reached his goal. When Adam fell, said Bull, he lost the whole complexion of supernatural grace. In the state of his integrity Adam had the grace of divine knowledge and this he lost through his sin. Like Taylor, Bull maintained that man was stripped only of extrinsic gifts, supernatural grace. Man lost his original righteousness which consisted of such grace but his natural perfection remained intact. That dimension of the divine image which was constituted by grace superadded to nature was defaced and blotted out¹ by man's transgression.

Only part of man's essential nature fell; his natural integrity was not involved in sin. That dimension of the divine image which was natural to man was not lost by Adam when he fell; Adam

1. Ibid., p. 488.

never lost that part of the divine image which was essential to his
manness.¹ Fallen man still remained man; he never lost his intel-
lectual power or liberty of will. Though one part of the divine
image is totally defaced the natural part of the divine image is
never wholly blotted out or extinguished but remains even in fallen
man.² Bull maintained that man never ceases to be man even though
he is fallen man. It must be added, however, that the retention of
man's natural perfection by Bull was a static state; an inherent
part of man rather than a continuation of God's absolute grace. In
asserting the divine image of man after the fall Bull looked to man
rather than to God's sustaining love.

Though Bull maintained the natural integrity of man after the
fall he asserted in the strongest terms that the natural man could
not possibly redeem himself. The retention of man's natural integrity
was not looked upon by Bull as worthy of God's redemptive grace. The
only worthiness that man had of heavenly glory was a deep and pro-
found sense of his utter unworthiness of it.³ In Adam's complete
integrity, both natural perfection and supernatural grace, he had
union with God and the bond of that union was the Divine Spirit.⁴
The essence of man's restoration to union with God necessitated that
the divine grace and the operation of the Holy Spirit be given to
fallen man.⁵ The act of redemption was simply an addition to the
natural perfection of man. By God's grace and the gift of the Holy
Spirit man was able to perform those things which pertain to eternal
life.⁶ Bull's concept of the creation and fall of man very definitely

1. Bull, op. cit., p. 488.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p. 173.

4. Ibid., p. 495.

5. Ibid., p. 503.

6. Ibid., p. 502.

conditioned his doctrine of grace: grace is an assisting and enabling aid. The emphasis on the grace of God was based on the understanding of grace as a co-operating aid which was added to nature rather than the creation of a new creature in Christ.

This pattern of thought was quite prevalent among the Caroline theologians and its most forceful exponent was probably Bishop Taylor. Without a radical understanding of the fall a radical doctrine of grace is impossible. The movement of course should be the other way; a radical concept of grace reveals the depths of man's depravity. However, when Bull and Taylor articulated their doctrine of the fall in a form which modified the radicalness of sin the doctrine of grace was in turn modified, making it an aid added to the natural man by which he is strengthened to do those things above his natural abilities. Fallen man, who still retains his free-will is called upon to accept the grace of God that by co-operating with grace he might be enabled to perform the conditions of the new covenant. The emphasis on this understanding of grace is concerned with man's activity rather than the activity of God in Jesus Christ. The tenacious retention of the free-will of man by Taylor and Bull was partially a reaction to the hyper-Calvinists and their claim of irresistible grace interpreted as a rigid arbitrary decree imposed on man.

The perversion of Calvin's doctrine of reprobation by the extremists in the Calvinist school had its effect on many of the Caroline bishops. By placing the same stress on the sovereignty of God's will in reprobation that Calvin had placed on predestination some Calvinists tended to make God appear as the author of sin. This is what Peter Heylin objected to in the Calvinist's position but he mistakenly

attributed this perversion to Calvin himself. He interpreted the Calvinists to mean that man was forced to sin by the will of God¹ thus making sin an inevitable determinism forced upon man. Heylin's quote from the Iliad reveals that he thought of Calvin's doctrine of sin as determinism from the side of God: "It was not I that did it but the Gods and Destiny."² The implication of this quote could have been directed against many of the Calvinists but Heylin certainly misunderstood Calvin on this issue. Calvin definitely placed the responsibility for man's sin on man himself,³ though keeping it within the bounds of the sovereignty of God's will. The fiery Bishop Mountague also took issue with the Calvinists on the question of sin in its relation to the sovereignty of God. He maintained that man was not determined to sin against his will.⁴ Mountague, in opposition to the Calvinists, placed the entire weight of sin on man's free choice without keeping sin itself within the bounds of God's sovereignty. This was Taylor's tendency also but Taylor had some reservations to make on his position of reprobation to which we shall shortly refer.

Bishop Taylor's thought was anything but consistent regarding his doctrine of sin and the nature of man's free-will. At times he seemed to be of the opinion that man could completely determine all

1. Heylin, Peter, The Historical and Miscellaneous Tracts (London: Printed by M. Clark, for Charles Harper at the Flower-d-lace over against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleetstreet, 1681), pp. 520,521,522.

2. Heylin, op. cit., p. 507.

3. Calvin, op. cit., 2:16:3. "For howsoever we be sinners by our own fault, yet we may remain his creatures. Howsoever we have purchased death to ourselves, yet he made us unto life."

4. Mountague, Appello Caesarem, op. cit., p. 68.

his actions by the use of his free-will. He claimed at such moments¹ that it was as easy for man to cease from sinning as it was to sin. In certain sections of his works he vigorously denied that man's nature was sinful, tending to sin, but on other occasions he asserted that sin is made necessary to the natural man because his nature had been weakened by the fall and it would continue so as long as his nature remained unregenerated.² He thought it best to add that any corruption of nature did not excuse our sins or render us innocent of them.³ This was always close to the forefront of his concerns; nature was not so corrupt as to make sin a natural necessity which in turn excused man from responsibility for sin. He elaborated his position further:

Natural corruption can make us a criminal, but not innocent; for though by him that willingly abide in the state of mere nature, sin cannot be avoided, yet no man is in that state longer than he loves to be so; for the grace of God came to rescue us from this evil position, and is always present to give us a new nature, and create us over again: and, therefore, though sin is made necessary to the natural man by his impotency and fond loves, that is by his unregenerate nature; yet in the whole constitution of affairs, God hath more than made it up by his grace, if we make use of it. —4

Taylor stated his position clearly here; sin was always man's choice for he generally thought that even the unregenerate could leave his state of unregeneracy simply by willing it by his free-will and thus make use of God's free grace.

As a rule Taylor was prepared to consider that there was no

-
1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 88.
 2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 249.
 3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 249.
 4. Ibid., p. 249.

necessity involved in the will of fallen man. The tension implied in Beveridge's understanding of a 'Willing Necessity' with regard to the will was decidedly missing in Taylor's thought. The will for Taylor was equally ready to will evil or good and it was just as much in the power of man to lift his hands in prayer as it was to lift them against his brother in quarrel.¹ In fact Taylor thought there was a greater affinity between the will and a virtuous object than an evil act.² There was little to suggest in such remarks any indication anything of an internal willing necessity to evil imposed by the will of fallen man or little indication that Taylor saw God's will as the primary activity in the acceptance of grace or in the continuation of sin. Generally Taylor placed the entire emphasis of both on man's free-will.

This statement is abundantly substantiated by Taylor's writings and must be pointed out as a dominant stress in his thought. However, once we have said this, it must be added that Taylor made qualifications to this understanding in some of his other works. There is, in fact, an incipient doctrine of predestination and reprobation to be found in Taylor's thought though it was not formative in his concept of either grace or sin. He attributed the first motions of grace, as he termed it, to come solely from God.

For unless God, by his preventing grace, should first work the first part of our pardon, even without any disposition of our own to receive it, we could not desire a pardon, nor hope for it nor work towards it, nor ask it, nor receive it. —3

-
1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 303.
 2. Loc. cit.
 3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 211.

When Taylor spoke of grace in this manner he placed the complete stress on God as the gracious giver. He called this movement of grace 'a great forwardness of forgiving' because it is God's mercy that gives the pardon, the way to find it, the hand to receive it, the eye to search it and the heart to desire it. ¹ At such times Taylor kept his concern centred on God and not man; the movement of grace and the 'first work' is completely from God. Taylor was not consistent in this formulation of grace, however, for after the 'first work' of grace his concern was centred on man. This becomes most obvious in his doctrine of the atonement.

Taylor also noted that not every man was given the grace of God and he contrasted the two states that men were placed in by the gift of grace on the one hand and the state of reprobation on the other.

This giving of preventing grace is a mercy of forgiveness contrary to that severity, by which some desperate persons are given over to a reprobate sense; that is a leaving of men to themselves, so that they cannot pray effectually, not desire holily, nor repent truly, nor receive any of those mercies which God designed so plentifully, and the Son of God purchased so dearly for us. —2

In his concept of reprobation Taylor moved the stress from God to man but he retained the sovereignty of God's will in this state. It is God who gives them over to a reprobate mind. Taylor did not conceive of the 'desperate persons' as being created for sin but since they persisted in it they were 'given over to a reprobate sense'. The sovereignty of the will of God was retained in this concept of reprobation but the stress was correctly placed on the 'desperate persons'.

1. Ibid., p. 212.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 212. See also Carleton, op. cit., p. 18. Carleton upheld Calvin's doctrine of reprobation at the Dort Synod and Taylor's understanding on this matter is very similar to his.

This is probably the best articulation of the relation of sin and grace that can be found in Taylor's thinking and one which placed him close to the main stream of Caroline thought.

The particular doctrine of the fall that MacColl had in mind when he wrote his account of the Restoration Settlement at the turn of the last century was the one articulated by Taylor and Bull. MacColl exalted it over a radical doctrine of the fall and was very critical of the Reformers who maintained that man's whole nature was corrupted. "They taught," said MacColl, speaking of the Reformers, "that the Fall vitiated human nature at the very core, making it altogether corrupt, so that God could find nothing in it but what was abominable and hateful."¹ It is most regrettable that MacColl should have continually stressed that the Caroline doctrine stood in opposition to Reformed thought; unfortunate because it was not true. Even Bull and Taylor never held that there was anything in man that was worthy of God's grace.

MacColl had failed to understand that Calvin's doctrine of a radical fall was thought out from the doctrine of grace.² The reason why Calvin and the Reformed Church could speak of sin in radical terms hinged on the concept of the radical nature of God's grace in Jesus Christ. The grace of God for Calvin was the total self-giving of God in Jesus Christ and in Him there is a new creation. Because Calvin spoke of grace in total terms he was compelled to speak of man's depravity in similar terms.³ Calvin's doctrine of sin did not annihilate

1. MacColl, op. cit., p. 46.

2. T. F. Torrance, Calvin's Doctrine of Man (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), pp. 83, 85.

3. Torrance, Calvin's Doctrine of Man, op. cit., pp. 83, 85.

man for he saw that God still upheld and redeemed man from the very depths of sin and this understanding is an essential part of grace. However, unlike Bull and Taylor, Calvin looked to God and not to man for the retention of the divine image: "But because the Lord will not loose that which is his in us, he find¹eth yet somewhat that he of his goodness may love." The love of God is grounded in 'his goodness' and not in a goodness in man.

We do not find in Bishop Andrewes' works anything like a complete doctrine of sin but there is ample evidence in his concept of the incarnation and redemption to show that he regarded Christ as totally redeeming every instant of man's life. Andrewes saw that the Scriptural emphasis of the conception and birth of Christ revealed that Christ redeemed every stage of man's existence, even in its embryonic form. If such full redemption is necessary it shows most clearly that all of man is corrupted by sin.

We have already noted that Andrewes considered the fall of Adam as a two-fold total fall.² Andrewes did not retain the free-will in man after the fall.³ Nothing that is good grows in the flesh of man, grace comes from outside of man.⁴ Man's fall is away from God and there is no ability in fallen man to turn to God.⁵ If God should say to us, "Turn to Me, and I will turn to you, we must pray, Convert Thou us, O Lord, and we shall be converted."⁶

-
1. Calvin, op. cit., 2: 16: 3.
 2. See pages 108, 110, 111.
 3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 57.
 4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 313.
 5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 318.
 6. Loc. cit.

Andrewes kept the stress of our conversion and salvation on God. We must pray to God for our conversion but even here the emphasis was on God's initiative: no man can pray without the Spirit of God.¹ God's love comes to man not in his goodness but in his sin. God reaches to the very depths of sin to redeem man for God for-² gives the very worst that man can do - the murdering of Christ. Sin reached its utter bounds in the crucifixion of Christ and this act showed the superabounding of God's grace. Andrewes held sin and grace in this tension. In all our sin God shows us His grace. Behold, said Andrewes, "He, even He, that God from whom we thus fall, depart, revolt, reacheth His hand to them that fall, turneth not away from them that turn to Him, is ready to receive to grace them, even them that rebelled against Him."³ It is only when we see what Paul saw that grace superabounds over sin can we dare speak of sin in absolute, radical terms.

The tendency in the thought of Bull and Taylor was to regard sin as a deficiency of grace and this concept gave sin an appearance of a negative state. They err, said Bishop Davenant, a Dort participant, who say that original sin is nothing more than a defect of grace.⁴ Davenant affirmed that the essence of sin was sin against the majesty of God; a positive act.⁵ Downname also

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 351.

2. Ibid., p. 99.

3. Ibid., p. 318

4. John Davenant, An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians (London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1831), I, p. 455.

5. Ibid., p. 237.

stressed the positive nature of sin. Original sin, he said, is in all men by nature and is not only a privation of all spiritual goodness but it is also an evil disposition and proneness to all manner of sin.¹ Thus sin is not simply an absence of good but a positive attack upon God. "For by our sinnes we nayled CHRIST upon the CROSSE; by our sinnes we pierced the precious body of JESUS CHRIST: we are the men that crucified our blessed Saviour."² Bishop Beveridge was also of this mind. Man's nature is now averse from good and inclined to evil as it was before averse to evil and inclined to good.³ The entire nature of man and his destiny is inverted by sin.

When Adam lived in original righteousness, said Davenant, the rectitude of the whole man was to God.⁴ The original righteousness of Adam comprehended the spiritual life of the mind.⁵ The mind of man before the fall had perfect illumination and man's whole being was in harmony with the knowledge and will of God.⁶ The mind of man was in perfect accord with the will of God and all the faculties of man were in perfect subjection to the mind. When man sinned he sinned against the face of God whose brightness he reflected, then the illumination of the mind was darkened and the will of man, no longer reflecting the glory of God was left a

1. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 146.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 266.

4. John Davenant, A Treatise on Justification (London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co., 1844), I, p. 100.

5. Ibid., p. 101.

6. Ibid., p. 100.

¹
blind faculty. The terribleness and in fact the reality of sin is seen in God's judgment against sin; death is pronounced upon man by God. The sentence of death is by divine ordination² and it is spiritual, actual and eternal death.

Though Taylor came under much criticism from his contemporaries for his concept of sin and we must continue to be critical of some aspects of his writings, nevertheless, Taylor came very close to seeing the true nature of man's fall when he pointed out that the sin of Adam damned him to the eternal loss of the sight of God's glorious face.³ But unfortunately Taylor did not press this understanding in a positive manner. He said that original sin damned us only to this loss. Taylor did not see as clearly the significance of this deprivation as did Davenant, who pointed out that this was precisely the loss for all mankind. There could be no greater loss for it meant separation from the source of man's light and life. Taylor again came close to seeing that man reflected the image of God when he was allowed to gaze on the glorious face of God. Man no longer reflected the image of God when he was damned to the loss of the sight of God's face. Davenant saw the implications of this very clearly but Taylor did not. Undoubtedly Taylor's doctrine of sin would have been different had he asserted this understanding in more positive terms and hence his doctrine of grace would have shared more vitally in the person of Christ; it would have been more Christological.

1. Ibid., p. 100.

2. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 451.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 12.

Taylor believed that man, though not really depraved in nature, could not regain by himself what he had lost in Adam. His natural inheritance had been too weakened by sin, that is, the loss of supernatural grace. Something had to be done for man.

I deny not, but all persons naturally are so, that they cannot arrive at heaven; but unless some other principle be put into them, or some great grace done for them, must stand forever separate from seeing the face of God. --1

Taylor considered this 'great grace' as the cross of Christ by which event Christ purchased grace and gave it to the believer that it might be for him a new principle of life. The act of the cross was accidentally occasioned by the sin of Adam.² But this grace was thought of in quantum terms and as an addendum to nature. This was the principle of new life. Taylor called this the state of regeneration, where nature is infused with a new principle or nature by the Spirit of God.³ The concept of renovation in Taylor's thought was in terms of an addition to nature but his insistence that the nature of man was not really corrupted by the fall prevented him from formulating his doctrine of grace as a thorough recreation in Jesus Christ.

Davenant stated that by the fall of Adam mankind was plunged into a state of spiritual death, having lost the image of God in which he was created.⁴ The divine grace which was the soul the very life of life itself, was withdrawn from man and its place

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 13.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., pp. 33, 41.

4. Davenant, Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 450.

was taken by sin.¹ Davenant thought of divine grace as essentially union with God and the fall of Adam was the death of grace which dissolved the union.² In the fall of man all the faculties of the soul suffered the loss of the perfect rectitude to God.³ When man turned himself away from the light of his life and life of his life it was as if, said Davenant, man had turned away from the sun. The mind lost its light when Adam fell and it became buried in thick darkness.⁴ Man's will can no longer turn itself to the light of God's glorious face because it is blind. Man lost the original rectitude and his will is no longer conformable to God's will.⁵ In fallen man the will was no longer deprived of its original rectitude but now it was filled with perversity.⁶ The mind therefore does not reflect the will of God but in its place it wills evil. Original sin is not only a privation of truth but a positive hatred of truth as well.⁷

Davenant's concept of the fall clearly indicates that he thought of the fall in radical terms; man was totally involved in sin. In fallen man the will has an aversion to God the creator and His will for man.⁸ Original sin robbed the mind of any true

1. Loc. cit.

2. Ibid., p. 451.

3. Davenant, A Treatise on Justification, op. cit., I, p. 100.

4. Davenant, Colossians, op. cit., I, pp. 453, 451.

5. Davenant, A Treatise on Justification, op. cit., I, pp. 118, 126.

6. Davenant, Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 453.

7. Davenant, A Treatise on Justification, op. cit., I, p. 101.

8. Ibid., p. 102.

knowledge of God and the human mind is out of harmony with the
divine will.¹ The harmony which existed between the will of
man and his own faculties was destroyed when the primary harmony
between God and man was destroyed by sin: man is at war with
himself. In the act of sin the control of the mind was upset
and the inferior faculties shook off the authority of the mind,
bound reason and lead the will captive.² All of man is involved
in the state of sin and in this state he is utterly helpless.
It was useless to talk of free-will toward salvation because the
will has lost its rectitude and can no longer turn to God.³ Sin
has filled the understanding of the mind with darkness so that
man can not know the things of God. The will is depraved and
does not will the mind of God but rather its own will which is
filled with darkness and perversity. Unless the mind is again
formed to the life of grace by God it continually turns from God
to evil.⁴

Bishop Pearson's understanding on this issue was similar
to Davenant's though it lacked adequate formulation. At no time
did Pearson seek to retain the wholeness of man's free-will. Man's
will was turned away from the will of God and only God by His Holy
Spirit could reform man's will: "For our natural corruption con-
sisting in an aversion of our wills, and a depravation of our
affections, an inclination of them⁵ to the will of God is wrought
within us by the Spirit of God." Pearson very forcibly stressed
the utter seriousness of sin by showing the position that man was

1. Ibid., p. 116

2. Ibid., p. 102.

3. Davenant, Colossians, op. cit., I, pp. 453, 454.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Pearson, op. cit., p. 577.

in had Christ come only to reveal and judge our sin. Sin placed man in a fearful state:

We must confess that we have all sinned, and there is not any sin which we have committed but deserves the sentence of death; we must acknowledge that the best of our actions bear no projection to eternity, and can challenge no degree of that weight of glory; and therefore in a judgment, as such, there can be nothing but a fearful expectation of eternal misery, and an absolute despair of everlasting happiness. --1

All men are defiled by the corruption of their nature and the pollution of their sin. ² Pearson stressed the incarnation to show that God incarnate fulfilled the relationship of obedience to the will of God which the first Adam had violated. The incarnation was the unfolding of the drama of the atonement in which man's whole being was reformed after the image of the Son. The sinless God comes in our sinful flesh and His death is propitious for He is not worthy of death. This aspect will be elaborated in our next section.

Taylor's understanding of the relation of the will to sin and grace differed considerably from Bishop Davenant's. Taylor abstracted the relation of the will from its rectitude to the will of God because he interpreted it in moral terms. He considered the law of the mind as an inherent structure of law which governed the moral behaviour of man. The law of the mind is the law of nature and right reason

which had been so rased and obliterate, and we, by some means or other, so disabled from observing it exactly, that until it was turned into the law of grace, (which is the law of pardoning infirmities, and assisting us in our choices and elections,) we were in a state of deficiency from the perfect state of man, to which God intended us. --3

1. Ibid., p. 538.

2. Ibid., p. 577.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, Preface, XIVIII.

Taylor conceived of the law of the mind as the perfect law of God which Adam knew before the fall but which was defaced when he fell. But Taylor also thought that man was now unable to keep this law of God because he had been divested of supernatural grace. The redemption of the law of the mind was Christ Himself in Taylor's understanding who perfected and restored the first law, the law of the mind and by the assistance of grace it was now reduced into a law of holy living.¹ Man, by the assistance of grace is now able to keep this renewed law of the mind. Taylor again refused to implicate the whole nature of man in the state of sin; the law of the mind, as an inherent structure is restored in man by Christ and it is now capable of being fulfilled by grace. Taylor's concept of sin, for which he was severely criticized by his fellow bishops, and his doctrine of grace would not allow for a thorough understanding of the biblical concept of the atonement.

Bishop Davenant retained the tension between grace and sin² even in the regenerate. Original sin was not only the loss of original righteousness but the loss of the knowledge of God and this knowledge is not perfectly restored even in the baptized. Davenant did not conceive of baptismal grace as did Bellarmine the Roman apologist; while holding that baptism perfectly remits original sin Davenant did not conceive of baptismal grace as simply a cutting away of original sin.³ Davenant thought of baptismal

1. Loc. cit.

2. Davenant, A Treatise on Justification, op. cit. I, pp.104,111,ff.

3. Ibid, p. 107.

grace as a saving and sanctifying grace rather than simply onto-
logical grace.¹ Perfect rectitude is never completely restored;
the will of the regenerate is not exactly conformable to the divine
will.² However, man though a sinner is by grace recognized by God
as righteous. This was the tension between sin and grace; it was
a state in which the redeemed lived. From the side of God man
stands as righteous in the sight of God in Jesus Christ, but this
righteousness can never be arrogated to man's own being. The
eschatological dimension of grace is minimized in an ontological
doctrine of grace which tends to relegate grace to essence. There
were two aspects in Caroline thought which placed the doctrine of
grace into its proper eschatological framework; first by relating
grace to both the backward and forward movement of the atonement
and secondly by sustaining the tension between sin and grace. The
first aspect will be elaborated in the following chapter. The
second, which of course cannot be separated from the first, will
be considered now.

In maintaining the tension between sin and grace Davenant,
while stressing the completed act of salvation, insisted that there
is always a lack of perfect love in the regenerate for God.³ He
quoted Augustine on this matter and agreed with him that perfect
love in the will is not actualized in the regenerate while on
earth.⁴ Davenant, with Augustine, referred to this state of grace
for the regenerate as the militant one.⁵ The eschatological

1. Ibid., p. 108.

2. Ibid., pp. 118, 122, 126.

3. Ibid., p. 120.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Loc. cit.

character of grace is to be seen at once in the fulness of this life, still under the shadow of the cross, and as triumphant in heaven as the fulness of glory. But both the militant and triumphant forms are but dimensions of the one grace of our Lord. Davenant rejected Bellarmine's concept of regeneration which stated that in the regenerate sin is utterly cut away and that now there is proneness or tendency to sin but that this is not really sin.¹ Davenant maintained that since the will lacked perfect rectitude to God's will there were contrary motions in our will so that it does not reflect the perfect will of God.² The will in this world continues to strive against itself.³ Davenant did not limit the completeness of the grace of Christ but his doctrine of grace allowed him to say at once that man was already justified in Christ but that in the militant state of grace he waited for the consumation of his redemption. Bishops Downname and Beveridge were exactly of this mind.

The tension between sin and grace which Davenant was able to maintain gave Taylor considerable difficulty. On this issue Taylor stood closer to Rome than he did to the Caroline tradition. He, like Bellarmine, considered concupisence to mean only a tendency to sin but not sin itself. Taylor was brought under severe criticism for his interpretation of the Ninth Article of Faith. Even in answering his critics he continued to perpetuate his error. He declared "that it is one thing to say a thing in its own nature

1. Ibid., pp. 105, 109.

2. Ibid., p. 121.

3. Loc. cit.

deserves damnation; and another to say, it is damnable to all those persons, in whom, it is subjected." ¹ Taylor was prepared to affirm the former, that is, the perpetual lusting of the flesh against the Spirit deserves damnation and the wrath of God but Taylor would never fully acknowledge that man's nature was precisely that which lusted against the Spirit. He was prepared to say that nature tended toward sin but not that nature itself was sinful. Taylor did not stand fully with the Ninth Article because he distinguished too sharply between concupiscence and the nature of sin. The Council of Trent had done exactly that and thus its interpretation of sin at this point disagreed with the English Article. ² Part of Taylor's failure to understand this article properly arose from the fact that whereas the article spoke of the nature of sin itself, Taylor always thought of sins — actual moral lapses. "He that says, every sin is damnable, and deserves the anger of God, says true; but yet some persons that sin of mere infirmity, are accounted by God in the rank of innocent persons." ³ Taylor failed to see that all moral actions, good and bad, proceeded from persons who were sinful by nature.

Taylor realized that there were contrary motions in the regenerate man but he never attributed to these motions the nature of sin. These motions were the concupiscence in man but they were not sin in themselves. Taylor saw, only in a negative way, the

-
1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VIII, Preface, CCLIV.
 2. Browne, op. cit., p. 252.
 3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VIII, Preface, CCLV.

subtlety of sin but he did not affirm it to be really true.

Some men tell us that every natural inclination to a forbidden object is a sin; which they that believe finding them to be natural, do also confess that such sins are unavoidable. But if these natural and first motions be sins, then a man sins, whether he prevails or prevails not, and here is no difference but this, - he that fights not against, but yields to his desires, sins greatest; and he that never yields but fights always, sins oftenest. But then by this reckoning, it will indeed be impossible to avoid millions of sins, because the very doing of our duty does suppose a sin. If God should impute such first desires to us as sins, we were all very miserable; but if he does not impute them, let us trouble ourselves no further about them, but to take care that they never prevail upon us. Thus men are taught, that they never say their prayers but they commit a sin. Indeed that is true but too often; but yet it is possible for us by the grace of God, to please him in saying our prayers, and to be accepted of him. --1

Thus in a negative way Taylor saw that man lived in a state of sin but it was a concept which he repudiated. To have affirmed it in the proper tension with grace would have enabled Taylor to say that the whole life of man stands in need of redemption; even man's goodness must be forgiven. But Taylor's doctrine of grace and sin would not allow him to affirm such a radical tension.

Taylor showed even more clearly that he had failed to keep sin and grace in tension when he interpreted St. Paul on Rom. 7:19. This particular passage was a reference by the Apostle to the time before he was in a state of grace.² Arminius had placed the same interpretation³ on this passage. Bishop Carleton had retained the tension between sin and grace, affirming that this was a reference

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 257.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 207.

3. Harrison, Beginnings of Arminianism, op. cit., p. 29.

to the regenerate Paul. There was a difference of opinion in this matter within the Caroline tradition but the prevalent thought within this tradition, as formulated by Andrewes, held sin and grace in tension. Such an understanding of sin and grace could affirm that in Jesus Christ sin had indeed been overcome once and for all but the militant dimension of grace in this world allowed the sinful structures of the age to remain. Thus we can say that man is righteous and yet sinner; righteous before God but waiting the redemption to which he has been sealed by the Holy Spirit.

There was a difference of opinion also on the question of free-will in fallen man among the Carolines. Hall, like Andrewes, rejected the doctrine of free-will and asserted that the Church of England was flatly opposed to it. Hall maintained that there was no power in the will of natural man to work his own conversion. Hall saw that such a doctrine divided the work of atonement between God's grace and man's free-will and it was this false doctrine which Rome upheld. Since the fall of Adam the will of natural man had no ability of itself for any act toward salvation. Like Davenant, Hall insisted that every such act could be attributed only to the grace of God and not the will of the flesh. Hall was

1. Carleton, op. cit., p. 113.

2. Eph. 1:13, 14.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 68. 4. Ibid., p. 494.

5. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 318.

6. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 492.

aware of the misunderstanding that the question of grace and free-will had caused. Though he maintained that the will was naturally inclined to evil he did not hold that grace forced or violated the will of man. God makes no covenant with the unwilling for the covenant of grace is founded on love which involves freedom. God does not force man nor does he overthrow the nature of the will but by His grace makes it work according to its essentially created nature; freely and willingly. Hall saw, as Andrewes did, that our turning to God was an act of God. The good that is willed by the will of man does not come from its own freedom, which is slavery to itself, but rather from grace.

Bishop Downname's explanation of the relation between the freedom of man's will and the necessity that it was under in fallen man did not differ essentially from Hall's. The will was not free but it was not forced externally. The freedom of the will consists in a freedom to sin. The will of fallen man is in voluntary service to evil and it was free to will evil though it could not will anything toward salvation. Until the will was freed by grace it could only be free to sin. Beveridge's explanation of the nature of the will followed this same line of thought. He maintained that man's will is free after the fall as it was free before the fall but with this difference:

-
1. Loc. cit.
 2. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 118.
 3. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p.495. See also, Works, op.cit.I., p.118.
 4. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 118.
 5. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 492.
 6. Downname, The Christian Freedom, Op. cit., p. 41.
 7. Loc. cit.
 8. Loc. cit.

Then it was free to choose the good as well as the evil; now it is free to choose the evil but not the good; then it was free from sin to holiness; now it was free from holiness to sin: then it could so refuse the evil to choose the good, and so choose the good as to refuse the evil; but now it can only so refuse the good as to choose the evil, and so choose the evil as to refuse the good. --1

Such an understanding of the freedom of the will ruled out entirely any concept of free-will toward salvation. This was stressed by Beveridge at a time when the spirit of rationalism was making inroads into the Church of England at the latter part of the seventeenth century. The Reformed doctrine was sustained therefore in the midst of Arminian acceptance.

Bishop Beveridge, perhaps more than any other Bishop, spoke most clearly on the tension between willing and necessity of the will. He saw that fallen man was placed in this state and kept there by the same sin. While Beveridge would have rejected the extreme Calvinist's abstract concept of determinism in relation to sin he nevertheless saw with great clarity the inner necessity, or willing necessity, in which fallen man found himself. This was his explanation:

For his will being itself corrupted, it cannot but choose and delight in corruption; and so it must necessarily refuse what is good and honest; which necessity doth not excuse the will, as the will does not exclude the necessity. As angels necessarily love God, and yet they love him willingly; so man willingly love to sin, and yet love it necessarily, not from any external but an internal necessity, not forced by others but allowed by himself; his own will so taken with sin that he cannot but take delight in it, and so averse from holiness that he cannot turn to it. --2

Beveridge upheld both the depravity of the will and also the re-

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 232.

2. Ibid., pp. 275, 276.

sponsibility of the will; a willing necessity. It was precisely this concept of necessity that Taylor had failed to grasp in his understanding of sin and he therefore retained free-will in fallen man thus limiting the radical nature of the fall, sin and grace.

Bishop Taylor was not alone in the misunderstanding.

Peter Heylin charged Luther with reviving the error of the Manichees by denying all freedom to the will, especially in matters pertaining to eternal salvation.¹ His charge against Luther was founded on the same evidence that constituted his attack on Calvin - he misunderstood Luther. Bishop Cosin was closer to Luther's thought on this issue as of course was Beveridge and Hall. Cosin agreed with Luther that man's free-will had become enslaved by evil.² Luther acknowledged that man had a free-will, said Cosin, but it was abused by the devil and man no longer used it correctly.³ By sinning man had fallen out of God's service which is perfect freedom and had taken the devil's freedom which is perfect slavery.⁴ In sinning against God man sided with the devil, the professed enemy of God.⁵ In the face of a denial of reformed thought Cosin, standing in the Caroline tradition of Andrewes, affirmed it.

The sin of the world which plunged the whole world into sin was not the breaking of a moral law or commandment.⁶ The eating of the fruit was not good or bad in itself but only as it was an act against the person of God. By their disobedience, declared

1. Heylin, op. cit., p. 353.

2. Cosin, Works, op. cit., I, p. 244.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Ibid., p. 222.

6. Ibid., pp. 214, 215.

Cosin, "they did as much as make an open profession that they would be none of His subjects, but renounce His power and lordship over them."¹ This was their sin and it is our sin also² because we are all branches of the infected stock of Adam. All mankind is poisoned with sin; the sin of disobedience against God's will which undid and disordered the world.³ God revealed the heinousness of sin and our contempt against Him by coming into our midst and becoming affected with our sin.⁴ Cosin saw the radical nature of sin in the witness of the gospel; that it would force God to come into our disordered world.⁵ The coming of the Word unto us full of grace and truth makes it possible for us to come to Him. Before His coming there was only wrath and men hid themselves as children who had sinned; until Christ came Adam must hide himself in the bushes.⁶ We remain children of sin and wrath until we are engrafted into Christ.⁷

Andrewes elaborated the nature of sin, as sin against God's Person, by discussing the motives why men should not sin. If we should sin no more simply because we fear the penalty of some penal law it showed we were living under the spirit of this world.⁸ Even if we now decided not to sin on consideration of sin as something brutish and against reason; or if our motives were higher and

1. Cosin, Works, op. cit. I., p. 215.

2. Ibid., p. 209.

3. Ibid., p. 210.

4. Ibid., p. 214.

5. Ibid., p. 214.

6. Ibid., p. 14. See also, D. Bonhoeffer, Ethics, (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1955), p. 145.

7. Ibid., p. 209.

8. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 198.

9. Ibid., pp. 198, 199.

we turned from sin in order to keep our souls fit for heaven, such reasons also belong to the spirit of the world. It was the spirit which blew from Aristotle's Gallery. These motives do not reveal the true nature of sin for they are but moral and philosophical motives and not theological. Andrewes stressed the theological motive. Since sin is sin against God so the reason for not sinning must be seen in God Himself.

But if with eye to God I forbear, because in so doing I shall offend Him and do evil against His Presence the awful regard to His power, the kind respect of His Bounty and Goodness; this now cometh from the Sanctuary, this wind bloweth from Heaven, this is right Sanctus indeed. —³

Bishop Hall's remarks on this subject were even more to the point. Grace takes the legal aspect out of the law, said Hall: "The grace of God preventeth our obedience: therefore should we keep the law of God, because we have a Saviour."⁴ Hall was surely right, the new creature in Christ lives the life of a new creature because he is a new creature in Christ, one who is loved and who is set free by such love to live the life of the beloved. Grace creates a new man in Christ who lives the life of grace because of grace itself and not because of any ethical considerations.

The question of sin and grace which so greatly concerned the Caroline Bishops in their discussions resolved into something like this: To what extent can man be said to be corrupted by the

1. Ibid., pp. 198, 199.

2. Ibid., p. 199.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 117.

fall without making him a determined creature who is simply acted upon by God's grace? This was certainly Taylor's problem and partially explains why he retained free-will in fallen man. By the retention of free-will Taylor sought to show that the fall of man still left man in the position where he could reject or accept sin or grace. Bishop Andrewes dismissed that view which retained man's free-will toward salvation which understanding made grace something added to the will so that it could work. ¹ The ground and the primary movement of salvation is not to be found in the will of the flesh but in the will of God. Andrewes refused to distract from God's grace by giving something to man.

It is dangerous to ascribe too little to the grace of God, for then we rob Him of His glory, but if we ascribe too little to ourselves there is no danger, for whatever we take from ourselves it cannot hinder us from being true Christians; but if we ascribe that to the strength of our own nature which is the proper work of grace, then we blemish God's glory. —2

The Reformers, in asserting that salvation was completely the work of God, did nothing more than this; we are justified by grace only. They gave the entire glory of God's grace in Jesus Christ to God. Andrewes was absolutely of this mind.

Bishop Bramhall was also concerned with the relation between sin and grace. He held that man's fall was of a radical nature and maintained that when Adam fell the image of God was defaced in man, the understanding infatuated, the will confounded and the affections disordered. ³ In place of the perfection of

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 564.

2. Ibid., p. 316. See also Calvin, op. cit., 2:2:10.

3. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 148.

the divine image sin entered and corrupted both the body and the
soul of man.¹ Sin was a hereditary infection, a spiritual lep-
rosy which could not be cured by anything in nature; there was
no natural cure for sin.² Redemption comes only from Christ,
He overcomes our sin and this redemption is ours by repentance.³
His vivid description of fallen man shows that Bramhall held a
radical view of Adam's fall. But Bramhall, like some of the
other Carolines, was concerned to illustrate that God's grace
in Jesus Christ did not ignore or violate the nature of man.

Bramhall asserted that God in Jesus Christ had decided
for man very definitely but he was insistent in maintaining at
the same time man's need to decide for Christ. Bramhall re-
peatedly affirmed that man was an active participant in receiv-
ing God's grace and was not one who was arbitrarily acted upon
by grace. "It is most true, that all grace is from God: but it
is most false, that God hath not given man a will freely to re-
ceive it freely."⁴ But Bramhall did not seek to preserve the
freedom of man's will after the fall as Taylor often claimed in
much of his writings. The freedom of the will for Bramhall was
not something retained by man after the fall but was given anew
by God. "As all grace is from God so the elective power to assent
to the motions of grace is from God likewise."⁵ There was no

1. Loc. cit.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 233.

5. Loc. cit.

suggestion of merit to be found in man because of his free-will for it was itself part of the saving grace of God and not something which man contributed to his salvation. He acknowledged that the will of man had no power to determine itself aright without the grace of God. Man was "not preserved from all sin and utter destruction by the power of his own free will, but by the special grace of God, ...Whose grace is the only fountain of ¹ salvation."

What we see in Bramhall at this point is a determination to show that the salvation of man by God is not a monologue carried on by God Himself. Bramhall did not question the fact that the entire redemptive act was God's in Jesus Christ. However, in the face of the extreme position of some of the Calvinists who stressed the atoning work of God to the point of man's exclusion, Bramhall raised the question as to man's participation in the redemptive act in Christ. "Is it God alone," he asked, referring to the repentance of a sinner, "or doth the penitent person concur also freely with the grace of God? If it be God's alone then it is His repentance, not man's repentance." ² Bramhall's question was a needed one where the hyper-Calvinists failed to properly relate the atonement to the incarnation; that in Jesus Christ God and man were totally involved in the salvation of mankind. The weakness of the Calvinists was Bramhall's weakness also. Bramhall failed to see clearly that the incarnation was the only answer to his question of man's participation in the redemptive act. Bishop Andrewes saw this with penetrating insight. It was

1. Ibid., p. 231.

2. Ibid., p. 106.

God as a singular man who made the atoning sacrifice for the sin of the whole world but in Christ as the second Adam all mankind was also involved. Because Andrewes saw this and vitally related our participation to the atoning work through baptism the question that troubled Bramhall was not a concern for Andrewes.

Bramhall never suggested that man might in any conceivable way be saved by his free-will but he wanted man's decision for Christ to be really man's decision. However, he took seriously the fact that man's decision for God was grounded on God's decision for man in Jesus Christ. Bramhall was explicit about this: "The coming unto Christ is a supernatural action, and requireth the preventing and preparing grace of God, which is called His 'Father's drawing.'¹" Though Bramhall conceived of this as the primary motion he was nevertheless anxious also to stress man's commitment at the same time. We must say, said Bramhall, that God draws us and "yet withal leaving to the will its natural freedom to elect, and will actually, and so consent to the calling² of God, that is, to determine itself by the power of grace." The emphasis here was unfortunate for it was placed on man's will. Bishop Hall's doctrine of predestination effectively placed the emphasis of election in Christ nowhere but in the will of God. Said Hall, men can resist God's grace by their free-will and those whom God has elected in Christ can resist but by His effectual and saving grace they do not resist.³ Hall's emphasis was on the will

1. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 231. 2. Ibid., pp.231, 232.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, pp.514, 515, 502, 506. See also Eph. 1: 4,5,6.

of God rather than on man's will but Hall never spoke of grace as a deterministic force.

The concept of grace as an assisting power can be seen in Bramhall's thought though he also understood grace to be much more than just a strength by which the will operated for good. Even though he rightly stressed the need for a decision by man he still saw at times that grace itself was the decision. "No man can have the actual will to believe and to be converted but by the preventing grace of God."¹ Still it was only when Bramhall vitally related grace to the person and work of Christ that he best articulated his concept of grace. Bramhall showed that by grace he understood that gracious act of God in Christ which brings us out of the nothingness into which our sin had thrown us. This was Bramhall at his best: "God's calling, and illumination, and inspiration, is not in our power, and we are brought by His grace as it were from nothing to a new being in Christ, in which respect a regenerate Christian is called 'a new creature'.²" The act of grace was here seen by Bramhall to be wholly God's but still an act which completely concerned man. The act of grace in Christ was here likened to creation ex nihilo and a new creation in Jesus Christ which is the biblical doctrine of grace.

Bishop Beveridge, standing at the end of the Caroline period, stood in the Caroline tradition which affirmed a radical doctrine of sin, that Adam's sin was truly our sin. The Scriptures are

1. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 232.

2. Loc. cit.

clear on this issue said Beveridge for they plainly show "that Adam's sin is our guilt as well as his, and that we did as really sin in him as we proceed from him."¹ God created Adam in such a way that the whole of mankind was in him.² Therefore, Adam's fall is our fall and his sin our sin. By reason of our sin in Adam the whole man is disordered and out of harmony.³ Beveridge saw that the entire structure of man's life was deranged. Man's nature is corrupted and the devil has set enmity between man and God and man and man.⁴ Man's nature was distorted by the fall. Before the fall of Adam man's nature was opposed to evil and inclined to good but sin had so deformed the nature of man that now he was in the state of rejecting the good and inclining to evil.⁵ Everything that man does partakes of his corrupted nature so that there is nothing we do which is acceptable or well pleasing to God in itself.⁶

Beveridge stressed, as did Davenant, that sin was not a negative state; not simply not loving God but in fact hating God; not only not hating our sin but loving our evil.⁷ Though Beveridge saw the terribleness of sin in man he saw the real depth of sin by seeing the price God had to pay for our sin. So great is sin that no sacrifice less than the Lamb of God Himself could make atonement for us.⁸ It was in the atonement that grace revealed

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 267.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 347. 3. Ibid., p. 301.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 344. See also, Works, op. cit. III, p. 413.

5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 266. 6. Loc. cit.

7. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 152. 8. Ibid., p. 279.

the nature of sin and Beveridge saw this clearly. He continued to hold sin and grace in tension. The second Adam is the correlary to the first, said Beveridge. All mankind was brought into a cursed state by the fall of the first Adam but God to show His mercy and truth raised up a second Adam for our salvation. ¹ It was only in Christ, the second Adam, that God has promised us grace. ² He saw the act of Adam's sin met by the act of God's grace. The promise of our redemption was made to us "the same day that Adam fell, Christ was looked upon as existing at the same time because what God saith shall be, is as certain as if it already was." ³ The promise of grace was therefore not an afterthought on the part of God, it belonged to His very nature. Because this promise of grace was given by God in His Word and God's promise is as good as His Word Christ is referred to as the Lamb slain from the foundations of the world. ⁴ In this way Beveridge saw that it was the same grace of Jesus Christ which was given to the people of the Old Testament.

The goodness of God to Adam was seen by Beveridge as consisting in the whole creation and man in particular. The infinite guilt of Adam's sin arose from the fact that it was against God; the infinite God. ⁵ The judgment pronounced by God against sin was death. This judgment was of an infinite nature because it was pronounced by the infinite God. But Beveridge discerned in God's wrath the infinite love of God who of His own infinite grace

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 344. 2. Ibid., p.349.
3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 258. 4. Ibid., p.259.
5. Ibid., p. 413.

promised another Adam to redeem. Beveridge held God's grace and judgment together. Pearson also held these two together. There is no incongruity in this, said Pearson, "that a Father should be offended with that Son which he loveth, and at that time¹ offended with him when he loveth him."

The doctrine of the second Adam is extremely important in Pauline thought and its significance for Beveridge is marked in his writings. The second Adam took upon Himself the nature of man as fully and wholly as it was in the first Adam and thus sanctified the nature of man.² In so assuming our nature Christ reaches back fully to the first Adam and gathers up all the years that the locusts have eaten. Beveridge's understanding of the incarnation at this point closely resembles Andrewes' thought. Sin at the very source is overcome for us by Christ who in our nature works out the perfect obedience to God. The sin of man was seen by Beveridge as consisting in the first Adam whereas the grace of God was revealed and brought into being by the second, Jesus Christ.

Beveridge's language on the nature of sin very definitely reveals that he thought of the fall of Adam in radical terms. It is also quite apparent that Beveridge measured the fall of Adam, not by a human measurement but rather by an eternal one; by the grace of God. Beveridge saw the absoluteness of man's sin on the cross and the crucifixion of Christ revealed to him also the lengths that God went in order to overcome our sin. It was to

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 639. See also Calvin, op. cit., 2:16:4.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, pp. 413, 414.

the cross, therefore, that Beveridge pointed to show the terrible-
ness of man's sin and the wonderousness of God's grace in Jesus
Christ. The liberty is taken to quote this lengthy and moving
passage:

Behold and see what your sins have done, what they have
done to Me the Eternal Son of God, the Only-begotten of the
Father! See what scorn and contempt they have brought upon
Me, what spittle they have thrown in My face, what gashes
they have made in My head, what wounds in My hands and feet,
what blood and sweat over My whole body! And yet, alas! All
that you can see is nothing in comparison of what I feel; I
feel the wrath of God, the wrath of My Father, and all that
fury and vengeance which is due to your sins; it all now cen-
tres in Me. Oh, the fire now kindled in My heart! enough
to burn up ten thousand such as you to nothing. How doth
it flame and spread itself over My whole man! My throat is
dry My heart is faint, 'my soul is sorrowful unto death.'
What a lead is now upon Me! What a burden do I now bear!
No less than the sin of the whole world! A burden so great,
so heavy, so greivous to be borne, that I Myself should sink
under it, but that I am supported by My Almighty Power and
Godhead. Oh but that you could look into My heart, that you
did know what pain and anguish, what horror and confusion,
I there suffer for your sins! How would it grieve you to the
heart! And yet all this is not enough neither; for nothing
less than death, than My death, will satisfy My Father for
your sins: so that either I must die now, or else you must
die for ever. And therefore behold My love; rather than that
you should die eternally, I Myself for your sakes give up the
ghost, and die. --1

In this passage Beveridge painted a most vivid picture of
the absolutely appalling character of our sin. He showed clearly
the direction of sin; sin is directed against the heart of God.
In the drama of salvation Beveridge saw that the eternal Christ
had placed Himself at the very centre of our life that He might
take the full judgment of God against sin upon Himself. This
was God's mighty act of grace. This was God acting graciously
to sinful man. This was Jesus Christ, the incarnate God, full of

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 186.

grace from whom we receive. God, against whom we have sinned bears our sin; the full guilt and punishment of our sin in all its terribleness falls upon Him. The offended takes the place of the offender. Here is real substitution. As we have seen Beveridge's doctrine of the Trinity reveals that God's grace in the sending of His beloved Son is a complete self-giving of God. God accepts the judgment that He has made upon sin and Himself pays the penalty of man's sin. Beveridge's description of the cross showed the absolute limits that sin had gone but the cross also revealed that God's grace went beyond the bounds of sin; grace superabounded. It was precisely because he saw so clearly this relation between sin and grace that he could speak of sin in such radical terms.

Beveridge saw in the person of Christ such grace that meant a complete self-giving on the part of God and his doctrine of sin was formulated from this absolute character of grace. Beveridge did not fear to uphold a doctrine of sin which showed its utter terribleness because he saw it through the grace of Christ which was more than sufficient.

As a general rule, however, we find in the Caroline tradition that those who held a limited fall of man, such as Taylor, matched that view with an equally limited concept of grace.

The rationalistic spirit of the seventeenth century made its inroads on Caroline thought. The stress on the rational capacity of man and hence an assertion of the freedom of the will, enhanced that understanding of the fall prominent in the writings of Taylor, Bull and Thorndike. The mainstream of Caroline thought was maintained in this period also. Beveridge, whose life reached into the first decade of the eighteenth century upheld this tradition.

CHAPTER VI

THE ATONEMENT AND GRACE

There were three main currents of thought in the Caroline period which attacked the orthodox doctrine of the atonement. All three of them were in fact rebirths of thought which had infected the early Church's life. Socinianism, like the Arian view of old, denied the consubstantial unity between Jesus Christ and God the Father and thus made the atonement of Christ less than the complete work of God. All anti-trinitarian concepts do the same thing. In such an understanding grace cannot be viewed as the complete self-giving of God to man in Jesus Christ.

John Biddle, the father of Unitarianism in England, held the same view of the atonement as did Socinus. He acknowledged that the atonement made by Christ the Son of God was God's atonement but he insisted that Christ was the Son of God by birth in time; of Mary by the power of the Holy Spirit. But Biddle denied the eternal generation of the Son; that He was co-equal and co-eternal with God. There was no incarnation of God in Biddle's concept and thus the hypostatic union of God and man in Jesus Christ found no place in his thought either. The atonement, though willed by God, was carried out by man; the man Jesus Christ

who was not God. Unitarianism ruled out any understanding of substitutionary atonement. Without the biblical understanding of the incarnation the grace of God is something that God has done for man by man but it is not what God is and has done for man as man. Adoptionism undercuts the whole biblical doctrine of salvation by God as the incarnate One. The glory of Israel, said Bishop Pearson, was not that Christ was a man made God but rather that He was God.¹

The Manichean view of determinism was reasserted by a perverted Calvinism which made of predestination a rigid and static necessity contrary to the thought of Calvin himself. It proclaimed the eternal decrees of God in such a manner as to make predestination appear as an arbitrary act of God which did violence to both God and man. The tendency in this thought was to separate the eternal decrees of God from the incarnate God thus making a double line of election which Calvin specifically denied.² Failure to relate the eternal decrees of God to God who became incarnate indirectly questioned the atoning work of Christ for the whole weight of salvation placed upon the decrees uttered in eternity reduced the significance of the atonement wrought out by the incarnate God. It is true that our election is born of the will of God before the foundations of the world were laid but Christ the incarnate God is identical to the will of God. The Puritan tradition of the Caroline period became

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 236.

2. Calvin, The Institutes, op. cit., 3:24:16.

corrupted to a large extent by this perverted Calvinism.

The powerful Arminian movement can be traced as a reaction to a hyper-Calvinism. Again there was much that was similar between Arminianism and the ancient heresy of Pelagius; both stressed the necessity of free-will. The Pelagians, said Andrewes, ascribed to the free-will of man the ability to keep the law of God and thereby made void the grace of Jesus Christ.¹ He referred to both Manicheeism and Pelagianism as 'two bastard slips of philosophy'. Hall also renounced both these heretical tendencies. He included the Church of Rome in the Pelagian camp saying, "our Semipelagian papists go not much less, save that they suppose some help given to the will, which it can thus improve."² Whereas the extreme Calvinists had all but eliminated man from the drama of salvation the Arminians raised the question of man's participation and answered the question with an overwhelming stress on the will of man. Hall dismissed the Arminian and hyper-Calvinistic thought and continually pleaded for a middle way which he claimed was the orthodox position. All must be ascribed to grace but so as it does not destroy nature.³ Hall was always conscious of the extreme Calvinists whose concept of grace tended to ignore and violate the nature of man. St. Bernard, said Hall, taught that man could will and that was from nature but to will good and will was not from nature but from grace.⁴

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V., p. 57.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 564.

3. Ibid., pl. 564.

4. Loc. cit.

It was not man's free-will that makes the difference in man, continued Hall; it is not free-will that makes man capable of grace. It is the calling of God that makes the difference.¹ When God called Gideon valiant He made him to be that.² He stressed, as did Calvin, that it was in God's calling that we must understand man's response. Man's decision had to be seen in God's decision for him. God who calls us

doth, together with his invitation, enable us to do what he requires; his spirit, working with his word, effects what he commands; as a mother or nurse bids the child come to her, but reaches forth a finger to uphold it in walk. --3

Bishop Downname also related the activity of the will toward God to the work of the Holy Spirit; the Spirit knocks at the door of our hearts and does Himself open the heart to assent to and believe the gospel, even as He did the heart of Lydia.⁴

Not all the Carolines, however, were free from the infection of the heretical opinions of their day. Some, in a conscious attempt to keep free from one extreme stepped unwittingly into another. Their writings reveal the constant struggle in which they were engaged. A definite attempt at asserting the Reformed tradition of the Church can be witnessed in the main stream of Caroline thought.

There is no salvation possible, said Andrewes unless the Saviour is truly Lord.⁵ Any doctrine which limited the complete

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 161. 2. Ibid., p. 231.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 564. See also Calvin, 3:22:1.

4. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 200.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 78, 79.

self-giving of God in Jesus Christ found no place in Andrewes' thought. Only Christ, he urged, as He is Lord can save our bodies and souls. The incarnation would not allow Andrewes to make a bifurcation between body and soul. Only He who is the Lord can overcome sin once and for all by destroying the very root of sin itself. No one but Christ can save for all others need a Saviour. Christ alone is Saviour for He is Lord and the Lord does not need salvation; He is salvation unto us. We confess Christ to be our Saviour, said Andrewes, because He is Lord. Christ as Lord not only works out our salvation but as Christ the Lord He is Himself our salvation.¹

To save may agree to man; to be salvation can agree to none but to Christ the Lord. To begin and to end; to save soul and body from bodily and ghostly enemies; from sin the root, and misery the branches; for a time and for ever; to be a Saviour and to be salvation itself; Christ the Lord is all this, and can do all this. --2

Andrewes stressed here that what Christ did and what He was are one because He is the incarnate God. Jesus Christ does not only make propitiation for the sin of the world but He is the propitiation.³

The whole act of God's grace and glory, said Davenant, is channelled through Jesus Christ.⁴ But God does not do this by man but as man. The fulness of God, the fulness of grace and the fulness of redemption are in Him.⁵ Christ is our atonement because

1. Ibid., p. 79.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Rom. 3:25. Also 1 John 2:2; 4:10.

4. Davenant, On Colossians, Vol. 1, op. cit., p. 61.

5. Ibid., pp. 229, 230, 231.

He is the incarnate God. Pearson was also of this mind. Christ does more than reveal salvation to us; Christ has wrought it out for us in Himself.¹ No man as man could redeem man since the whole human race was under the same captivity of sin.² Only Jesus Christ who is brother to mankind; who is Son of man and Son of God; who is like unto us in all things, sin excluded, could work redemption for us. Christ could and freely did redeem us. Thus said Pearson it is only by the blood of Christ that remission of sin is obtained.³ By the grace of Christ, that is His atonement, the dominion of sin has been taken away in this life and in the life to come the redeemed in Christ shall be free from the possibility of sinning⁴ itself.

Pearson saw the atonement as the fulfillment of the Old Testament concept of Priest and sacrifice. Beveridge also stressed this: as the first begotten of God, Christ was by right a Priest and was anointed into that office, performing every function by way of oblation, intercession and benediction.⁵ As our Priest Christ makes atonement for us said Pearson.⁶ Christ as Priest gives Himself as a propitiatory sacrifice for our sin.⁷ Pearson's great stress on the doctrine of the Trinity has shown us that he grounded his understanding of the atonement of Jesus Christ as the self-giving of God. To be the Saviour Christ was so the Son of God that He was God. It is God who atones for us exclaimed Pearson

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 132.

2. Ibid., p. 133.

3. Ibid., p. 134.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Ibid., p. 169. See also Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 406.

6. Pearson, op. cit. p. 185.

7. Ibid., p. 170.

1

but it is God the Son. Deliverance comes from God as man.

The act of salvation is the act of God in Jesus Christ. The Godhead of Christ, said Andrewes, alone fits Him to be Saviour; "none but God is Saviour."² Bishop Davenant was of exactly the same opinion. Christ the God-man is our redeemer because only God can overcome death and this He overcame for man.³ The man Jesus Christ is not only a man sanctified and upheld by the Holy Spirit but He is God dwelling in our midst; the God-man by hypostatic union.⁴ Thus Jesus Christ is not simply a man appointed by God to be a Saviour, as the Socinians and Unitarians held; the hypostatic union tells us that the Saviour of the world is God Himself and no lesser being. Andrewes, having clearly stated that only God can save, stressed the incarnation for it is man who must be saved and must be saved as man. Pearson was also of this mind. We are, said he, men of flesh and blood and cannot be saved except as the Redeemer takes our nature upon Himself fully and is our blood brother.⁵ If Christ is not man He cannot redeem man.⁶ The incarnation tells us two things: God alone can save and He saves man as man. The doctrine of the incarnation leaves no room whatsoever for any theory of adoptionism.

1. Ibid., p. 229.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 80.

3. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 163.

4. Ibid., p. 415.

5. Pearson, op. cit., p. 320.

6. Ibid., p. 341.

It is man that has sinned against God and therefore it is man that must make satisfaction for sin; man in the fullest sense.¹ But that is precisely what sinful man cannot do; he cannot make atonement.² Only God can make satisfaction to God. This is the divine necessity for the incarnation; God became man that He, as man, might make satisfaction to God.³ The entire movement of the incarnation and our salvation is from God to man - the Word made flesh. Thus the fulness of Christ is the fulness of salvation and it is from this fulness that we receive from Him.⁴ The act of salvation by God in Jesus Christ was for Andrewes the essential meaning of grace. Therefore Andrewes rejected every attempt that had been made in the history of the Church to deviate in the slightest from the biblical witness which testified that the atoning work of Christ be nothing less than the work accomplished by God Himself. The Word made flesh meant precisely this for Andrewes: that is, He was God and none other than God the Son who had become man in order that He God, might save man. Andrewes saw the real concern of soteriology. Flesh had sinned against God by rejecting the Word of God.⁵ This was man's sin. God's answer to man's sin was judgment; divine judgment against sin. The justice of God demands fulfillment - flesh must make satisfaction.⁶ That is why the Word became flesh that as flesh

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 81.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., p. 79.

5. Ibid., p. 90.

6. Loc. cit.

the Word might make satisfaction for the flesh which first re-
jected the Word. God Himself, ¹ as man, fulfills all righteous-
ness. ² The incarnation shows in fleshly form the eternal depth
of love: this is God's grace to man in Jesus Christ - Himself!

The incarnation was a terrible reality for Andrewes. The fact that God had become man had the significance of the cross. The incarnation was the emptying of God in humiliation in the form of a man. Bishop Hall, though stressing the incarnation to a lesser extent than Andrewes held a similar view. He also regarded the whole earthly life of Christ as a perpetual passion. ³ The dishonour of Christ, said Andrewes, was the incarnation and this humiliation of the Son of God is our honour. ⁴ The entire life of Christ from the cradle to the tomb was a continual cross. ⁵ Andrewes believed that there could be no atonement unless there was a real incarnation. He rejected the heresy which asserted that God did not become fleshly man. ⁶ God became man, was the continual assertion of Andrewes and it was God who suffered as a man, not simply a man who suffered while the Word looked on as a spectator. ⁷ God had completely involved Himself in our sin - He suffered. The Word that became flesh and suffered, said Pearson, was the same Word

1. Loc. cit.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 33.

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 141.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 167, 168.

6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 90.

7. Loc. cit.

which was in the beginning with God and was God.¹ The sufferings of Christ in the frail body of man was therefore the suffering of God.² In the strongest terms Andrewes articulated the reality of the incarnation. Jesus Christ was God and man and in this man the love of God and the grace of God had appeared to all mankind.³

The presence of Christ in this world was the presence of God's grace among us. The presence of God which is the nearest and the happiest for us, said Hall, was His presence in His grace.⁴ Thus the union with God our Saviour was the ground of all consolation.⁵ The presence of Christ is the grace by which we are united to Christ.⁶ For God to grace His elect meant for Hall God's inhabitation in them in Christ and their mutual indwelling in Him.⁷ This union in Christ is not an imaginary one but "this is true, real essential, substantial union, whereby the person of the believer is indissolubly united to the glorious person of the Son of God."⁸ Hall stressed that this union with Christ was really existent and spiritual but he opposed the view which held Christ real as separate from Christ spiritual.⁹ This was a dominant emphasis in Caroline thought because the incarnation was so forcibly pressed. To separate Christ real from Christ spiritual was for Bishop Hall to divide Christ from Himself.¹⁰ The incarnation

-
1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 332.
 2. Ibid., pp. 336, 337.
 3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 289.
 4. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 563.
 5. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 122.
 6. Loc. cit.
 7. Ibid., p. 135.
 8. Ibid., p. 122.
 9. Ibid., pp. 123, 129.
 10. Ibid., p. 129.

showed Hall that the new man, Christ, is incorporated into us¹ and we have become one with Him. In this union Christ is as² truly ours by grace as our own nature is ours. This union was an eternal union and we can no more be severed from Christ than He can from Himself.³ Hall spoke of grace as union with Christ through faith in vivid language though he did not see as clearly as Andrewes the full significance of the incarnation in this regard. Hence Hall did not involve the whole person of man as completely and radically, his nature included, in the union of grace with Christ. Andrewes, stressing the incarnation in a more exhaustive manner, gathered the whole nature of man in the new creature of grace. Andrewes' concept of union with Christ was of a more fleshly nature.

Andrewes' doctrine of the atonement was very clearly a substitutionary atonement. God, in the person of Jesus Christ, stood as man where man should have stood. God the offended stands in for the offender. The concept of the atonement was worked out by Andrewes within the understanding of the consubstantial union of the Father and the Son. In every sense God the Son is God and it is He who comes to save man as man. It is from Jesus Christ as⁴ the Son, therefore, that we receive grace, said Andrewes.

Hall's interpretation of Christ as the second Adam also helped his doctrine of the atonement to be substitutionary. The second Adam died for all mankind and brought life to all believers.⁵

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 128.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.,

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 110.

5. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 392.

Through the blood of Christ the cross became the tree of life to all who believed. The second Adam represents the entire human race and in Christ all humanity hangs upon the cross.¹

Every believer is a limb of that body: how can he therefore but die with him and in him? The real union then, which is betwixt Christ and us, makes the cross and passion of Christ ours; so as the thorns pierced our hands, the scourges blooded our backs, the nails wounded our hands and feet, and the spear gored our sides and hearts: by virtue whereof we receive justification from our sins, and true mortification of our corruptions. --2

Christ's death and perfect obedience is given to us by imputation, said Hall. Obviously with Rome in mind he pointed out that those who ridiculed the fact that another's righteousness was given to us were enemies of grace.³ The grace of Jesus Christ, given to us in our union with Him, meant the gift of redemption. Though sin remained in us we must look up and behold the infinite holiness of Christ to whom we are united and who is ours by faith.⁴

What Christ does for us God does for us, said Andrewes as he elaborated his view on the atoning work of Christ. God does not give us certain things by which salvation is secured, it is self-giving that God gives in Jesus Christ. Andrewes was governed in this understanding by St. Chrysostom's exposition of 2 Cor. 5:21. The righteousness that God gives to man is not the operation or effect of His righteousness "but His very righteousness, yes His very self unto us."⁵ The unspotted Lamb by whose blood atonement

1. Loc. cit.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, pp. 142, 143.

4. Ibid., p. 144.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 115.

is made for the sin of the world is none other than the Lamb of God "to speak plainly, a Lamb that is God. His Blood, and nothing else, will serve to do this."¹ This then is God's grace; that He gave Himself to become man and as man gave Himself to be the atonement for the sin of the world.

We notice the same trend of thought in the writings of Bishop Davenant. Salvation from the slavery of sin is not simply a declaration of freedom on the part of God. A deed is done in our flesh. A debt has to be paid and God in Jesus Christ pays that debt.² All the life of Christ enters into this act but in the pouring out of His blood there was a completion of satisfaction.³ By the death of Christ satisfaction is made to God and the power of Satan is destroyed.⁴ But like Andrewes, Davenant was emphatic in his declaration that it was God who made the satisfaction. The death of Christ was the death of God; the blood of Christ was the blood of God.⁵ The fulness of grace in Jesus Christ was the fulness of God in Him.⁶

Andrewes pushed his understanding of the self-giving of God to include the complete giving of the life of God in Christ as the atonement. The shedding of blood by the Lamb that is God was not simply a blood letting while the Lamb lived; "but His best, most precious, His heart-blood, which bringeth certain death with it."⁷ By the death of the Lamb who is God, who freely gives

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 113.

2. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 167.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Ibid., p. 168.

6. Ibid., p. 230.

7. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 113.

Himself to die, atonement is made and we are saved. The whole drama of redemption turns on the self-giving of God in Christ in the thought of Andrewes. Even the death of Christ was seen by Andrewes to be included in God's act on man's behalf.

By Himself, His Ownself, and by Himself slain; by His death, and by His Blood-shedding, and by no other means, quis audivit talia? The Physician slain, and of His Flesh and Blood a receipt made, that the patient might recover. --1

Thus we see in Andrewes' thought that the author, the executor and the finisher of atonement is God Himself.

In Jesus Christ God substitutes His righteousness for our sin. Commenting also on 2 Cor. 5:21, Hall explained that here indeed was a marvelous exchange. "We are nothing but sin; Christ is perfect righteousness. He is made our sin, that we might be made his righteousness."² There is nothing about us or in us that deserves God's grace for we are not only sinful but sin itself.³ Hall emphasized, as did Andrewes, that we are not given righteousness as some possession apart from the person of God but God in His infinite grace makes us to be His righteousness.⁴ This is only accomplished by Christ being made sin for us. God's grace finds us sinful but it does not leave us in that condition.⁵ The grace of Christ is atonement. Hall thought of God's mighty act of grace in Jesus Christ to be one of saving grace.

1. Loc. cit.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 140.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., p. 141.

5. Loc. cit.

In his consideration of the incarnation Andrewes strenuously maintained that God and no lesser being than God became man and that He became man in every conceivable sense. Christ like all men was conceived, was in fact an embryo. God showed His great love towards us that He not only condescended to take our natures upon Himself "but to take it by the same way and after the same manner that we do, by being conceived." ¹ This was most important for Andrewes even as it had been for Irenaeus because it meant that Christ as the second Adam reached back past the first Adam, who was not conceived and thus redeemed man's nature at the very source. These are his own words:

For our conception being the root as it were, the very ground-sill of our nature; that He might go to the root and repair our nature from the very foundation, thither He went; that what had been there defiled and decayed by the first Adam, might by the Second be cleansed and set right again. —2

Thus Andrewes saw that from the very instant of His conception Christ was Redeemer and redeeming. Even in embryonic form, 'all the nine months He was in the womb', the Word of God was reforming our corrupt natures. ³ Our natures are involved in Christ's conception and in the womb "He even ate out the core of corruption that cleft to our nature and us, and made both us and it an unpleasing object in the sight of God." ⁴ Pearson also thought of this aspect in similar terms: Christ's sanctification in the womb ⁵ is ours in our regeneration.

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 140.

2. Ibid., p. 141.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 141.

5. Pearson, op. cit., p. 299.

In the incarnate Christ God stands in Man's nature.

God wears our flesh, said Andrewes; he is flesh of our flesh and as such we cannot think that God hates us for He has become one with us. ¹ Every time God looks upon Christ He thinks of us. As the Father loves His eternal Son with an eternal love so now in Christ God loves us with the same depth of eternal love.

And the Father cannot now hate the flesh which the Word is made; which is now taken into one Person with His only Son, and united to the Deity itself. If He love the Word, He must love it too, for the Word is become it; either love both, or hate both. —2

³ The very angels adore Christ in our flesh. The eternal love of God was thrust into our flesh in the incarnation. As God the Father loves God the Son so God loves man. In Jesus Christ this love is returned to the Father from the side of man. This was a very important aspect in Andrewes' thought. He saw the beginning of the atonement initiated in God Himself and moving to man in Jesus Christ. The completion of the atoning work was seen by Andrewes in the ascension of man's humanity to the right hand of God. This was the completed act of grace.

In certain passages Taylor affirmed very forcibly that sinful man could not be redeemed from the slavery and tyranny of sin but by the grace of Christ. ⁴ Though Taylor sought to attribute all to grace he continually qualified this concept by his understanding of grace itself. The notion of Christ renewing the entire nature of man which was very important in Andrewes' thought formed

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 97.

2. Ibid., p. 99.

3. Ibid., pp. 98, 117.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 131.

no integral part in Taylor's understanding of the atonement. This was a logical development from his doctrine of sin. There were some persons apart from their single acts of sin, who needed no repentance in so far as it is a conversion of the whole man.¹ There is an evil principle in infants which operates when the child can choose but this is overcome by placing a new principle of grace in them.² Rather than thinking of the atonement as a new creation in the second Adam, as was Andrewes' understanding,³ Taylor saw grace as a principle or power added to man's nature.⁴ The new principle of grace was related to baptism by Taylor.

Even when Taylor spoke of a new creation he thought primarily of a new moral creature. It meant having new strengths or grace from God which were strong enough to prevail over our follies and infirmities.⁵ The new creature was one who had a new nature put into him but Taylor interpreted this as the principle of better purposes and holy actions.⁶ The new principle of this new life was referred to by Taylor as the Holy Spirit who brought to us the grace of Christ.⁷ Taylor regarded faith as the first great instrument of changing our nature into a state of grace but again he

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 259.

2. Ibid., p. 283.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., X, p. 93.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 275.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 155.

6. Ibid., p. 156.

7. Ibid., p. 158. See also Works, op. cit., VII, p. 325. Also Works, op. cit., IX, p. 33.

geared his understanding of faith into the orbit of his main concern and referred to faith as a principle productive of a holy life. ¹ Man was not justified by faith only ² said Taylor. We are justified "by God's truth and by ours, by his grace and our obedience." ³

It was precisely this tendency that Bishop Barlow had repudiated completely. In his consideration of justification by faith only he pointed out that faith whether it be an act, work or instrument from man does not justify. ⁴ He acknowledged that faith was the hand which received God's gift of grace but he insisted that faith itself was a gift of God and in no sense a work on the part of man which forms his contribution to the act of redemption. ⁵ God gives us His Son and He also gives us faith by which we may receive Him. ⁶ It is not the hand that receives which makes for righteousness but the righteousness received which is Christ Himself. ⁷ Barlow rightly kept his eyes on God the giver and stressed this aspect rather than man who received. Taylor's tendency was definitely the latter. Barlow insisted that man contributed nothing to the atoning work of Christ and that the gift of faith needed no supplementation on the part of man. Faith is not victorious in overcoming the world

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 159. See also Works, op. cit. VII, p. 462.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 272.

3. Ibid., p. 279. See also Works, op. cit., VII, p. 327.

4. Barlow, T., Two Letters Concerning Justification By Faith Only (London, L. B. Seeley and Sons, 1828), p. 54.

5. Ibid., p. 48.

6. Loc. cit.

7. Loc. cit.

rather ¹is is victory itself.

Taylor maintained that the promises of Christ are all made to us upon condition of obedience. ² Man is justified when faith lays hold of the promises of God and sincerely endeavours to be obedient and keep God's commandment, said Taylor. He warned that we must not magnify the free grace of God to the extent that we exclude the conditions which the free grace places upon us. ³ Taylor, at this point, was very conscious of the Antinomian heresy which seemed to suggest that free grace might be interpreted as a freedom to sin. Taylor elaborated his position:

Christ freely died for us, God pardons us freely in our first access to him; we could never deserve pardon, because when we need pardon we are enemies, and have no good thing in us; and he freely gives us of his Spirit, and freely he enables us to obey him; and for our little imperfect services he freely and bountifully will give us eternal life; here is free grace all the way, and he overvalues his pitiful services, who thinks that he deserves heaven by them; and that if he does his duty tolerably, eternal life is not a free gift to him, but a deserved reward. — 4

Taylor at times did stress the free grace of God in emphatic terms saying that the gift of grace was dependent only on God's own goodness. ⁵ But the movement of his thought is always the same; the suggestion that God's grace is conditioned by the 'little imperfect services' is almost always present in Taylor's total thought. He acknowledged the initiative of grace to be wholly God's but again he limited grace to a first grace which revealed

1. Ibid., p. 59.

2.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 279.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., pp. 279, 280.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 207. See also Works, op. cit., IX, p. 60.

that Taylor's understanding of grace lacked real forward significance.

Bishop Thorndike, though very critical of Taylor's doctrine and indeed of the Arminians in general, did not differ essentially from Taylor's concept of grace in its relation to the atonement. In articulating his covenant of grace Thorndike placed the whole emphasis on God's initiative declaring that only God's own goodness moved Him to give us the covenant of grace.¹ However, like Taylor, he then proceeded to give this a moral twist when he spoke of the forward significance of this covenant. He denied that the covenant of grace was simply a free promise.² God's grace was free in the giving, he said, but there were conditions attached to it. These conditions required by the covenant of grace must be some act of man's choice.³ The fulfilling of the conditions of the covenant of grace at God's demand qualifies us for those promises which it gives.⁴ Thorndike, like Taylor, considered baptism as the door of entry into the covenant of grace. The writings of Thorndike reveal that he was also very conscious of the Antinomian presence and he continually attempted to guard against this heresy. He intended to make the grace of God absolutely free while at the same time show the falseness of the libertine position. In order to offset such dangers as the latter position Thorndike stated that the benefits of the covenant of

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt.1, p. 39. Also Works, op. cit., III, pt. 2, p. 445.

2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, pt. 1, p. 39.

3. Ibid., pp. 55, 56.

4. Ibid., p. 56.

grace were not given to a man until he accepted the terms of the covenant. Though the results were unintentional the free grace of God was again conditioned by the actions of men. This was bound to occur when grace was considered to be a divine gift apart from union with Christ Himself.

The most consistent understanding of grace in the thought of Andrewes can be seen in his insistence that Jesus Christ is the incarnate God. The presence of God in man's flesh is the predominant motif in his understanding of grace. No one but God can make satisfaction to God. The reason for his strong emphasis on the doctrine of the Trinity becomes very clear in his concept of the atonement. It is God who loves, it is God who sends, it is God who comes and it is this same God who becomes flesh of our flesh. God, said Andrewes, hallowed our flesh by becoming man. He filled it full of Himself, full of God. The manner in which God come^s to man as a man - and yet one who is still God^{as} is the basis for Andrewes' ^{interpretation} statement of affirmation that Jesus Christ is full of grace and truth; the truth of God Himself mighty to save. His persistent concern with the nativity of Christ and its relation to grace is indicative of this point of view. Grace and truth both have to do with God; grace refers to the Son and truth to the Word and both are in Jesus Christ.¹ The consubstantial union of the Father and the Son is ever maintained in the person of Christ.² The Word that was with God and was God is the same Word that became flesh and was Jesus Christ. The nearness

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 96, 88.

2. Ibid., p. 88.

of God to man is the presence of grace in our midst. In Christ there is the fulness of grace for there is the fulness of God and the fulness of man. The same thought was expressed by Pearson; the nearer the relation of Christ to God the greater His love to us for whose sakes He sent Christ to suffer.¹ Andrewes dismissed any concept of a spiritualized incarnation. It implied a contradiction. The Word of God had flesh on it.² He thought of grace analogous to this fleshly incarnation; grace is clothed with God.³ The truth of God which is Christ is, as it were, the flesh of His grace.⁴ Andrewes did not separate the truth which is God from the grace of God for grace is precisely God who comes to save.

God comes to man as man in order to save man. Grace has to do with the saving act of God in Jesus Christ. As sinners we stand out of grace and without grace.⁵ This is the state in which the Word finds us when it became flesh but in the beloved Son man is brought into grace again.⁶ God receives us to grace for the grace that the Son had with Him; the fulness of God.⁷ In Christ our flesh is ever in the presence of God, united with God for God wears our flesh; He is flesh of our flesh and He is gracious to that flesh in which His Word is incarnated.⁸ This is

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 245.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 96.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Loc. cit.

7. Loc. cit.

8. Ibid., p. 97.

atonement and it is worked out in the entire birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ.

Andrewes placed a great stress on the importance of the incarnation in the atoning work of Christ and regarded it as the beginning of the cross; it was part of the passion. Andrewes so grasped the utter horror of God Himself coming into our history that the passion of Christ was at every stage of His earthly life. Of course Andrewes did not lessen the importance of the death of Christ. He saw clearly that atonement involved death for the atoning One. In Andrewes' thought the incarnation was the atonement in so far as it was the manner in which Christ was to be the atonement; where God and man meet in eternal union. Andrewes saw in the incarnation God giving Himself, His very self, to man. ¹ As such Christ is the sacrifice which is God. In sending His Son for our redemption "He sent the greatest, the best, the fullest thing He had." ² God had in fact come Himself to redeem man and this is what Andrewes called the grace of God.

The manner of Christ's conception revealed the freedom of the grace of God, said Pearson. God's grace or motivation of grace does not lie outside the Person of God. The grace of God is co-existent with the Word of God. ³ Davenant also affirmed that nothing outside of God deserved His coming to us. ⁴ The movement

-
1. Davenant, A Treatise on Justification, op. cit., II, p. 290.
 2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 115.
 3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 51.
 4. Pearson, op. cit., p. 298.

of the incarnation from God to man was founded on the love of God and His utter grace.¹ Before God's calling all men are by nature sons of wrath said Hall. In relation to God's grace all men are equally devoid of the possibility of grace.² The choosing of Aaron's rod was compared by Hall to man's election. There was no difference in the wood, nor was Aaron's character better than the rest. It was God's choice that made the difference. So it is with God's election of man. Only the grace and effectual calling of God makes the difference in man.³ The purpose of love, of Christ's coming, was the redemption of man. The work that Christ did once and for all is continually being done into us by way of application. We are continually being sanctified by the grace of Christ until that day when Christ delivers up His mediatory kingdom into the hands of His Father.⁴ But Christ redeems us fully from the law, sin and death. These can hurt us no longer for now we do not live under the law but under grace.⁵ Christ is all to us and all is ours in Him.⁶

Christ, in becoming man becomes man's surety and undertakes the debt which is against man for his sin.⁷ God's judgment against sin is death.⁸ Thus Christ as surety must die. Christ

1. Ibid., p. 291.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 161.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 144.

5. Ibid., p. 145.

6. Ibid., p. 146.

7. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 54.

8. Loc. cit.

accepts the curse of the law upon Himself as one 'born under the law'. "Therefore He became bond for us also, entered bond anew, took on Him not only our nature but our debt, our nature and condition both."¹ Against this background Andrewes set Christ, full of grace, as fulfillment of the law. "The law full of rigour, many threats, and curses in it - Christ bringeth the word of grace, opposeth to that."² The Law was not made void, however, for the word of grace was the Word made flesh which stood under the curse of the law.³ The word of grace which Christ brings was for Andrewes the Word of grace which Christ is and does for us in our flesh.

The concept of the fulness of time meant for Andrewes the filling full, or filling up of time with the fulness of God.⁴ The fulness of God in time was the emptying of Himself for our sakes.⁵ At the conception of the Word and His birth into the world God identified Himself with our estate and nature. This identification of God with man presses forward to baptism and the cross. At the circumcision of Christ the identification begins to move in this direction. The few drops of blood which Christ shed then was a surety and earnest that he would shed all His blood for us.⁶ Andrewes saw that the cross was implied for Christ at His circumcision and the name of Jesus, a Saviour, was given to

1. Loc. cit.

2. Ibid., p. 96.

3. Ibid., pp. 55, 47, 48.

4. Ibid., pp. 48, 49.

5. Ibid., p. 50.

6. Ibid., p. 55.

to Him.¹ At the baptism of Jesus also there was a heightening² of the identification. At His baptism Christ put us on. Bishop Thorndike also understood Christ's baptism as an identification of Himself with our sin, claiming that Christ's baptism was His cross.³ At the cross Jesus Christ stood completely where sinful man should stand. The identification with man is pressed to the fullest. What Christ had undertaken at His incarnation and circumcision He paid to the full at His passion.⁴ Not only did Christ pay the debt to the full by giving His life for us but he went behind death itself by accepting the worse death that the law could inflict; "the most bitter, reproachful, cursed death of the cross."⁵

The atoning act of Christ is made through His life and death. Unlike all the rest of mankind Christ alone lived the perfect life under the law without breaking so much as one jot or tittle of the law.⁶ Christ fulfilled the law in His own life, therefore, He above all men should not die because there is no curse of the law against Him.⁷ At the incarnation Christ offered Himself to be accounted and handled as a sinner and to endure all that the law could inflict upon Him.⁸ The death of a sinful man can make no atonement for himself or for others. The cross of

1. Loc. cit.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 250.

3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, pt. 1, p. 20.

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 55.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Ibid., p. 56.

7. Loc. cit.

8. Loc. cit.

any man would simply be the just death of a sinner. But Christ did not need His death as an atonement because He had fulfilled the law.¹ In the incarnation Christ gives His life to us and in His passion He gives His death also. This is the fulness out of which we received grace upon grace and from this fulness we receive our adoption and redemption. Christ redeemed us from the law which held us prisoners and by Him also we are adopted into a heavenly inheritance.² This is the fulness of grace which came by Jesus Christ.

Pearson's understanding at this point was similar to Andrewes'. By Christ's death on the cross the full curse of the law is taken upon Himself and removed from us.³ As the crucified one Christ abolished the strength and power of the whole law in His flesh.⁴ Bishop Barlow stressed a two-fold righteousness in Christ; His righteousness as God and man.⁵ As man Christ is born under the law and fulfills it yet He suffered all the punishment for sin. The death of the righteous One is the righteousness which is imputed to us for our Justification.⁶ We do not possess the righteousness; it is in no way inherent in us.⁷ By dying the worst kind of death we are assured that Christ has in fact overcome every kind of death.⁸ Christ descended to the

1. Loc. cit. See also Barlow, op. cit., p. 127. Also Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 270.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 56,57.

3. Pearson, op. cit., p. 369.

4. Ibid., p. 370.

5. Barlow, op. cit., p. 120.

6. Loc. cit.

7. Loc. cit.

8. Pearson, op. cit., p. 371.

very depths for us that by a servile death he might release¹
and redeem us while we were slaves and in bondage to sin.
Christ's death is a complete death. As a man He died utterly²
and ceased to be man as every man does when he dies. But even
in this complete death of man the hypostatic union remained; the
incarnation, Word and flesh, is an eternal union. The union of³
the natures continues even in death.

There were two aspects to the atonement for Andrewes.
Man had sold himself under sin and was imprisoned by the law,
bound with the cords of sin.⁴ In order to redeem man from this
state Christ had to buy back that which had been sold.⁵ The
price that Christ had to pay for this purchase was the price of⁶
His blood.⁷ Barlow was also of this opinion. Christ, baptized
into our sins, is baptized with the water of the Jordan but it is
no water baptism that takes away the sin of the world but baptismus
sanguinis.⁸ Only the blood of Christ can wash away the sin of
the world. It was by the complete sufferings of Christ, said
Pearson in agreement with this thought, that Christ was made an
expiation, atonement and propitiation for all our sins.⁹ And like
Andrewes Pearson stressed that salvation was impossible without
the shedding of blood. The Redeemer had to suffer, the Lamb had
to be slain.¹⁰ Andrewes saw the sacrifice of Christ, His blood,

1. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 371, 372.

2. Ibid., p. 380.

3. Ibid., pp. 381, 382.

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 57. See also Works, op.cit.V, p.87.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 57.

6. Ibid., p. 58.

7. Barlow, op. cit., pp. 116, 117.

8. Andrewes, Works, op. cit. III, p. 251.

9. Pearson, op. cit., p. 341.

10. Loc. cit.

as the price paid for our release from sin. "Let the price I pay be their redemption, and it was so." The release from sin represented the backward movement of the atonement in Andrewes' thought.

Bishop Sanderson's understanding of this aspect of the atonement was in keeping with the dominant trend of thought in the Carolines. By selling ourselves to sin and satan we had put ourselves under their dominion and they have become our lords. Our sin is an injustice and ingratitude: selling ourselves from God our true Lord and Master into the hands of satan, a rebel and enemy of God. While we live in the dominion of sin we are completely under the lordship of satan. "Your lips and your tongues are his; your hearts and hands are his; your bodies and your souls his; all you have, all you are, wholly and entirely his." Sin makes man void of grace and glory and washes out of the heart of man the very impressions of his humanity. Satan has us and can do what he wishes with us but Sanderson kept the ultimate power in the hands of God, claiming that even satan exercised all his power over us within the sovereignty of God's will. We have sold ourselves to sin which was our doing and God sells us also to the punishment of our sin; that is his judgment. But even in our sin Sanderson stressed the sovereignty of God; it is only by God's grace that

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 58.

2. Sanderson, Works, (Oxford: At the University Press, 1854), I, p.175.

3. Ibid., pp. 178, - 180.

4. Ibid., p. 176.

5. Ibid., p. 178.

6. Ibid., p. 176.

7. Ibid., p. 186.

we are redeemed from this state of sin.¹ The sin and baseness of man is revealed in the sale of man's self to satan and in the redemption of man the power and grace of God is made manifest.² The power of God shows the effectiveness of God as Redeemer; God was able to do it and did it. Christ entered into the stronghold of satan and took away his armour; the law, sin and death and liberated his slaves - man.³ The grace of God shows how freely our redemption has been wrought.⁴ In baptism, Sanderson saw that the sale of ourselves to satan was annulled.⁵

A price had to be paid for our release; the greatest ransom price ever paid, said Sanderson. The $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\nu$ ⁶ was the whole riches of God's grace; the gift of Himself. Sanderson related the grace of God in the atoning work of Christ to the very person of God. Grace was the self-giving of God for our salvation in Christ. Bishop Downname held the same view. God, he said, came in the person of Christ to redeem man. Christ did not justify the elect simply by pronouncing them free from sin after the manner of a judge. Christ is Redeemer; atonement was the self-giving of God. Such an atonement rules out all forensic notions. Christ gave Himself for us by accepting our debts and bearing our iniquities and as Redeemer paid our ransom for us and freed us from bondage; the person and work of Christ always go together.⁷

1. Ibid., p. 176 .

2. Ibid., p. 188.

3. Ibid., p. 189.

4. Ibid., pp. 189 - 192.

5. Sanderson, Works, op. cit., I, p. 186.

6. Ibid., p. 193.

7. Downname, A Treatise of Justification, op. cit., p. 72.

Sanderson, like Andrewes, related the sacrifice for sins directly to the person of God in Christ; The Lamb that is sacrificed on the cross is provided by God and in fact is God.¹ Redemption is only free for the sinner but not for God; it costs God His life.² The grace of God is the life of God in Christ given for man. In no way does man share in the giving of the *λύτρον*. "This work then is merely an act of grace, not a fruit of merit: grace abundant grace on His part, no merit, not the least merit at all on ours. And well it is for us that we have to do with so gracious a God."³ The gospel of redemption belongs to those who know their own poverty; who accept the act of God as one of grace.⁴ Only the shame of the cross is ours, said Sanderson. The glory of God's grace and the power in our redemption belong to God.⁵

Andrewes saw that man was not only redeemed from the power of sin but he also saw that the atonement had a future reference. We are not only redeemed from our sin, but Christ, who is the heir, the first born of heaven, offers to divide His inheritance with the prisoners whom He releases with the price of His blood. We are bought from sin and bought for adoption also.⁶ Christ does both. The entire act of redemption and adoption, the atonement, we receive from the fulness of Christ, grace for grace.⁷ Pearson

1. Sanderson, Works, op. cit., I, p. 195.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Ibid., p. 196.

6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 60.

7. Ibid., p. 63.

distinguished the Sonship of Christ from our adoption as sons. Christ is the Son of God as the beloved One, the first born and only begotten while our sonship is dependent on His. ¹ Christ is the Son of God by nature, by His own essential nature. We are not sons by having the essence of God. Our sonship is an adoption by grace, completely dependent on Christ. ² This was Sanderson's understanding also. ³ Andrewes related the fulness of Christ to Word and sacrament, to the fulness of worship and we shall concern ourselves with this aspect of his thought in our next chapter.

We notice a similar stress in Bishop Hall's writings in the matter of a twin aspect of the atonement. In Andrewes' thought the atonement begins and ends in the heart of God. The backward and forward movements of the atonement move out from the incarnation. Christ as the second Adam reaches backward and gathers all humanity in His flesh and man is redeemed from the power of sin. As the ascended Christ the forward movement reaches its completion at the right hand of God where Christ, still clothed in our humanity, possesses eternal life and glory for us and sends the Holy Spirit to unite us in a holy union with Him. In Hall the backward and forward references are seen most clearly in his doctrine of predestination; beginning in God and ending in God. Only the almighty power of God's grace ~~can~~ make us to be sons of God. ⁴ There was a dual aspect to grace in this change; the grace

-
1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 53.
 2. Loc. cit.
 3. Sanderson, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 342, 366.
 4. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 615.

of regeneration which signified the backward movement of the atonement and the grace of adoption which secured the forward movement.¹ For Andrewes and Hall both these movements are one in the act of grace itself. As a son of God by adoption, said Hall, we are made co-heirs with Christ.² Our union with Christ is by faith which is the grace that justifies and sanctifies.³ Atonement means in its essential nature union with Christ and this is the act of grace. This saving grace was related to the Holy Spirit even as it was by Andrewes.⁴

Andrewes believed that there could be no reconciliation of man and God until man who is unrighteous by sin is made to be righteous by grace. But Andrewes did not think of righteousness as some thing done for man apart from the person of God and man. As with his understanding of grace so righteousness was also related in a living way to God. God is more than our Justifier or One who makes us righteous; God Himself is our Justification,⁵ He is our righteousness.⁵ This of course followed from Andrewes' view of the incarnation where he saw the self-giving of God so completely. Therefore God does not give us the operation or effect of His righteousness but He gives us His very own righteousness; His very Self.⁶ This is what Taylor had failed to see clearly. Andrewes stated that God always acted in this very

1. Loc. cit.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, pp. 147, 558, 557.

3. Ibid., pp. 148, 149.

4. Ibid., pp. 553, 558, 559.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 114.

6. Ibid., pp. 121, 122, 115.

personal way with us; His person or being is involved in His act. God and His act were incarnate in the person of Christ. Andrewes emphasized this in relation to Christ's identification with man; He is not made a sinner but very sin itself, not only cursed for us but made a curse itself.¹ Thus man is not made righteous by God apart from the person of Christ and in Andrewes' thought righteousness had to do with union in Jesus Christ. This union, as we have seen, was the Holy Spirit.

It is God who justifies and it is grace which is our justification even as sin is our condemnation.² Whereas Andrewes thought of justification as having a backward and forward movement he saw that the Church of Rome acknowledged only the backward movement; that part of righteousness which is satisfaction for punishment.³ But he explained that Rome relied on a righteousness which was inherent in man by which man is justified and accepted before God. "So by this means shrink they up their Name, and though they leave the full sound, yet take they half the sense from it."⁴ Andrewes accused Rome of dividing the one work of Christ which is our full justification, full atonement. They divide the Name or person of Christ and he accused Bellarmine, the Roman apologist, of limiting the sacrifice of Christ to the backward movement of the atonement; the putting away of sin and then relying on man's merits, which at best are finite, to merit an infinite reward.⁵ Why, he asked Rome, will the oblation of Christ "free us from

1. Ibid., p. 115.

2. Ibid., p. 118.

3. Ibid., p. 121.

4. Ibid., pp. 121, 122.

5. Ibid., pp. 122, 123.

eternal death, and a great deal less will serve to entitle us to eternal life." ¹ Andrewes saw rightly that Rome limited the atoning work of Christ to past sins and placed on man's shoulders the unbearable burden of meriting eternal salvation. Andrewes stressed the totality of Christ's work, atonement from sin and atonement to the right hand of God, and he asked Bellarmine how this could in fact be divided.

Is there not as much requisite to purchase for us the crown of glory as there is to redeem us from the torments of hell? What difference is there? Are they not both equal, both alike infinite? Why is His death allowed solely sufficient to put away sin, and why is not His life to be allowed like solely sufficient to bring us to life? --2

Andrewes completely dismissed Rome's doctrine of merit. He rejected any concept which limited the fulness of atonement in Christ. Christ is our atonement and cannot be divided. The blessed saints who suffered the cruelest martyrdom could not by their death make satisfaction for their own sins nor could their death merit for them eternal life. ³ Satisfaction for sin and eternal life both came by the life and death of Jesus Christ. ⁴

It was clear to Andrewes what Rome had done; she had made the backward movement of righteousness, the doing away of sin, a righteousness inherent in man. Righteousness now became something which could be severed from union with Christ and hence full atonement. Upon this inherent righteousness Rome sought to build her doctrine of merit. Andrewes called upon the Fathers, St. ^{John} Chrysostom,

1. Ibid., p. 123.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Ibid., pp. 123, 124.

St. Augustine, St. Bernard and others to show that they too repudiated any concept of inherent righteousness.¹ There were also many in the Church of Rome, said Andrewes, who had grave doubts about its doctrine of merit. Hall also claimed that the Scriptures, antiquity and even some of the contemporary Roman doctors agreed with the Church of England's doctrine regarding the question of righteousness and grace.² Rome believed in the doctrine of inherent grace and merit by works while the Church of England upheld the doctrine of the grace of Christ; His perfect obedience and meritorious satisfaction which was wrought for us and applied to us.³ Inherent righteousness, said Hall, was our sanctification which is Christ's grace applied to us in this life.⁴ The thought that man is fully justified though not fully sanctified in this life is prominent in Hall's understanding. However, sanctification was not an uncertainty for Hall. He bound justification and sanctification together in his doctrine of predestination: Only those who knew the fulness of grace - glory - knew the beginning of grace now.⁵ In other words; only those who shall sit with Christ at the right hand of God now sit there in Christ. Only those who know the end of grace really know the beginning of grace. Hall, like Andrewes, secured the backward and forward movement of atonement.

1. Ibid., pp. 123, 124.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 220.

3. Ibid., p. 219.

4. Ibid., p. 220.

5. Ibid., p. 88.

Bishop Downname objected strenuously to Rome's doctrine¹ of merit because it attacked the atoning work¹ of Christ. He, like the Reformers, had high praise for good works but he, like^{as} they^{did} saw them as fruits of a redeemed life while Rome on the other hand pressed them as meritorius of sanctification and justification. This latter understanding of good works he dismissed² as odious and abominable in the sight of God. He quoted Luther on this point showing that Luther believed that by faith we were³ not free from good work but from the opinion of these works. The atoning work of Christ frees us from that (requisite) which requires the exaction by the law of perfect righteousness inherent in us and perfect obedience to be performed by us to our justification.⁴ The new obedience of the Christian was the fruit of redemption and not the cause of it.⁵ Downname stressed that our justification was in Christ who had performed perfect righteousness in His own person for us.⁶ Downname was emphatic, that our justification is made for us in Christ; that without any respect of inherent righteousness in us or obedience performed by us we are justified before God in Christ.⁷ God accepts us in Christ not because of inherent grace in us but by the grace which He has in Himself. Downname's concept of grace was most definitely one of

1. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p; 66.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Downname, The Christian Freedom, op. cit., p. 148.

4. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 49.

5. Ibid., p. 59.

6. Ibid., p. 49.

7. Ibid., p. 49.

saving grace and it was this saving grace which had appeared in
1
Jesus Christ.

In no sense could we hold that justification was our act
said Downame. It was not inherent righteousness nor any act that
2
man can do. Our justification is by Christ's righteousness alone
and in no way can man increase it by anything he does. 3 The right-
eousness of Christ our Saviour is the essential righteousness of
4
the Godhead. How can man possibly add to this when this is pre-
cisely what is given to us for our redemption. In the days of
His flesh on earth Christ, as God and man, performed this right-
5
eousness for us. By the free grace of Christ Downame saw that
His righteousness is communicated to us by the Holy Spirit in the
6
ministry of word and sacrament. Andrewes saw precisely the same
thing. The sacrament, said Downame, is God's pledge and assurance
7
of our justification and salvation by Jesus Christ. The righteous-
ness of Christ is apprehended by faith only and Downame understood
8
by faith not the work of man but the Work of God the Holy Spirit.
The Holy Spirit as the Spirit of regeneration works in us the grace
of faith and as the Spirit of adoption assures us of our justifi-
9
cation and sanctification.

Bishop Hall joined in the criticism of Rome's doctrine of

1. Ibid., p. 59.

2. Downame, A Treatise of Justification, op. cit., pp. 7, 17.

3. Ibid., p. 7.

4. Ibid., p. 17, 22.

5. Ibid., p. 18.

6. Ibid., pp. 9, 11.

7. Ibid., p. 12.

8. Ibid., p. 15.

9. Ibid., p. 71.

merit because, as he said, it brought into question the sufficiency of Christ's atonement and hence limited His grace. The question at stake for Hall was this: do we believe Jesus Christ when He says 'It is finished'. Speaking of the once and for all event of the cross, he affirmed that since Christ's sufferings were finished so also was man's salvation.¹ Hall accused the Doctors of Rome to be enemies of the cross of Christ because they held Christ's satisfaction upon the cross to be imperfect without the addition of man's satisfaction.² Hall related the atoning act of God to what Christ was and did.

Now in this word and act our sins are discharged, death endured, and therefore we cleared: the debt is paid, the score is crossed, the creditor satisfied, the debtor acquitted, and since there was no other quarrel, saved. —3

Hall stressed the fact that Christ had done all that could be done or need be done so that Rome's doctrine of merit placed a lie upon Christ and His cross.⁴ Christ says, 'It is finished', but Rome says "No, something remains: the fault is discharged, not the punishment; of the punishment, the eternal is quit, not the temporal."⁵ Davenant saw precisely the same fault in the doctrine of the Church of Rome;

For they affirm that Christ has, as Mediator, delivered sinners from the wrath of God and eternal punishment; but add, that it is the business of men to redeem themselves, by their own satisfactions, from the temporal punishment.—6

Davenant emphatically declared that in Jesus Christ there was

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 42.

2. Ibid., p. 213.

3. Ibid., p. 42.

4. Ibid., p. 43.

5. Ibid., p. 43.

6. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., II, p. 404.

complete redemption for man: full atonement had been made.

All the fulness of the Godhead and of saving grace are in Christ. ¹

We receive His fulness as we are in Christ. ² There is no place

whatsoever for human additions if our redemption is complete in

Christ. ³ Hall dismissed Rome's pretensions as absurd for what

was actually inferred by her doctrine was that God's grace was

not sufficient to strike out the farthing debts - the temporal -

but was sufficient to cancel the pounds - the eternal. ⁴

Rome's doctrine sets the grace of God on the same level

as man's works. Strange, said Hall, that God would retain what

men could discharge. The whole system of merits was attacked by

Hall because while denying the sufficiency of Christ's grace it

affirmed the sufficiency of man. Rome says that Christ's work

is not yet finished; "there wants yet much; the satisfaction of

saints applied by this vicar; add men's sufferings unto Christ's;

then the treasure is full; till then, It is not finished." ⁵ This

was precisely the charge that Luther had made against the Roman

curia and her vicar when he charged Rome with limiting the free

grace of God and remission of sin. There is no more common sin

than this, said Luther. In his commentary on Galatians he struck

at Rome's doctrine of merit:

Hereof it cometh, that Paul above the rest, doth so sharply
inveigh against Antichrist, for that he taketh away grace

1. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 426.

2. Ibid., pp. 426, 427.

3. Ibid., p. 408.

4. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 44.

5. Loc. cit.

and denieth the benefit of Christ our High Priest, who offered up himself a sacrifice for our sins. Now, thus to deny Christ, what is it else but to spit in his face, to tred him under foot, to set himself in his place, and to say: I will justify thee and I will save thee? By what means? By masses, pilgrimages, pardons, merit and such like. --1

Bishop Beveridge's sentiment on this subject was the same as
2
Hall's and Luther's.

Hall saw the terrible uncertainty that man was placed in by Rome's doctrine. Man never really knew whether he was actually forgiven. Luther had lived through this dreadful uncertainty in his pilgrimage. To such men of uncertainty Hall spoke words of great assurance: "Hear this, thou languishing and affected soul: there is not one of thy sins but is paid for; not one of thy debts in the scroll of God but it is crossed; not one farthing of all thy infinite ransom unpaid." ³ To the man that asked, what shall I do? Hall replied, 'turn and believe'. He stressed the utter sufficiency of the crucified Christ whose arms were outstretched to embrace; His side open to receive and whose words interpreted the fulness of His cross when He said, 'it is finished'. ⁴ "There is no more accusation, judgment, death, hell for thee: all these are no more to thee than if they were not: Who shall condemn? It is Christ which is dead." ⁵ The atoning work of Christ was the fulness of grace for Hall to which

1. Martin Luther, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd. 1953), p. 180.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 371.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 45.

4. Ibid., p. 46.

5. Loc. cit.

nothing could be added.

Taylor's doctrine of atonement did not differ essentially from the position of the Church of Rome. Like Rome, Taylor failed to integrate the forward movement of the atonement into his thought in any serious manner. We do not find in the writings of Taylor the concept of grace as the self-giving of God to man in Christ. Nor was Taylor's concept of adoption such as allowed for an understanding of intimate corporate union with Christ which is the essential ^{hint} meaning of atonement. Hence Christ's grace and righteousness had to be inherent for Taylor if they were to be man's¹.

The forward movement was made too dependent on the efforts of man's moral behavior in Taylor's thought. Rome made it dependent on her sacerdotal system. The backward movement was related to baptism by Taylor which was primarily a doing away with past sins and not essentially incorporation into Christ. Once man had made a breach in this first grace he was in a state of uncertainty² because man cannot be certain of his restitution and innocence. We do not know, said Taylor, whether we have done all that is necessary to repair the breach.³ Grace was an impetus that propelled man forward to a holy life but the emphasis of this forward movement of grace was placed upon man's endeavour by Taylor. He said that it was God who justified and it was He who was the judge but again Taylor directed God's eyes to dwell on what man did.⁴ Taylor

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 486.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 147.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., p. 179.

thought of the atonement primarily as the forgiveness of past sins and this he related to baptism.¹ At the time of our baptism we are initiated into the covenant of grace.² But the confidence of our election which the Holy Spirit creates in us is built on duty.³ The covenant which is made at our baptism declares that our sins are forgiven, that is past sins, while certain conditions are then imposed on man. Taylor called these conditions the laws of Christ.⁴ Taylor termed this a covenant of grace because grace was given to us which enabled us to keep the covenant; the laws of Christ.⁵ When man sins after baptism the covenant is broken and Taylor stated that man must either make amends for his sin or stand outside the covenant.⁶ The lack of stress on the forward movement of the atonement in Taylor's thought was partly motivated by the fear of Antinomianism which made a man indifferent to a holy life but he could have affirmed this movement without any such fear had his doctrine of the grace of Christ been more adequately thought out. The doctrine was not Christologically based. The only way in which Taylor could affirm the forward significance of the atonement was by the forgiveness of single sins as separate acts.⁷ This was not unlike Rome's doctrine of confession which like Taylor's misunderstanding is actually a backward movement.

1. Ibid., p. 177.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit., See also Works, op. cit., XV, p. 14.

4. Loc. cit., See also Works, op. cit., V, p. 486.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., I, p. 157. See also Works, op. cit., V, pp. 103, 431, 486.

6. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 493.

7. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 207.

The thought of Bishop Davenant stands in marked contrast to Taylor's. Davenant stressed the certainty of our eternal salvation and was extremely critical of Rome's position which made faith rest on conditional propositions. When Davenant spoke of this certainty he always had in mind the position of the believer, one who had received the grace of Christ. Davenant admitted that the state of grace was no static state or rigid condition but one in which the elect, by a true living faith wrought in his heart by the Holy Spirit, lays hold of the promises of God. ¹ The Holy Spirit sets the seal of confidence upon our hearts and assures us that Christ has already paid the λύτρον and that we are fully reconciled by Christ. ² Davenant clearly related the redemptive act to the Church and he affirmed that to deny the certainty of salvation to the true believer was to deny that Christ has a Church on earth. ³ In denying this certainty Rome denied to the believer the fact that eternal life was laid up for him in Christ. ⁴ The forward movement was directly related to the person of Christ by Davenant for he saw that the ground of our certainty of eternal salvation was our life in Christ. ⁵

Davenant observed that Rome allowed only for the backward ⁶ movement of the atonement in its concept of baptism. He acknow-

1. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., II, pp. 227, 228.

2. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., op. cit., I, p. 239. See also Downname, A Treatise of Justification, op. cit., p. 16.

3. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., p. 227.

4. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., II, p. 226.

5. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., II, p. 16.

6. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., I, p. 20.

ledged that Rome affirmed a concept of grace in this life and glory in the life to come but he pointed out that Rome bifurcated these two estates by not assenting to the reality of an assurance of salvation for the believer.¹ He saw with Andrewes that Rome asserted that man was freed from past sins and upon the backward movement man had to build human merits and therefore attach to himself the role of Redeemer.² "As if Christ had come into the world, not that he should himself fulfill the character of a Redeemer in every part, but to qualify men, so that they might become Redeemers themselves."³ The assurance of faith, said Davenant, was not the assurance of man but of God through the Holy Spirit. Davenant stood in agreement with St. Chrysostom, affirming that where the Spirit of God had testified to the truth of the thing itself there could be no doubt as to the reality.⁴ Christ by His Holy Spirit works in us both our holiness and our faith.⁵ The Holy Spirit, by faith, testifies to man that he is in grace and is the child of God.⁶ And there is no uncertainty about salvation for even now the Holy Spirit has given us certain signs of our adoption.⁷

Bishop Davenant was careful to stress that faith was an

-
1. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., II, p. 230.
 2. Ibid., p. 404.
 3. Ibid., pp. 404, 405.
 4. Ibid., p. 231.
 5. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 27.
 6. Ibid., p. 40, See also Downname, On Christian Freedom, op. cit. p. 37.
 7. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., II, p. 229.

instrument of justification and not the formal cause. He denied Bellarmine's charge that Luther and Calvin had made faith the formal cause of justification.¹ Davenant saw faith as that which contemplates the promise of forgiveness of sin and relies upon Christ as the object of this promise.² The formal content of faith which justifies is God's promise made in Jesus Christ. The act of faith lays hold of the free love of God and the inheritance destined for us in the kingdom of glory.³ The primary act of faith is God's absolute faithfulness in Jesus Christ.

The reason for stressing the doctrine of faith, said Davenant, was to show that at every point in the drama of salvation it was God and not man who wrought our redemption; that it was grace and not works which was Paul's thought exactly in Rom.4:16.⁴ We partake of God's righteousness when we rely on Christ in whom the promises of God have their foundation and efficacy.⁵ Faith exalts God and not man and that is why Davenant stressed justification by faith against Rome's doctrine. True faith always looks to Jesus Christ and acknowledges Him as the only Mediator and Saviour of mankind.⁶ The glory of a gift promised and given does not belong to the beggar that receives but to Him who gives: so we assign the whole glory of man's justification and

1. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., I, pp. 161, 176.

2. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., II, p. 409.

3. Ibid., p. 234.

4. Ibid., p. 410.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 27. See also Downname, On Christian Freedom, op. cit., p. 37. Also Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 13.

salvation, not to faith tending towards Christ and attaching it to itself, but to God Himself gratuitously justifying the believer. --1

Unlike the Arminians who placed the stress of faith on man's receiving Davenant correctly placed it on God the giver. He ruled out the possibility of faith becoming a good work for which man received justification. Man is never justified by his faith which is grounded in himself but by faith which is given to him by God and which is grounded in the absolute faithfulness of God Himself.

Andrewes pointed out that Rome held back the honour due to Christ and gave it to man when she made the forward movement of atonement dependent on man's merit. Bellarmine, said Andrewes, admitted that Rome was not content with the title of adoption but meant to claim it and merit it.² It is clear said Andrewes, that rather than lose their honour in meriting adoption Rome robs Christ of His atoning work. "Christ must part with a piece of His name, and be named justitia nostra only in the latter sense."³ The latter sense was Andrewes' reference to Rome's emphasis on the backward significance of the atonement which enabled Rome to arrogate the certainty of salvation into her own hands.

Bishop Davenant, in no less emphatic terms than Andrewes, rejected Rome's doctrine of inherent grace. He dismissed the concept of grace as an infusion of qualities as utterly false. Grace

-
1. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., II, p. 410.
 2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, pp. 126, 127.
 3. Ibid., p. 127.

for Davenant was the whole act of God in Jesus Christ.¹ And²
grace was given to man by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.
The doctrine of the Holy Spirit for the doctrine of grace was
important in Davenant's thought even as it was in Andrewes'.
The justification of man is essentially union with Christ: the
ingraftment³ into Christ the Redeemer "through whom he is re-
stored to the favour of God, preserved in the same, and accepted
to life eternal."³ Davenant denied Bellarmine's accusation of
the Reformers which alleged that they believed justification to
mean simply a covering of sins when they denied Rome's doctrine
of inherent grace. Davenant quoted from the writings of the
Reformers: Calvin, Bucer, Melancthon,⁴ Martyr and others to
show the falseness of the charge.⁴ Davenant stressed that the
believer did indeed receive grace for he was in union with Christ
and he rejected the concept of inherent righteousness which a man
could have in himself apart from union with Christ.⁵ Davenant
maintained that by grace a man was made righteous and by the Holy
Spirit was built up into righteousness but he insisted that man
did not possess righteousness in himself.⁶

The main doctrine of the gospel, exclaimed Downname, is the
assurance of our justification, not by inherent grace in ourselves
but by the righteousness of Christ alone.⁷ Sanctification was the

1. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., I, pp. 2, 167.

2. Ibid., p. 168.

3. Ibid., p. 2.

4. Ibid., p. 7.

5. Ibid., p. 14.

6. Ibid., p. 15.

7. Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 81.

righteousness of our justification worked into us by the Holy Spirit.¹ But even here, Downname was careful to point out that the righteousness of sanctification was the fruit of our justification and in no way could be thought of as inherent righteousness which saves us.² Downname observed that Rome had misunderstood the true nature of grace and had in fact attributed to the gifts of grace the nature of grace itself; in other words she looked on the fruits of righteousness as the righteousness by which we are justified.³ This was precisely Taylor's error also. Thus Rome conceived of grace as supernatural habit inherent in us.⁴ Rome had acknowledged the fruits of grace to be grace itself and had confused χάρις and χάρισμα.⁵ The grace by which we are justified is not the gift of grace inherent in us but rather we are justified by the eternal grace of God granted to us in Jesus Christ before the foundations of the world were laid.⁶ By this grace we are elected, called, redeemed, reconciled, adopted, saved and justified.⁷ Downname grounded grace in God Himself from all eternity and declared that it was this grace in Christ by which we are justified.

It was of God's free grace that hee elected any of us, that being elected hee called us, that being called and endued with faith hee justifieth and adopteth us, and thereby giveth us right to his kingdome; it was also of his free grace, that to them, whome hee redeemeth and justifieth, hee hath promised to bestow his grace upon them, whereby they are enabled to

1. Ibid., pp. 3, 4, 95.

2. Ibid., p. 79.

3. Ibid., p. 97.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Ibid., pp. 98, 99.

6. Ibid., pp. 101, 469.

7. Ibid., p. 101.

serve him in holiness and righteousness and are fitted for his owne kingdome. —1

This understanding of grace, formulated on St. Paul's doctrine² shows the absoluteness of grace and its absolute freeness, altogether unconditioned by man. It incorporates predestination and postdestination in Christ in whom God willed our election and salvation. The fulness of grace, the fulness of our redemption, appeared in the person of Christ and by incorporation into Christ by the Holy Spirit we are partakers of this same fulness.

Davenant also stressed this same fulness of redemption in Christ. While he affirmed in strong terms that Christ had utterly overcome and destroyed sin he still maintained that while we lived in this life sin was not totally eradicated out of us.³ In our baptism we are buried with Christ and the Holy Spirit by grace has broken down the dominion of sin and renewed the image of righteousness in us but Davenant agreed with Augustine that we must confess from the side of man that sin still lives in our bodies.⁴ In the regenerate sin still cleaves but its power is shattered.⁵ The relation between grace and glory was continually maintained by Davenant. The age of grace in which the Christian now lives is the militant state of grace; it is the new life and it is in Christ.⁶ He pointed out that the Reformed Churches affirmed in the strongest terms the biblical doctrine of salvation.

1. Ibid., p. 169.

2. Eph. 1:1-10.

3. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., I, pp. 16, 21, 22.

4. Ibid., pp. 25, 26.

5. Ibid., p. 80.

6. Ibid., pp. 33, 120, 121.

Man is now renewed and quickened by grace and yet that same man waits for the redemption of glory when all the elect shall actually and wholly live in a new life.¹ The life of glory was for Davenant the state of triumphant grace. The militant and triumphant concepts of grace, however, were not separated in his thought. They were united in the person of Christ; one grace even as one Christ. The concepts of grace as militant and triumphant must be seen in an analogy of faith to Christ who in His earthly life lived under the shadow of the cross a life of humiliation but He was the same Christ who now stands triumphant at the right hand of God. We now live in the state of militant grace for Christ has come into our lives here and has dwelt fully with us. When we partake fully of Christ's glorious body we shall then know the full glory of His grace. However, Davenant did not mean that man was only partially justified in this life and therefore in part still lived under the reign of satan and sin. He dismissed Bellarmine's contention that Protestants meant that Christ's ransom was imputative. The λύτρον which Christ offered to the Father for the complete release of the sinner was a genuine solid remission of sin.² The λύτρον was Christ Himself.³ The love of God towards the regenerate is not founded on their perfection but on Christ the redeemer, the beloved Son.⁴ Therefore the

1. Ibid., pp. 28, 33.

2. Ibid., p. 62.

3. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 239.

4. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., I, p. 29.

man justified by grace does not, cannot merit glory for and in himself. Grace and glory are his by right of adoption and not by inherent grace.¹ Eternal glory is not what man merits by his works of grace.² Eternal life is itself a gift of grace. The fulness of our redemption, grace and glory, are in Jesus Christ.

Andrewes had emphasized that the fulness of justification belongs to Christ. All our righteousness - the forgiveness of sin and the adoption as sons - are in Jesus Christ. "No abatement is to be devised, the Name of the Lord is not to be mangled or divided, but entirely belongeth to Christ full and whole, and we to call Him by it, Jehova justitia nostra."³ The entire act of atonement to which nothing can be added belongs to Christ. Andrewes alleged that we are not only freed from our sins and are righteous in Christ but we are made His children by adoption and have heaven itself by inheritance.⁴ The benefits of Christ's ascension are also given to the believer in Christ. It was in the ascension that Andrewes saw most clearly the forward movement of the atonement. Grace follows the path of Christ. When Christ sat down at the right hand of God the Father He took possession of it for us and not for Himself since it was His place by right even before the foundations of the earth.⁵ "Even now we sit there in Him, and shall sit there with Him in the end."⁶ Andrewes saw

1. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., pp. 37, 55. See also Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 71.

2. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., I, p. 38.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 125.

4. Ibid., p. 126.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 114.

6. Ibid., p. 115.

that it was the same Holy Spirit who conceived the Son in Mary
that also adopts us and unites us with Christ.¹ The whole pur-
pose of the atonement was not that we should only be purged from
our sin but that we might be brought to glory in Christ.² This
is the fulness of atonement. The ascension of Christ is an in-
separable part of atonement for by it Christ secures a place for
us at the right hand of God where God the Son dwells from eternity.³
What Christ does for us in heaven the Holy Spirit does for us on
earth.⁴ The Spirit brings to us the fulness of the atonement. We
have therefore in heaven and on earth a comforter and the Holy
Spirit is the anchor of both.⁵ Pentecost "seals up all by giving
us seisen of all that He hath done for us, by His Holy Spirit
sent down upon earth."⁶ The Holy Spirit is therefore the pledge
of glory and eternal life bringing to us all that Christ is and
has done for us. In Jesus Christ, who is flesh of our flesh and
bone of our bone, our flesh and blood inherit the kingdom of God.⁷
This is atonement in its essential form.

The unity of the backward and forward movement of the atone-
ment was decured by Andrewes in the person of Christ. He is the
atonement. Davenant articulated the same thought. It was by

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 114.

2. Loc. cit. See Also Works, op. cit., III, p. 149.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 159.

4. Ibid., p. 160.

5. Ibid., p. 159.

6. Ibid., p. 149.

7. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 98.

the Son of God that redemption is offered to all the world but it is in Christ that we have our redemption.¹ The saving benefits of our redemption are so united that to partake of one is to partake of all.² We are delivered by Christ from the kingdom of sin and satan and are translated into His kingdom.³ This twofold movement is but one act.⁴ There is but one kingdom of Christ whether it be understood either as grace or glory.⁵ Through union with Christ we enter into His kingdom and receive all the benefits of grace.⁶ We enter into the fulness of Christ's kingdom of grace and glory when we are engrafted into Him.⁷ For Davenant, ingrafting into Christ was through faith and by the Holy Spirit.⁸ There is nothing that we need for our eternal salvation which has not been done for us by Christ; even the redemption of our bodies is included in the atonement.⁹ All the fulness of Christ is ours as we are in Him.

Davenant, like Andrewes, and those who followed in the Caroline tradition made the distinction between grace and glory in relation to the atonement. All that had to be done has been done once and for all and in our baptism we are ingrafted into the fulness of Christ by His Holy Spirit.¹⁰ Our participation in Christ,

1. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 163.

2. Ibid., pp. 153, 458.

3. Ibid., pp. 156, 157.

4. Ibid., p. 158.

5. Ibid., p. 161.

6. Ibid., p. 160.

7. Ibid., p. 161.

8. Ibid., p. 164.

9. Ibid., p. 165.

10. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., II, pp. 16, 17.

in the whole redemptive act is real but keeping within the structures of this age this participation was seen by Davenant¹ as a sacramental participation. But this did not mean for Davenant nor for Andrewes that our participation in the fulness of Christ was less than real. The reality of our participation was analogous to the reality of Christ's presence in the eucharist. The whole redemption of man does not appear perfectly in us in this life but it is perfectly completed in Christ in whom our² lives are even now hid.

This same thought was also expressed by Bishop Downname when he affirmed the completeness of our redemption in Christ. He, like Davenant, understood baptism to mean participation in³ the wholeness of Christ; His death and His resurrection. In baptism we are sacramentally united to the body of Christ which⁴ is His Church. The Church is an essential part of the atonement. Downname stressed the certainty of salvation for the redeemed in Christ by showing the relation between justification and sanctification. Sanctification is an inseparable companion of justification and is a confirmation of it.⁵ Yet in the certainty of our redemption Downname did not negate the sinful forms of this age. The man who was redeemed was no longer under the power of sin but⁶ sin still remains even in the faithful. Through the actual union

1. Ibid., pp. 18, 19.

2. Ibid., pp. 19, 20.

3. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 36.

4. Downname, The Christian Freedom, op. cit., pp. 21, 22.

5. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 35.

6. Ibid., p. 37.

with Christ we know now the liberty of grace in this life.¹ The liberty of grace is to us the pledge of the liberty of glory; triumphant grace.² Downname also made the distinction between the militant and triumphant state of grace. He could say that man was now completely redeemed in Christ and still maintain that sin remained in this age. We are actual partakers of the grace wrought for us by Christ, which is the redemptive act, by the communication of the Holy Spirit.³ The Holy Spirit was the Spirit of grace for Downname because He communicated unto us all that Christ was and did for us.⁴

The direction of our life of grace in Christ, within the militant age of grace, is to God and in the state of glory, the triumphant state of grace, our life is with God.⁵ It is Christ who is our bond of union with God and in Him we are reconciled to God.⁶ The life of grace was like the childhood of glory in which we were being built up day by day by the Holy Spirit.⁷ In this world we have been raised from sin into newness of life and we are to be raised to a glorious life; both of these are hidden in Christ who is the fulness of our redemption.⁸ The absolute

-
1. Downname, The Christian Freedom, op. cit., pp. 30, 33.
 2. Ibid., pp. 149, 155.
 3. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 42.
 4. Ibid., p. 43.
 5. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., II, p. 20.
 6. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 240.
 7. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., II, p. 20.
 8. Ibid., pp. 21, 22.

certainty of our life of glory is given to us now because even now our lives are in Christ who is glorified.¹ The life of glory will be given to us fully when the glorified Christ returns to us to claim us as His own.² Christ has purchased the life of glory for us. He has promised it to us and He has prepared us for full participation in it by His Holy Spirit.³ Christ has already appeared bodily in our flesh. He appears continually to us in the preaching of the Gospel and we now wait for His appearing in glory when He shall return to judge the quick and the dead.⁴ The life of grace is therefore anchored to the Parousia. At that time those whose lives have been hid in Christ will be revealed and made glorious like the body of Christ.⁵

The importance of the ascension is to be seen in Pearson's thought also. He viewed the ascension of Christ as the fulfillment of the Old Testament concept of the priest's ascent into the holy of holies.⁶ Thorndike saw this also.⁷ Christ's atonement fulfills this concept said Pearson for He has ascended upon high and entered the holy of holies not made with hands.⁸ Christ appears before God as the atonement for our sins.⁹ Before God, Jesus Christ, to whom all power is given both in heaven and earth,

1. Ibid., p. 16.

2. Ibid., pp. 16, 24.

3. Ibid., p. 24.

4. Ibid., p. 25.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Pearson, op. cit., p. 477.

7. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 243.

8. Pearson, op. cit., p. 170.

9. Loc. cit.

continually makes an efficacious and glorious intercession for
us.¹ Pearson saw this intercession as the continuation of
Christ's own oblation which He offered once and for all.² Taylor
interpreted Christ's intercession as High Priest in a similar way.
His intercession in heaven makes effectual to man the grace and
glory which He wrought for us on the cross.³ Taylor related the
heavenly drama to the eucharist as the means of grace and the
pledged of glory.⁴

The ascension of Christ to the right hand of the Father
is the glorification of the Son and by it our hopes are secured.⁵
Christ's ascension was the ground and glory of faith for Pearson.
Man's very nature now resides in the highest of heavens in Christ.⁶
Christ, wearing our humanity, has ascended so that flesh of our
flesh and bone of our bone now sits at the right hand of God.⁷
Christ, still of our flesh now stands on the other side of all
principalities and powers, above all angels and archangels.⁸ In
Jesus Christ, said Pearson, the first-fruits of our nature are
ascended and the rest is sanctified by the Holy Spirit but this
could not have been given to us had Christ not first ascended.⁹
It is the Holy Spirit who makes us members of that body of which

-
1. Loc. cit.
 2. Ibid., p. 503.
 3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., III, p. 296.
 4. Ibid., p. 299.
 5. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 447, 474.
 6. Ibid., p. 482
 7. Loc. cit.
 8. Ibid., pp. 482, 493, 494.
 9. Ibid., pp. 484, 485, 486, 575, 577.

1
Christ is the head. The Holy Spirit assured us that we are
now adopted as sons and He is the earnest of our everlasting in-
2
heritance. Christ signified union and dimension "and therefore
while we look upon Him at the right hand of God we see ourselves
3
in heaven." The ascension of Christ was also important for
Pearson because it meant that Christ, who as our High Priest had
made atonement for us, sits on the throne and in the final day
Christ as Redeemer will be our judge; one who is flesh of our
4
flesh. The believer's confidence in the day of judgment is in
Christ who is Brother, Redeemer, High Priest and Advocate and the
5
One who has already absolved us. Christ will come to judge but
He will come as Redeemer to judge. In the ascension of grace in
Jesus Christ it is glorified even as He is glorified and this tri-
umphant grace will be fully ours in the last day. But Pearson
saw that the future content of grace is given to us now by the
Holy Spirit in the Church.

Hall, as we have seen, attacked Rome's doctrine of grace
which made election an uncertainty. All Protestantism refutes
6
Rome on this issue. There was a certainty of salvation for those
whom Christ had called and who by a lively faith had effectually
7
laid hold of Christ. Hall also pointed out to Bellarmine that
8
the testimony of our election is by the Spirit of adoption. The
Spirit is the witness so that we do not simply appear to be sons

1. Ibid., pp. 579, 580.

2. Ibid., p. 580.

3. Ibid., pp. 502, 503.

4. Ibid., pp. 438, 439.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Hall, Works, op.cit. V, p.666.

7. Ibid., p. 665.

8. Ibid., p. 670.

of God by adoption; it is not a mere conjecture but a certainty grounded upon God Himself and not man. The certainty of this grace can give us nothing in the way of pride because the grace is not ours but God's and the glory belongs to Him also.¹

There was a relative degree of continuity in the doctrine of the atonement in those Carolines which we have examined thus far. In the person of Bishop Taylor there was a definite shift of emphasis from the dominant thought of the Caroline period. Taylor dealt at considerable length with the concept of the Spirit as relating to grace and the atoning work of Christ. The Spirit of God was the Spirit of life by which the Christian is born anew.² The new life in Taylor's thought as we have seen, was related to a new principle which the Spirit gives. Taylor limited the doctrine of grace and the atonement by limiting the significance of the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost. This had drastic effects on his concept of the atonement. Taylor like Rome always tended to see the redemptive work of Christ in relation to the backward movement only. The participation of the Christian in the incarnate and ascended Christ which we have noted in Andrewes and others is noticeably missing in Taylor's thought.

The new principle of life by which man is made a new creature was understood by Taylor to be the grace which is given when we are adopted by the Spirit to be sons of God and members of Christ's body.³ This new principle, if cherished, grows up to

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 675.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 252.

3. Loc. cit., See also Works, op. cit., VI, p. 117.

eternal life.¹ The Holy Spirit as a principle was a perfecting constitution which produced actions of holy living.² In this way Taylor considered the Spirit as the principle of grace to be the earnest of glory.³ It must be noted, however, that the Holy Spirit as the earnest was conditional because Taylor conceived of a holy life primarily in moral terms.

Taylor set the initiative of grace in the hands of God, as we have seen, acknowledging that the grace of pardon is completely given by God and without it man could not do a single act toward his restitution.⁴ Taylor thought of this first grace as baptism and this was given completely by God but from this first grace onward man cooperates with the grace of God. Taylor interpreted a life worthy of repentance again in moral terms and this was clearly seen in his concept of a death bed repentance. The day of repentance for a man on his death bed was past, insisted Taylor, because repentance was the renewing of a holy life, a life of grace, which no death bed repentant could do since there was no time left for him to live a worthy life.⁵ Though the dying man could do nothing worthy of repentance Taylor did not maintain that his case was absolutely hopeless. The man could still receive grace but the case had to be committed to God

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 252.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 28. See also Works, op. cit., VI, p. 266.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 424.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 264.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 262. See also Works, op. cit., V, pp. 466, 468. Also Works, op. cit., II, p. 358.

for nothing else was left possible to be done. There was no great affirmation of assurance of hope on Taylor's part in this particular issue because the living of a holy life was very important in his concept of salvation.

Taylor called repentance a great volume of duty though the first grace is given by God.² A man's decision for Christ was not valid until he had in some measure performed what he had promised to do.³ That is why Taylor considered the death-bed ^{penitent} repentant to be in so precarious a position with regard to his eternal salvation. The life of repentance in Taylor's thought was a continual overcoming of sin by the strength of God's grace "And little by little to return to health and strength; unless we have grace and time to do all this, our sins will lie down with us in our graves."⁴ There is always a definite suggestion in all of Taylor's thought that man is called to cooperate with God that atonement might be completed. Man must make good the grace which is given him by God. The concept of substitutionary atonement found no place in Taylor's thought. Grace enables man to do those things which God, through Jesus Christ, accepts to salvation.⁵ What a man did was of no value in itself because Taylor grounded the work of man on the work of Christ but again Taylor conditioned the atoning work of Christ by stressing the work

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., III, p. 358.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, pp. 467, 594.

3. Ibid., p. 472.

4. Ibid., p. 475.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 204.

1
that man had to do.

As we have noted, Andrewes thought of the significance of the incarnation; the life and death of Christ and the ascension in relation to grace and the atonement. But this movement from incarnation to ascension was bridged by the resurrection of Christ. The resurrection of Christ tells us that the incarnation does have continuity; grace is not defeated but ^{surpasses and} superabounds over death and sin. Without the resurrection of Christ grace lies dead and buried under the sin of the world. The only way that we can really confess Christ to be the hope of the world is that Christ is risen. There is no hope in a Christ not risen.² In a resurrection sermon on 1 Cor. 15:20, Andrewes emphasized that the doctrine of the resurrection was one of the foundations of the Christian faith laid on the Rock which is Christ.³ The fall of Adam was a death from which there could be no rising, that is, there could be no resurrection from the side of man, but in Christ's resurrection the fall of Adam is turned into a rising.⁴ Christ who has assumed our nature in the incarnation is now risen in our nature and there is our certain hope that our nature will be resurrected also, even our persons.⁵ The resurrection is the continuity of the incarnation and atonement. There was no doubt at all in Andrewes' mind that Christ had indeed truly risen but he

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 207.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 212, See also Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 392.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 212.

4. Ibid., p. 193.

5. Ibid., pp. 193, 194.

observed with St. Bernard that the Christian was so a part of Christ's body by our being grafted into Him that Christ's body is not wholly risen until we are resurrected also.¹ This thought did not take away the reality of the resurrected body of Christ but it stressed rather our union in Christ. We have already noted that Andrewes also emphasized the other aspect of our union with Christ by stressing that even now we had risen with Christ and were seated in Him at the right hand of the Father.

Pearson shared in this understanding of Andrewes' and likewise grounded the Christian hope on God's act in the resurrection. Christ's resurrection, as His life and death, is for our benefit and apart from the resurrection of Christ there is no hope of our being raised; death then is the victor and satan reigns supreme because God has been overcome.² He, like Andrewes, stressed our union with Christ in this act of God; when Christ took up His life He took up ours also.³ "We are the members of the body of which Christ is the Head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind."⁴ By His resurrection Christ revealed that He has power to raise all from the dead. The Spirit of Christ, who makes us members of Christ, is our full right and title of resurrection with our Head.⁵ Pearson saw the resurrection as a form of creation, a new creation. The creation of man from the

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 194.

2. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 66, 67.

3. Ibid., pp. 474, 475.

4. Ibid., p. 475.

5. Ibid., pp. 475, 666.

dust of the earth reveals God's power of resurrection.¹ Pearson rightly related the resurrection of the body of Christ to that Body of which He is the Head - the Church.² There is, said Pearson, an initial form of eternal life in this life which is the guarantee of that which is to follow.³ The initial form was the age of grace in which we now live. The perfection of eternal life shall be conferred upon the elect immediately after the blessing pronounced by Christ.⁴ This perfection was the age of glory when the fulness of grace was fully consummated.⁵

Andrewes thought of a two-fold resurrection: the resurrection of the spirit and the body, but this concept did not signify a dualism in Andrewes' thought between spirit and body. It was a dimensional concept. By the resurrection of the spirit we have victory over the dominion of death; over the mighty monarch which is death.⁶ The resurrection of the Spirit is the resurrection to grace in the thought of Andrewes.⁷ This resurrection is given to us now. It is also the pledge, the earnest, that our bodies will also be resurrected for without the resurrection of the spirit there can be no resurrection at all.⁸ Andrewes related the resurrection to grace as the gift of the Holy Spirit who is the giver of all life.⁹ Against this mighty assurance of a

-
1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 655.
 2. Ibid., p. 66.
 3. Ibid., p. 688.
 4. Loc. cit.
 5. Ibid., pp. 693, 694.
 6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 195.
 7. Ibid., p. 201.
 8. Loc. cit.
 9. Ibid., p. 222.

resurrection to eternal life Andrewes painted a vivid picture of the Christian still living under the shadow of the cross in this life.¹ The resurrection of the spirit was the resurrection to the life of grace now, a life in Christ and the resurrection of the body was the resurrection to glory which was not finally possessed by us in this life. However, the first resurrection, of grace, is the promise that we shall know the fulness of resurrection.² These two concepts were brought together in Andrewes' thought because he could affirm that we had already risen in Christ and it was an error for us to think of the resurrection merely as a future event.³ This is the miracle of grace and this is its eschatological content. We are risen in Christ and we will certainly be raised. Christ's resurrection to glory, His ascension, is for us the first-fruits of that life which is for us now the life of grace.⁴ These first-fruits we receive at our baptism which is the renewing of the Holy Spirit.⁵

Bishop Hall also thought in terms of the first and second resurrection. The second Adam gives us new life and is the new life of our regeneration.⁶ The new creature now lives by the Spirit of Christ and the life He gives us is the life of Christ which is the life of grace that ends in glory.⁷ Hall saw both the life of grace and the life of glory as the life in Christ.

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 96.

2. Ibid., pp. 201, 202.

3. Ibid., p. 201.

4. Ibid., p. 223.

5. Ibid., p. 222.

6. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 133.

7. Ibid., p. 136.

The life after the second resurrection is the life of Christ
¹
under the state of glory.

The Arminian controversy raised the question of the relation between the work of Christ and the man who stood outside the state of grace. The Arminians were also concerned with the activity of man in the drama of salvation. Bishop Hall, as always, was conscious of the fact that many of the Calvinists and the Arminians held extreme positions. Though Hall utterly rejected any doctrine of merit, he showed the relation between faith and works. He stressed that no one could be saved by good works nor could one be saved without them. However, Hall maintained this only because he understood that faith expressed itself in relation to God's will but he never would allow faith to be dependent on good works. The certainty of our election came before good works, and therefore the latter is in fact dependent upon election. Our good works do not add to our faith but they show forth the truth of our faith.² Bishop Barlow also emphasized this aspect, claiming that a sinner is first justified by faith and that faith is a continuation of our justification.³ Good works are indeed the fruits and effects of faith but they cannot contribute to the continuance of our faith.⁴ Good works evidence the fact that faith is lively even as good fruit presupposes a good tree but does not make it good.⁵

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 133.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, pp. 144, 678.

3. Barlow, op. cit., p. 64.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Ibid., p. 71.

Hall put forward the words of Bonaventure who attributed all to grace and nothing to the self of man.¹ Hall also affirmed Andrewes' thought on the subject and declared that it did no harm to the piety of man to attribute all to the grace of God but when man subtracts from the grace of God and gives it to nature it offends both God and man.² Hall denied that the Church of England believed election to rest on faith foreseen. The bishops of the Church of England have strongly refuted this contention, said Hall, and have opposed it in the Church of Rome and Arminians and have carried it down to the depths of hell.³

Whereas Hall stressed the good work of a Christian as the showing forth of the truth of God's grace, Jeremy Taylor shifted the emphasis of work to the necessity of insuring our election.⁴ Taylor left an uncertainty about our election or rather he interpreted election in such a way that it was not grounded in the will of God. Christians could be as sure of their election as they could be of their future acts.⁵ Taylor placed the stress on man's action rather than on God's act. The confidence which the Spirit creates was built upon duty.⁶ Nevertheless, at times Taylor did distinguish between God's secret will and the condition in which the Christian lived. Taylor thought

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 318.

2. Ibid., p. 518.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 365.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 248.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., III, p. 183.

6. Ibid., p. 177. See also op. cit., Works, V, p. 422.

that there were a few Christians to whom God had given the confirmation in grace which meant a certainty of condition or election.¹ Had Taylor continued in this direction of thought his doctrine of grace would have been more Christocentric and the implications of such a position would have radically affected his entire structure of thought had he consistently followed it through. But even at the point where Taylor did not condition election by man's moral striving he related it so closely to the ethical life that it virtually destroyed the distinction.

Though Thorndike rejected any notion of justification by works on the part of others he nevertheless interpreted the gospel to be a new law of works by which a man could be justified.² These works were post baptismal and were conditions of the covenant of grace. However, Thorndike did maintain that these works are the works of grace and were dependent on the gospel.³ He rejected as heresy the opinions of Socinus and Pelagius which stated that man could be justified apart from the grace of God in Jesus Christ, upon which grace justification by faith was grounded.⁴ The grace which God declares to us is in consideration of Christ's obedience.⁵ However, Thorndike actually said something quite different when he began to define the nature of grace and it becomes very obvious in his thought that grace is to be regarded as helps which enable man to do the works of faith.⁶ But to regard

1. Ibid., p. 185.

2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, pp. 99, 100.

3. Ibid., pp. 100, 101.

4. Ibid., pp. 101, 102.

5. Ibid., p. 102.

6. Ibid., pp. 148, 167, 168.

grace simply as helps and aids to salvation is in fact to rob grace of its essential meaning even though we may say as Thorndike did that grace is given only for the sake of Christ. Thorndike denounced the Arminian doctrine as heresy but there was not as much difference between his understanding and theirs as he liked to believe.

Downame saw the real issue at stake. It was precisely this understanding of the covenant of grace affirmed by Thorndike that he denied. The covenant which God had made with Abraham and his seed was one of grace and it rested upon the very self of God for its beginning and continuation, The oath that seals and sustains the covenant is God Himself.¹ Downame denied that the covenant of grace could be interpreted as a new law or that Christ was a new lawgiver.² He interpreted the atoning work of Christ as a second creation and likened it to the first as a creation out of nothing.³ For Downame, the life of the Christian was not one in which he did good works by the helps of grace. Downame's thought on this subject was akin to St. Paul's in I Cor. 15:10. The whole life of the Christian; whatever he thinks, wills or does was related by Downame to the new creature of grace; 'not I but the grace of God'.⁴

Thorndike's doctrine of the atonement was closer to Taylor's than it was to Andrewes'. The victory of Christ over sin and death

1. Downame, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., pp. 9, 28.

2. Ibid., p. 29.

3. Ibid., p. 32.

4. Ibid., p. 31.

was not given to man as a completed event in Thorndike's thought. It was given to man in the way of helps which God granted in consideration of Christ's victory.¹ Thus Christ's overcoming is given to men to enable them to overcome.² Thorndike's interpretation of the triumph of the cross made it a victory in which man did not fully share. By the victory of Christ's death we are enabled to put to death sin in the flesh.³ The Son of God assists the slaves of sin by dying Himself and by His death helping them to their freedom.⁴ This interpretation limits the objective act of the atonement as a once and for all event which is given to the believer. The substitutionary concept so prominent in Andrewes' thought is conspicuously absent from Thorndike. A radical difference is involved in saying that the victory over death is given to the believer in Christ than to say that the victory helps us to victory. A difference again in saying that we are made free by the grace of Christ than to say that the grace of Christ helps us to this freedom. The difference is in the completedness and givenness of the act of grace - the atonement.

In articulating his concept of justification Thorndike had sought to refute the Socinian doctrine of the atonement which denied that satisfaction made by Christ was in reference to His Godhead while at the same time he sought to refute the absolute predestinarians whose views tended to exclude the necessity of the

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 321.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

¹
covenant of grace. Thorndike claimed that both these views side-stepped the need for baptism: the Socinians by their stress on free-will and the latter by claiming a predestination to glory. Thorndike's quarrel with the doctrine of predestination was valid when he attacked a rigid determinism which, as we have noted, was stressed by some of the hyper-Calvinists but when he dismissed the doctrine of predestination to glory Thorndike simply revealed his misunderstanding of grace; he separated grace and glory and thus broke the eschatological dimension of grace which is now glorified at the right hand of God. Predestination from the will of God before the foundations of the world cannot be separated from postdestination at the right hand of God. It is this concept of grace which gives to the believer his absolute confidence in faith and it is precisely this concept which Thorndike rejected that showed the uncertainty in which the believer was placed by his doctrine of grace.

Thorndike channeled the whole atoning work of Christ to the covenant of grace which is extended to us in baptism. Baptism showed the free grace of God.² But Thorndike qualified this statement when he spoke of the covenant of grace which was instituted by baptism. He ratified the act of baptism by man's will in accepting the conditions of the covenant.³ Thorndike regarded the grace of God as consisting in the satisfaction offered to God by the sacrifice of Christ's cross which purchased the terms of our

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, pp. 528, 529.

2. Ibid., p. 529.

3. Ibid., p. 528.

¹ release. But Thorndike did not see the cross of Christ as being a substitutionary atonement whereby God as man in Christ completed all that was required for our salvation. The sacrifice was viewed rather as all sufficient for the purchasing of a new covenant, the covenant of grace, in which a man may be saved. The grace of God provides the conditions of man's release and helps man to perform these conditions.² Thorndike rejected the concept that works of nature could oblige God to give the helps of grace.³ The righteousness of the law is the work of nature which sets aside the grace of Christ.⁴ Thorndike never maintained that a man could merit glory by his works of grace but he held these works to be necessary in fulfilling the conditions of the covenant of grace which alone brings us to glory. It was precisely this tendency of thought that Davenant had criticized in Bellarmine.⁵ It amounted to nothing more than saying that God in Jesus Christ had provided the means whereby the sinner could make satisfaction to God. "An unheard of kind of justification, to make the injured party provide the means, so that the guilty may himself furnish satisfaction on his own score."⁶ Andrewes had made exactly the same criticism. Thorndike must stand under this criticism also.

Though Thorndike emphasized that the purchase of the covenant of grace was wholly wrought by God his tendency was to

-
1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, p. 528.
 2. Ibid., p. 326.
 3. Ibid., p. 532.
 4. Ibid., p. 538.
 5. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., p. 405.
 6. Loc. cit.

make the continuity of the covenant dependent on man's faithfulness to the terms of the covenant of grace. Bishop Sanderson saw more clearly than Thorndike that the continuity of the covenant was not sustained by man but by God's faithfulness. God's free election of those whom He proposed to save was from His own free grace without any motives in the elect themselves. Their certain perseverance to salvation lay in the immutability of God's love and grace towards His elect. The primary motive for election is hid in the eternal will of God and revealed in Jesus Christ but man cannot undo the eternal will. No force of evil can enter and there destroy our election. Sanderson stressed that nothing in man can annul the covenant of God. This is what Thorndike failed to see. He put the stress on man. Sanderson put the emphasis on God.

Neither the original unworthiness of God's children, through the universal corruption of nature, nor their actual unfaithfulness, betrayed, through frailty, in particular trial, can alienate the free love of God from them, or cut them off from the covenant of Grace; but that still God will be glorified in the truth and faithfulness of His promises, not withstanding any unrighteousness or unfaithfulness in man. --4

The anchor of the covenant of grace is in the heart of God not the will of man nor the faith of man. This is the believer's absolute confidence.

The bishop who best articulated the dominant theological thought of the Caroline tradition at the close of its period was

1. Sanderson, Works, II, p. 46. 2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p. 41.

4. Loc. cit.

William Beveridge. The act of God's grace was very closely related by Beveridge to the person and work of Christ. His doctrine of the Trinity and the incarnation revealed that Beveridge conceived of grace as the self-giving of God to man for man's redemption. His doctrine of the atonement is the working out of grace which has for its ultimate object the final state of man's redemption. All things that are required for our eternal salvation, said Beveridge are contained in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.¹ The sending of the eternal Son was seen by Beveridge to be the act of God's own infinite and essential love to man and in no way was it dependent on any thing that man did to merit His love. The movement of grace flows from the goodness of God. Grace as used in the New Testament is opposed to anything that man can do or deserve.²

The grace of Christ as the atonement which Christ made for us was grounded upon Christ as God and man. What Christ does is done by God Himself.³ The person that suffered for us said Beveridge was truly God. Jesus Christ is the eternal Son of God of one substance with the Father who took upon Himself the nature of man and is both God and man.⁴ Beveridge, like Andrewes, stressed the concept of Christ as the second Adam who while being one particular man also gathered in Himself the whole nature of

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 224, 225.
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 57.
 3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 155.
 4. Ibid., p. 153.

¹
man. Christ is both the One and the many. As God and man in
one person Jesus Christ is full of grace and truth.²

The sacrifice that Christ made for the sin of the whole world was seen by Beveridge as a divine offering offered up to God Himself by Himself from the side of man.³ The fundamental concept of the atonement in Beveridge's thought is one of substitution where God offered Himself for sinful man as man in the person of Jesus Christ.⁴ Beveridge admitted that just the thought of this; God suffering for the sins which we had committed against Him, left him in a maze of confusion. The subject of God's atonement was so sublime "that I can neither fully conceive what I ought to express, nor express what I myself conceive of it."⁵

In His sacrificial death on the cross Christ offered up Himself as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world.⁶ It was God who made the propitiatory sacrifice for us. When Christ died, God Himself may be truly said to have died.⁷ This was Beveridge's way of stating in bold words the truth that God Himself had come to atone; God and no lesser being. To know Christ is to know God Himself and to know Christ crucified is to know how the Lamb of God takes away sin and how God Himself is made of

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 153.

2. Ibid., p. 222.

3. Ibid., p. 267. See also Works, op. cit., II, pp. 58, 59.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 316.

5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 266.

6. Ibid., p. 187.

7. Ibid., pp. 270, 271.

Himself redemption for us. The Almighty God, the Lord and giver¹ of life died for us upon the cross.² Beveridge stressed the necessity of Christ's crucifixion for without it, without the shedding of blood, there could be no remission of sin. The blood which was shed upon the cross was the blood of the incarnate God.³ Beveridge affirmed that the grace of God came to us through the death of Christ on the cross.⁴ In Beveridge's thought grace was vitally related to the atoning work of Christ and was in fact the act of atonement.

The sacrifice of Christ Himself made atonement for the sin⁵ of the world and did not simply cover up our sins; sin was atoned. He observed with St. Chrysostom that the atonement of the Lamb of God has taken away, not only some particular sins but sin in its totality; sin as sin.⁶ Christ took upon Himself the curse of the law which God had proclaimed against sin and the same nails that fastened His hand and feet to the cross also secured the curse to the cross and it too was crucified, dead and buried and dead for ever.⁷ Beveridge emphasized that the sacrifice of the cross was not only a propitiation for the sin of the world at one particular time in the past but that Christ continually takes away sin. Beveridge of course did stress the one particular event and would never dismiss that history, yet he saw in that one historic

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 334.

2. Ibid., p. 402.

3. Ibid., p. 332.

4. Ibid., p. 400. See also Works, op. cit., II, p. 59.

5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 267, 330.

6. Ibid., p. 267.

7. Ibid., p. 404.

event an eschatological dimension which touched every instant of our lives and rooted itself at the right hand of God. By virtue of the fact that Christ had made propitiation for sin upon the cross Christ continually ¹ is the propitiation.

Like Andrewes, Beveridge vitally related what Christ did to what He was, His person. Our peace and reconciliation to God was made by Christ upon the cross, by the death which He suffered and the blood which he shed.² Beveridge pushed the atoning work of Christ to the very self of Christ and hence to the very self of God. Christ not only made our peace with God but Christ is Himself our peace and He reconciles us in Himself to God.³ He is the reconciliation.

In Beveridge's thought grace was conceived as existing only in Christ and we can best understand his concept of God's grace to man to be Christ Himself. In the redemption of fallen man by the incarnate Son God revealed the glory of His grace.⁴ The fulness and completeness of grace is revealed in Christ. God reveals His grace and truth in the act of raising up a second Adam after all mankind had fallen in the first.⁵ It is only in Christ the second Adam that God promised grace and it is only in Him that the truth of the promise is fulfilled.⁶ Christ fills full

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 406, 407. See also Works, op. cit., II, p. 59. Also Works, op. cit., III, p. 196.

2. Ibid., p. 405.

3. Ibid., pp. 405, 406.

4. Ibid., p. 456.

5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 344.

6. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 456, 457, 359. See also Works, op. cit., II, pp. 28, 56, 58.

the promise of God because Christ is full of God. Our justification before God and His acceptance of us as righteous must be ascribed wholly to the grace of God in Jesus Christ exclaimed¹
Beveridge.

Beveridge maintained the backward and forward movement of the atonement by stressing our union with Christ. Man, by being in Christ was in the whole redemptive movement of Christ. Christ took our nature upon Himself and those who are united to Christ, those who are in Him, are really concerned with all that He did and suffered for us in our nature.² In Beveridge's thought union with Christ was union by the Holy Spirit.³ By faith man is cut out of the old stock of Adam and is ingrafted into Christ and by that incision we are made one body with Him.⁴ Beveridge refused to entertain the false notion of union as a natural emanation and he maintained that such an analogy was unbiblical. Men may extol the light of nature and the power of natural religion if they will, said Beveridge, but it had no power whatsoever to create a new creature.⁵ Only the power of the Almighty God can create and re-create new creatures and God exerts that power only in Jesus Christ.⁶ The union with Christ was the Holy Spirit and it is by this union that we are made new creatures in Christ.⁷ In Christ the old man

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 60. See also Works, op. cit., III, p. 273.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 347. See also Works, op. cit., III, pp. 313, 413, 414.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 347.

4. Ibid., pp. 346, 354.

5. Ibid., p. 357.

6. Loc. cit.

7. Ibid., p. 351.

in us is crucified with Christ, dead and buried, and the new
body of grace is formed in Him.¹ By our ingrafting into Christ
we are placed into the fulness and fountain of grace.² In Christ
we are in the new life which He is. By being in Christ we have
Christ's righteousness as ours and we are accounted righteous by
it.³ The fulness of the atonement is ours in our union with
Christ who performed redemption in our nature. In Him we are
sanctified; in Him we have fulfilled all righteousness; in Him
we have suffered the death which God judged against sin and in
Him we are absolved from our sin and justified before God.⁴ This
is what Beveridge considered the fulness of grace; complete atone-
ment.

The justified are those who have been accepted in the
beloved, and they must attribute their justification

to the infinite goodness and free grace of God, who might
justly, if He had pleased, according to the first Covenant,
have exerted perfect righteousness and obedience from them,
performed by everyone in his own person, or for want of that
have condemned them to everlasting punishment. --5

The grace of God is revealed to us in that He has opened up a
new way for us in Christ, the living way. Our election is one of
grace and attributed wholly to God's goodness in Jesus Christ.⁶
It is as we are in Christ that our hopes of salvation, past,

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 355.
 2. Ibid., p. 356.
 3. Ibid., pp. 345, 381. See also, Works, op. cit., III, p. 410.
 4. Ibid., pp. 347, 381.
 5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 411.
 6. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., IV, pp. 232, 233.

present and future are made certain. The whole of our salvation from first to last is begun, continued and perfected only in Christ.¹ The fulfillment of our redemption in glory was grounded by Beveridge to our union by grace in Christ and this union was extended to us now.²

Beveridge maintained that God's propitiation for sin was for all men. He stressed two aspects in this regard. God never forces man to accept salvation but Beveridge utterly rejected as false the doctrine of salvation by free-will.³ None can come to God the Son by faith but he that is drawn by the grace of God the Father.⁴ The Holy Spirit does not first work faith in us and then come to us but He first comes to us and then He works faith in us.⁵ Beveridge rejected the Tridentine view, that it was necessary to be prepared and disposed by the motion of our own free-will in order that we may be justified and he declared most emphatically that the Church of England believed that sinners are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord by faith and so justified by faith only.⁶ Beveridge's understanding of faith affirmed that it was the work of God the Holy Spirit.

The gift of the Holy Spirit is given to man by Christ that the reconciliation of God to man which He effected by His death might be worked into us and so be reconciled to God in Him.⁷ The

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 36. See also Works, op. cit., V, p. 201.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 362, 358, 359.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, pp. 275, 276.

4. Ibid., p. 277.

5. Ibid., p. 304.

6. Ibid., p. 368.

7. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 454.

Holy Spirit brings¹ God's grace to us that we might turn from darkness to God. Our essential humanity is restored by the Holy Spirit who brings to us the atonement of Christ and imprints upon us again the image of God and adopts us by grace as children of God.² By the gift of the Holy Spirit we are ingrafted into Christ. The Holy Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance which is reserved for us and which we shall possess.³ Eternal life can only be given by God and He gives it only through Jesus Christ. "So that whatsoever a man doth, he cannot merit or deserve it, but still he is wholly beholden to the free gift of God for it, after all, it is His free gift."⁴ The new creature in Christ is called to the new life of the new creature but Beveridge in no way viewed this as meriting either what had been given or deserving the fulfillment of the new life.

When a man is born again of God and made His child by adoption and grace the Holy Spirit is breathed into him and he not only has the promise of eternal life but by the Holy Spirit he has eternal life even now.⁵ Grace secures us to its destination - to glory. The Holy Spirit is given to us from the side of completed and fulfilled grace - the ascension. The Holy Spirit is given through the mediation of Christ at the right hand of God

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., IV, pp. 64, 65.

2. Ibid., pp. 65, 66.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 446, 447, 393, 356, 412.

4. Ibid., p. 289.

5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 192.

the Father and by the power of the Holy Spirit we are made child-¹ren of God by adoption and grace. It was only because Beveridge saw the eschatological nature of grace that he could speak of grace in such complete terms; that even now we are given eternal life. Even now grace cannot be separated from Christ who stands glorified before the Father; grace cannot be separated from glory. The man who is baptized into Christ is baptized into the wholeness of Christ.

Though Beveridge could speak of grace in such absolute terms, that even now we have eternal life, he nevertheless maintained the distinction between grace and glory, Though a man is redeemed in Christ now and nothing can be added to that redemption² still the redeemed man was not without sin in this world. He was redeemed in Christ and he waited for his Lord. Not only the worst sinner but also the saints must acknowledge that while on earth they have sin as well as grace.³ Even though a man is born again sin remains in him though he may not live in sin.⁴ The grace of Christ frees us from the dominion of sin.⁵

This eschatological concept of grace which holds together the participation of final redemption and the retention of the sinful structures of this age was a dominant feature in Caroline thought. Grace proclaims man justified before God in Christ and this was boldly asserted by those Caroline writers who followed in the tra-

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, pp. 392, 414.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 331.

3. Ibid., p. 332.

4. Ibid., p. 267.

5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 60.

dition of Lancelot Andrewes. Beveridge stood in this tradition. Grace justifies completely and thus grace is complete justification but we know this grace under the conditions of this world. It is militant grace; grace which is still under the cross and still retains the marks of the cross. But at the same time it is inseparable from triumphant grace - glory - for it is the grace of Jesus Christ now glorified.

Beveridge related our being in Christ to the Church for¹ it was only in Christ alone that the Church is founded. Our² entrance into the Church, the body of Christ is by baptism. It is by the Holy Spirit that we are made members of Christ's body³ by baptism. Baptism into the Church meant for Beveridge baptism into Christ. Christ saves none but those who are His body, the Church, and as such are really His.⁴ Admission into the Church⁵ and thus into the state of salvation is by baptism said Beveridge. This great change made in us "when we are brought out of the state of nature into that of grace, is wrought in us wholly and solely⁶ by God Himself."

It is in the understanding of the Church again that we see the unity and distinction of grace and glory in the forms of militant and triumphant dimensions. The Church militant is no less the Church than the Church triumphant since the Church is the One

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 359.

2. Ibid., p. 343.

3. Ibid., pp. 441, 443. See also, Works, op. cit., II, p. 183.

4. Ibid., p. 444.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 418.

body of Christ but the Church militant is the Church in the world.

The doctrine of grace in its relation to atonement can best be seen in Caroline thought in a way analogous to their eucharistic doctrine. That is why Beveridge could say that when a man is justified by grace he is a new creature and even now has eternal life but still maintain that sin remains. Again we see the bread by grace is for us the very body of Christ but the bread, the form of this world, ^{remains bread} does not pass away. But militant grace fully involves glory - triumphant grace, the full completed grace glorified. Andrewes could say that even now in Christ we sit at the right hand of God. The fulness of grace was related by Andrewes to the second coming of Christ when He would return in His glorified body and our bodies would be raised and glorified and made like unto His glorious body. Then the fulness of grace would be consummated, then sin would utterly disappear; the age of glory will appear in its fulness and we will sit with Christ at the right hand of God.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY OF WORD AND SACRAMENT

The most penetrating concept of the Church as the body of Christ, in Caroline thought, is to be seen in Andrewes' understanding of the Holy Spirit. The prominence given to the third person of the Trinity and the depth of understanding shown by Andrewes was nowhere duplicated in any of his Caroline successors. We have already noted something of his understanding of the Holy Spirit in our previous chapters and especially important is his concept of the Holy Spirit as the union of the Trinity. Andrewes consistently maintained in his understanding of the Church the consubstantial unity of the Father and the Son and the hypostatic union of the two natures of Christ. He thought of both the consubstantial union and the hypostatic union as the same union - the union of the Holy Spirit. Andrewes elaborated his understanding of the third person of the Trinity into the entire movement of the eternal Son; the movement of God to man. At every stage of the drama of the atonement Andrewes saw the Holy Spirit as continually bearing, maintaining and indeed being in His own self the essential, eternal union of love between the Father and the Son and also between God and man in the incar-

1
nate Son.

Andrewes saw the meaning of the conception of the Word in the womb of Mary as the act of the Holy Spirit by which the Word was thrust into human flesh and hence the eternal relation of the Holy Spirit became incarnate in the person of Christ. As the Holy Spirit was the consubstantial unity between the Father and the Son in eternity so Andrewes acknowledged Him as the hypostatic union of the God-man Jesus Christ.² In Andrewes' thought the union of God with man was in Jesus Christ and therefore he saw a particular significance of God's union with man in the Church which was the body of Christ. The Holy Spirit always accompanies the body of Jesus Christ and is the union between Christ and His Church.³ By this understanding of the Holy Spirit Andrewes bound the Church as the body of Christ to the person of Christ in the most vital and living way possible for it partook of the same eternal union of the Father and the Son. It was the Holy Spirit who descended upon the person of Jesus Christ at His baptism and identified Him as the one who is the eternal Son. The Father, said Andrewes, did not speak until the Holy Spirit descended upon Christ. He saw this same drama re-enacted at Pentecost when the Holy Spirit was poured upon the Church.

Meet, that having once before been, and never but once, upon Christ the Head, it should be so once more on the Church, the Body. It pleased Him to vouchsafe to grace the Church His Queen, with like solemn inauguration to that of His own, when the Holy Ghost descended on Him

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, pp. 113, 243.
 2. Ibid., pp. 148, 387.
 3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 148.

in likeness of a dove; that she might no less than Himself, receive from Heaven like solem attestation. --1

Those who were in the Church were in Christ, in His fulness; Christ incarnate full of grace and Christ ascended full of glory. The ascended Christ is our anchor in heaven and the Holy Spirit is our anchor on earth.² The Holy Spirit bound these two concepts together in Andrewes' thought.

Andrewes saw the essential relation of the ascension of Christ to the sending of the Holy Spirit. The ascension of Christ was the completion of the work of grace. The event of Pentecost was the pouring out of the fulness of Christ; all that He was and did for man. Andrewes thought of the Holy Spirit as being poured out the cistern which was the body of Christ glorified. The Holy Spirit from the flesh of the glorified Christ was poured upon all flesh.³ He emphasized that the entire redemptive act of Christ meant nothing to man without the Holy Spirit for it was the Holy Spirit who brought to man the completed work of Christ who had ascended. The ascension is the completion of the atoning act. In this sense it would also be true to say that the Holy Spirit is the completed work of Christ given to man. The Holy Spirit seals the work of Christ to us and he administers to us what Christ had purchased for us.⁴ Andrewes related this movement to the Church and its ministry of word and sacrament. The ascension of Christ was the focal point upon which a 'royal exchange'

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 116.

2. Ibid., p. 159.

3. Ibid., p. 312.

4. Ibid., p. 108.

took place when the incarnate Christ of our humanity ascended and sent His Holy Spirit that we might partake of His divine nature which meant the atonement and union with Christ.¹

The movement of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost had direction said Andrewes. It was sent to the place where the Apostles were gathered - to the Church and nowhere else.² There was a two-fold significance in this act of the Holy Spirit. The movement of the Spirit was to the Church but Andrewes also saw the descent of the Spirit as the birth of the Church itself. The Holy Spirit, said Andrewes, blowes from heaven and fills the Church with the breath of heaven.³ Andrewes saw a parallel between the descent of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Christ and Pentecost. The Holy Spirit descended on Christ because He was the eternal Son incarnate and at Pentecost the same Holy Spirit descends on the disciples - the Church. The Church, baptized by the Holy Spirit, was the body of Christ and was in essential union with Christ its Head through the same Holy Spirit.⁴ Christ was both a singular person, a particular man and He was also the second Adam who had a corporate being; the many and the one. The Church was the body of Christ and Christ was the Head of the body.⁵ As Christ was the Head of the body so the Holy Spirit was the Heart of the body.⁶ Andrewes always associated life giving

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 109, 146

2. Ibid., p. 120.

3. Ibid., p. 121.

4. Ibid., p. 257.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 249.

6. Ibid., p. 258.

powers to the Holy Spirit; He made the body to live. Without the Dove, said Andrewes, there is no Church. He also inverted this proposition and maintained that apart from that Church upon which the Holy Spirit came and where He anointed there was no Holy Spirit and hence no remission of sins.¹ This meant in Andrewes' thought that the Holy Spirit only comes to the Church, the body of Christ, whose Spirit He is.

Andrewes frequently related the meaning and purpose of creation to the Church. He stated that the world itself was created for the Church.² The Holy Spirit who hooded upon the face of the waters in the beginning and brought forth creation also recreates the world, "the Christian world, or Church, by the same Spirit moving on the waters of baptism."³ The Church is the new appearing in our midst. Andrewes saw here that the Holy Spirit inaugurated the Church at its baptism and when a person is baptized into the Church he is in reality baptized into a new life.⁴ The first gift of the Holy Spirit to the first man had been choked with sin. The second gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost restored and renewed man.⁵ The redemptive act of God wrought in Christ is given to the Church at Pentecost. The Spirit who conceived Christ in the womb of Mary must also conceive us anew and this is done at baptism.⁶

Andrewes elaborated his concept of creation and recreation

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 256.

2. Ibid., pp. 291, 385.

3. Ibid., p. 191.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Ibid., p. 112.

6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 191.

and its relation to the Church. There were three moments in the creative and recreative drama at which the eternal Godhead was said to be present; at the creation of the world the Father, Word and Holy Spirit were present. So also at the baptism of the Son; the Father in the voice, the Holy Spirit in the dove and Christ in the water. The third instance was the baptism of the Church.¹ The latter reference was to Pentecost where both the Father and the Son poured out the Holy Spirit upon the Church; the Spirit which was their essential unity. Andrewes likened the creative act of God in the creation of the world to the redemptive act in Christ and He focused the redemptive act on the Church. Since the Holy Spirit brings to us the fulness of the ascended Christ all the channels of grace are conveyed into the Church.² Therefore only in the Church, the body of Christ, is there remission of sin.³

The gift of the Holy Spirit to the Church meant for Andrewes the eternal presence of God in our midst. The eternal Spirit in Andrewes' thought represents a two-fold union in relation to the presence of God. The Holy Spirit as the eternal union and love of God the Father and God the Son signifies that in the ascension of Christ's humanity our flesh and blood stand in the presence of God who in turn now dwells with His people on earth in the Holy Spirit. The eternal union of the Godhead dwells in the

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 385; ?
 2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 100.
 3. Ibid., p. 101.

check refs

Church by the Holy Spirit who is that union. It is God's love for us, His own essential love, that makes Him wish to continually dwell with us and He does this by His Holy Spirit.¹ The Spirit is the true ark of God's presence among His people.² He is the continuity of God's presence among His people who are His temple.³ It is the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Andrewes' thought that gives his concept of the Church its eschatological direction. The Holy Spirit comes to the Church from heaven and fills the sails of the Church with a heavenly wind and bears it heavenward.⁴ The act of God's dwelling with men on earth by the Holy Spirit, as by the incarnate Son, is by grace.⁵ Grace allows us to have God in our midst. The concept of union with Christ in Andrewes' thought is always one of grace as opposed to nature. By nature we are men of sin separated from God. God grants us grace in Jesus Christ that we might be united with Him and He completes His grace in us and gives us the fulness of grace - glory - by which we are taken to where Christ is that we may dwell with Him.⁶ The coming of the Holy Spirit begins with the ascension of Christ and ends with our ascension. "Sent Him down to us to bring us up to Him."⁷ Christ ascended that God might continually dwell with us, that so dwelling with us we may in the end

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, pp. 241, 98.

2. Ibid., p. 241.

3. Ibid., p. 160.

4. Ibid., p. 121.

5. Ibid., p. 244.

6. Ibid., p. 241, 244.

7. Ibid., p. 244.

¹
dwell with God. This is the fulness of the atonement, to be at
one with God and this by grace. But even now, in this life,
Andrewes understood that by grace we are anchored in the ascended
²
Christ.

There is a close affinity between Bishop Davenant's
thought on the Church and that of Andrewes'. Davenant, like
Andrewes, stressed the oneness of the Church with Christ. He
also related the redemptive work of Christ directly to the Church.
In his exposition of Paul's epistle to the Colossians, Davenant
stated that the Church was those who had been redeemed and renewed
by Christ who is the Head of the body.³ He called this renewing
our new nativity in the life of grace and a certainly of a new
and glorious resurrectional birth in the life of glory.⁴ Christ
is the Head of His Church as He is God and man. As the incarn-
ate One He is the Head of those who are incorporated into His
body, the Church.⁵ Christ and His Church are, therefore, one
flesh.⁶ Davenant included the Old Testament Church in the Church
as the body of Christ and stated that Christ was the Head of His
Church before the incarnation and even according to His humanity
because He is the promised One of God.⁷ The whole redemptive act
of God from beginning to end was gathered up in the Church. Christ

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 244.

2. Ibid., p. 43.

3. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 172.

4. Ibid., p. 226.

5. Ibid., p. 211.

6. Ibid., pp. 211, 216.

7. Ibid., pp. 211, 213.

as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the earth is likewise¹
Head of the Church from the foundation of the world. Like
Andrewes, Davenant recognized that the union between Christ and²
His Church was the eternal union of the Holy Spirit.

The creation of the Church, with regard to man's participation in the body of Christ was stressed by Davenant as established by the ministry of the gospel. "In this sense we call any assembly of men whatever, professing the doctrine and religion of Christ under legitimate pastors, a church."³ Davenant was careful to show that membership in the body of Christ did not depend solely upon an external profession of faith and external participation of the sacraments. He saw that this was the basis for a doctrine of ex opere operato. He criticized Bellarmine for asserting that only an external union with the Church of Rome and an external profession of faith and participation of the sacraments were sufficient to be a member of the true Church.⁴ Davenant, while admitting that such a profession constituted membership in the visible Church also maintained that not all such external members belonged to the body of Christ but only those who are⁵ joined to Christ Himself by faith and the Spirit. Of course Rome could make such a claim because she had identified herself with the Church invisible.

1. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 211.

2. Ibid., p. 217.

3. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 218. See also Bramhall, Works, op. cit., II, p. 24.

4. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, pp. 218, 219.

5. Ibid., pp. 218, 226.

Again like Andrewes, Davenant acknowledged the Spirit to be the union between Christ and the members of His body. He did not support the concept of an invisible Church and a visible Church as if there were two Churches. There was but one Christ, one body, one Church. The visible Church he maintained was the Church of Jesus Christ under the militant state of grace.¹ Such an understanding must surely always be maintained for it stresses the fact that all the humanness and sinfulness of our world does not rule out the Church existing in this age. It shows clearly the ultimate victory of Christ and His grace in allowing mortal man still clothed in unresurrected flesh to be members of His body. The Church under the militant state of grace is the Church under the cross.

Those who are members of the body of Christ are those who have been quickened and made alive by the vitality of grace.² Grace, for Davenant meant union with Christ now, in this age. To be a true member of the Church meant full participation in Christ. Christ is the beginning and foundation of salvation and grace in this life and glory in the life to come.³ The Church participates in the fulness of Christ. Davenant related Christ's work of reconciliation to His person as Head of the Church. Christ alone is our union with God. Christ alone is the fulness of grace.⁴ The Church has the two-fold state of grace and glory. Under the forms

1. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., I, p. 23.

2. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 220.

3. Ibid., p. 223.

4. Ibid., p. 240.

of this age the Church lives the life of grace and spiritual resurrection while it is also sealed to the life of glory and eternal resurrection of the body.¹ The Church of grace and glory² are both ours in Christ who is the first born. Those who are not united to Christ in this life are neither partakers of grace in this life nor the fulness of grace - glory - in the life to come.³

In his controversy with the Puritans Bishop Hall stressed the Pauline criterion of unity in the Church: one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Where these are present there is the Church.⁴ These are the essentials, said Hall, though he also included the Lord's Supper and correct doctrine in the concept of the Church. Christ is the Saviour of His body, the Church, God's elect who are baptized in the laver of regeneration and whose faith relies upon Christ.⁵ Hall was not blind to the divisions of the Church in his day, he was in fact painfully aware of them but he continually pointed to the given unity in Christ. In speaking of the unity of the Church Hall maintained that in our considerations we have reason to begin in heaven for there is the origin of the Church.⁶ There are many particular Churches but all these make up the one Catholic Church of Christ.⁷

1. Davenant, On Colossians, pp. 223, 224, 225.

2. Ibid., p. 223.

3. Ibid., p. 226.

4. Hall, Works, op. cit. V, p. 282.

5. Ibid., pp. 283, 284.

6. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 149.

7. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, pp. 284, 285.

Hall considered baptism the initiatory sacrament. He regarded baptism as the sole way of incorporation into the Church on earth and hence he stressed that baptism constituted the Church on earth and stood as the seal of the Church also.¹ This became very clear in his discussion with the Brownists who had separated from the Church of England claiming that the Church of England was no true Church. His sole argument that the Church of England was a true Church finally rested on baptism. If the Church of England is not a true Church then the Brownists who had been baptized in that Church should be rebaptized but if they admitted that the baptism was valid then they must confess that the Church of England is a true Church.² At this point Hall clearly made baptism the mark of the true Church. That is why he still recognized Rome to be of the true Church though corrupt. Her baptism 'though shamefully deformed with rotten tradition'³ was still a true baptism.

Archbishop Laud was even more to the point on this matter. He also emphasized as did Hall that baptism preserved the Church of Rome. Laud really saw the issue at stake. He stressed, using Augustine's thought, that it was not Rome's baptism which was valid but Christ's and the Church of England feared to repudiate Rome's baptism for fear of calling into question God's faithfulness in Christ.⁴

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 601. See also Works, op. cit. IX, p. 24.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, pp. 25, 35.

3. Ibid., p. 46.

4. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, p. 333.

1

Therefore, there could be no rebaptism. This statement becomes extremely important in Laud's thought especially in relation to the Reformed Churches. Laud also admitted that the Church of Rome was a true Church but he insisted that this did not mean she was therefore a right Church either in doctrine or manners and hence she was a dishonour to the Church of Christ. A true Church for Laud was a company of men who professed the faith of Christ and who were baptized into His name.² In his controversy with Fisher Laud repeatedly affirmed that baptism was the only entrance into the Church and hence into salvation. "So, no baptism, no entrance."³ In our baptism we are sanctioned by the Holy Spirit.⁴ Laud, especially in his discussions with Rome, considered baptism to be the mark and unity of the Church.

Pearson based the foundation of the Church's existence upon the promise of Christ in His discourse with Peter.⁵ Pearson largely maintained a direct relation of the Church to the person of Christ when he dealt with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In his discussion of the Church he immediately moved to the concern of a concrete historical Church which had a "nature capable of daily exercise."⁶ Pearson was most insistent on this point. The Church which was in our history was one Church in its beginning

1. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, p. 324.

2. Ibid., p. 144.

3. Ibid., p. 65.

4. Ibid., p. 67.

5. Pearson, op. cit., p. 591.

6. Loc. cit.

and all those who since had become members of the Church had become members of that Church. He cited passages of Scripture which speak of Churches but he declared that these Churches were always considered as one Church. The local Churches were those "believing and baptized persons of each family, with such as they admitted and received into their house to join in the worship of the same God."¹

The fulfillment of Christ's promise to build His Church was consummated in the sending of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples. When the Holy Spirit descended Peter began to preach and those who believed were baptized into the Church. Our belief in the Holy Catholic Church is grounded in the promise of God in Christ and in nothing else.² Pearson cited the second chapter of Acts to show the continuity of the Church; those who were baptized in the name of Christ, who continued hearing the word preached, received the sacrament and joined in the worship of God. This was the Church.³

The primary unity of the Church was in the person of Jesus Christ in Pearson's thought. The foundation upon which the Church is built is Christ and all who are converted to the true faith are added to this Church.⁴ Pearson thought of this as the unity of origin. It is the Holy Spirit who joins us to Christ and makes us members of Christ's body which looks to Christ as its

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 594.

2. Ibid., pp. 592, 601.

3. Ibid., p. 592.

4. Ibid., p. 596.

1
Head. The union between the members and the Head is a spirit-
2
ual union for the union is the Holy Spirit. Pearson, like
Andrewes, considered that communion with the Father and the Son
3
was wrought by the Spirit who was the unity between them. In
4
the Church, the body of Christ, we are in communion with God.
Pearson dealt at length with the person of the Holy Spirit and
there is much that is commendable in his thought but his doctrine
of the Holy Spirit lacked the depth and breadth that we find in
Andrewes' work. Pearson's doctrine of the Holy Spirit has a
static quality about it that is reflected in his concept of the
Church.

In his discussion of the Church Pearson related our union
with Christ to the atonement; Christ bears our sin and gives us
5
His grace. In our baptism we are baptized into the Church and
6
into the forgiveness of sin. It is the Holy Spirit who baptizes
us into the Church and we have our communion with Christ by the
7
Holy Spirit. Those members who are truly united with Christ re-
8
ceive saving grace and never are separated from Him. Hence they
are never separated from the Church; they are forever united to
the members and to their Head. The final consummation of the
atonement, the fulness of grace consummated, is for those alone
who are united to Christ by the Holy Spirit who sanctifies them

1. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 579, 580.

2. Ibid., p. 580.

3. Ibid., pp. 376, 563, 623.

4. Ibid., pp. 622, 623.

5. Ibid., p. 623.

6. Ibid., p. 632.

7. Ibid., pp. 376, 563, 623.

8. Ibid., pp. 605, 630.

and adopts them and who is the assurance of resurrection. Both the backward movement and the future reference of atonement was related to the Church by Pearson.

The concept of the Holy Spirit, so prominent in Andrewes' doctrine of the Church, is sustained in his consideration of the Church's ministry of word and sacrament. The word and sacrament are thought out Christologically by Andrewes and thus the Spirit is most vitally related to them.

Andrewes stressed the fact that the Holy Spirit added nothing to the work of Christ rather He is the seal which validates and administers to man all that Christ was and did for mankind. The Holy Spirit is the witness to the grace of Christ.² Andrewes made much of the way the Holy Spirit appeared to the Church and in this Epiphany of the Spirit he saw the confirmation, seal and guarantor of the word and sacrament. The Holy Spirit as the eternal unity of the Trinity conveyed the word and conceived Him in the flesh so also it is the same Holy Spirit who still conveys the same word to the Church; the word and body of the eternal Son. The Holy Spirit dedicated the word and sacrament to the Church.

The word given to the Church by the Holy Spirit was directly related to the Word that is Christ and also to the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ.³ The word that is preached by the Church is an analogia fidei of the Word that is Christ.⁴ Andrewes

1. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 624, 666.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 357.

3. Ibid., p. 201.

4. Ibid., pp. 201, 124.

used the word abstract rather than analogia fidei but the intended meaning is essentially the same. The seat of the tongue is in the Head and the Head of the Church is Christ who is also the Word.¹ Christ is the Head of the body and the Church which is the body of Christ speaks the Word which is Christ. Andrewes grounded the Word which the Church proclaims on the incarnation of the Word of God, Jesus Christ. The Word of the Lord which came to the Church is the primary Word. The word which the Church proclaims is the ἠχος², the echo of God's Word.

Bishop Pearson expressed a similar thought regarding the preaching of the Prophets and the Apostles. The saving word was spoken by them but the saving word is not the words of men but the Word of God spoken by them.³ The revelation of the Word of God was the work of the Holy Spirit.⁴ Since the proclamation of the Church's word is the echo of the Word, said Andrewes, her preaching does not come directly from the Church. It is not her own word. If the Church should so speak, that is speak a word which is her own, then it is to be suspected. The Church can only make a sound but cannot speak the Word of God unless she echoes the Word of God. Therefore true preaching is calling on the name of the Lord.⁵ The Holy Spirit does not accompany any

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 124.

2. Ibid., p. 117.

3. Pearson, op. cit., p. 16.

4. Ibid., p. 575.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 323.

word but only one Word, the Word of God.¹ Unless the Church echo that one Word she is not proclaiming the Word of God; there is no preaching. There can be no preaching without the Holy Spirit for without Him the Church can only speak the letter that kills.² It is the Holy Spirit that makes alive the words that the Church speaks that it might be the Word of God. Andrewes regarded preaching as the early Church Fathers did; as placing the Spirit upon the ear of the hearers.³

The sacraments, like the word, were related to the person and work of Christ by the Holy Spirit in the thought of Andrewes. He understood the sacraments in relation to the mystery of the incarnation.⁴ Because of the incarnation, Christ's embodiment in our humanity, He uses bodily things to work out our salvation.⁵ The sacrament in Andrewes' thought was the *μυστήριον* by which the Church initiates us into the fellowship of the incarnate Word.⁶ For Andrewes, both word and sacrament had to do primarily with participation in Christ. Word and sacrament were the means of grace because they presented us with Christ. God conforms Himself to our earthly state in the word and the sacrament even as He did when the Word became flesh and in this way conveys His grace unto us.⁷ The sacrament was the visible verbum,

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 117.
 2. Ibid., p. 172.
 3. Ibid., p. 131.
 4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 43.
 5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 92.
 6. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 43.
 7. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, pp. 144, 145.

the word to the eye even as preaching is the word to the ear and these two aspects of the word were never separated from each other in Andrewes' thought.¹ The Holy Spirit makes alive the flesh of the sacrament and without Him baptism remains only water and the bread and the wine ^{carneal} fleshly elements that do not profit our receiving.² The incarnation was the basis for the word and sacrament in Andrewes' thought and they were held in unity by the same Spirit who carried the Word and conceived it in the flesh of Christ's humanity.

The eucharist was very important in Andrewes' understanding of the means of grace but the doctrine of the incarnation, extremely important also, kept Andrewes from making a bifurcation between the word and the sacrament. To divide them was to divide Christ which cannot be done. The word moves to the flesh; the preaching of the word to the participation of the sacrament. This understanding was very prominent in Andrewes' thought and it is reflected in the structure of his sermons. He was explicit on the relation of the word and sacrament with reference to the incarnation. "The word we hear is the abstract of Verbum; The Sacrament is the antetype of caro, His flesh. What better way than where these are actually joined, actually to partake them both?"³ To receive the wholeness of Christ we receive both word and sacrament. The word is not a disembodied word nor

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 145.

2. Ibid., p. 172.

3. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 100.

can the flesh be thought of apart from the word. It is the Word made flesh full of grace and truth.

If it be grace and truth we respect, how may we better establish our hearts with grace, or settle our minds in the truth of His promise, than by partaking those the conduit-pipes of His grace, and seals of His truth unto us? Grace and truth now proceeding not from the Word alone, but even from the flesh thereto united; the fountain of the Word flowing into the cistern of His flesh, and from thence deriving down to us this grace and truth, to them that partake Him aright. --1

This statement speaks Andrewes' mind exactly on his concept of the relation of word and sacrament. The two must be held together in analogy to the person of Christ, the Word and the flesh. Bishop Cosin also followed Andrewes in this understanding of word and sacrament. His preaching of the word pointed to and was followed by the participation of the eucharist even as the Word became flesh in the incarnation.²

There was, however, an other element in the Caroline tradition that did not come through Andrewes which bifurcated the unity of word and sacrament and has caused untold harm. We can discern this trend in Archbishop Laud who, partly in reaction to the Puritan emphasis on preaching, exalted the importance of the eucharist over the proclamation of the word.

I say the greatest, yea, greater than the pulpit; for there 'tis, Hoc est corpus meum, 'This is my body,' but in the pulpit 'tis at the most but, Hoc est verbum meum, 'This is my word.' And the greater reverence, no doubt, is due to the body than to the word of our Lord. --3

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 100.
 2. Cosin, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 235, 262, 290, 305.
 3. Laud, Works, VI, Pt. 1, p. 57.

Laud lacked the understanding of the incarnation that was so important for Andrewes. Andrewes would never have made such a false separation of the word and the sacrament. Such a separation involves the natures of Christ. It was God the Holy Spirit who united the Word to the flesh and ever remains the eternal union of them in Jesus Christ. God had in very deed joined them together and what God had so joined together man cannot separate. Andrewes saw this most clearly. The Word and flesh remain joined in an eternal union of the Holy Spirit, the same Holy Spirit who is the union between the Father and the Son. Laud in everything was a Puritan in reverse. In reaction to Rome the Puritans emphasized the preaching of the word and tended to minimize the sacrament. The Puritans recognized something of the vain pretensions of Rome in the sacrificial aspect of the mass. In turn Laud reacted to this Puritan emphasis and laid the greater stress on the eucharist. Both reactions were governed by shallow theological thinking and the voice of Andrewes must be heard again in this matter in the Church of England.

In his disputation with Fisher, Laud drew a comparison between the Church of Rome and the Puritans who exalted preaching over the eucharist. He acknowledged that there was great disagreement between them but they were at one in this: "That the sermons and the preachings of the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the Church, are able to breed in us divine and infallible faith; nay, are the very word of God."¹ Laud saw that the Puritans were

1. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, p. 113.

in danger of 'transubstantiating' the word in preaching. Laud, however, was not able to speak critically to this situation because he himself had so misunderstood the proper relation of the word of Christ to His person. Again it was Andrewes' thought that was needed for he saw the proper relation between the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and the $\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha$ which was a relation of grace that excluded the doctrine of transubstantiation. The Puritan bifurcation of the word and the sacrament can clearly be seen in the writings of such Puritans as Tobias Crisp and John Saltmarsh. Though they were extremely Christocentric in their thinking it was not an incarnational Christocentricity. Hence, in both these men there was little mention of the Church and no mention of the sacraments in relation to the atoning work of Christ.

The participation of the sacraments, for Andrewes, had to do with incorporation into Christ. The sacraments of the Church were the seals that assured us of grace to make us Christ's and the pledge to keep us His.¹

And by, and with these, there is grace imparted to us; which grace is the very breadth of this Holy Spirit, the true and express character of His seal, to the renewing in us the image of God whereunto we are created. --2

The atoning work of Christ was related to the sacraments by Andrewes. He acknowledged the Holy Spirit to be the Spirit of grace because in the word and the sacrament the Holy Spirit presented us with Christ.

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 222.

2. Ibid., p. 223.

Andrewes formulated his doctrine of baptism as analogous to Christ's baptism by John. He saw Christ's baptism as His identification with the sin of man. Christ put us on in His baptism and we put Him on in ours.¹ Christ needed no baptism for Himself but He is baptized for us and this baptism is the whole of His passion; it is baptism into the cross.² Our baptism is not into Christ's water-baptism but into His cross-baptism; into His death.³ In our baptism the Holy Spirit applies Christ's blood to us.⁴ We are baptized into His atonement. But Andrewes stressed that we were baptized into the fulness of Christ. We are baptized into Christ's Sonship; now to be received of Him and then, at the consummation of time, to be made like His glorious body.⁵

Andrewes attributed a particular place⁷⁰ for the Holy Spirit in baptism. We are baptized by Him into Christ and born anew of Him and received as Sons of God.⁶ If we do not receive grace from the Holy Spirit there is no place for us with Christ.⁷ Andrewes' concept of the Holy Spirit as the eternal union of the Godhead emphasized the understanding of baptism as incorporation into the fulness of Christ, the God-man. We come to Christ by the Holy Spirit and we come to God by Christ.⁸ The first-fruits of the

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 250.

2. Ibid., p. 251.

3. Ibid., pp. 250, 251.

4. Ibid., p. 264.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Ibid., pp. 188, 246, 262.

7. Ibid., p. 399.

8. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 396.

fulness of Christ's atonement are received by us in our baptism¹ in this life. The first-fruits of Christ's glorification, the life of grace are given to us now in our baptism.² In our baptism the Holy Spirit seals us to the day of our final rising with Christ.³ Andrewes' thought of baptism as a first resurrection, a resurrection of the spirit and this is the first-fruit of Christ's resurrection.⁴ The blood of Christ by which we are baptized is the artery of His Holy Spirit, "His blood and His Spirit always go together."⁵ The Holy Spirit as the life of Christ's blood quickens us to this first resurrection and seals us to the final resurrection of our bodies.⁶

In Andrewes' thought baptism had to do not only with freeing us from the past sin of our lives but it also had the forward significance of the atonement.⁷ Baptism meant union with Christ for Andrewes and this union was one of grace. The Fatherhood of God is a term of nature for Christ who is the Son by nature and not by grace.⁸ Christ does not need grace for Himself to be united to the Father for He is filled with the fulness of the Deity. Christ is filled with the fulness of grace for us that we might be made by grace what we are not by nature; sons in His Sonship. "But that the manhood is taken into God, that was not of nature but of grace. And what is of grace is ever properly

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 222.

2. Ibid., p. 223.

3. Ibid., p. 222.

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 102.

5. Ibid., pp. 102, 103.

6. Ibid., p. 102.

7. Ibid., p. 262.

8. Ibid., p. 289.

ascribed to the Spirit."

Our union by grace was in contrast to Christ's union by His own nature to God. In baptism the Holy Spirit unites us to Christ's body which is in eternal union with God the Father. Baptism changes our nature, our generation. From creatures of our first creation we are made to be new creatures in Christ. In Christ, we are regenerated and translated into the state of grace. We are adopted into Christ as sons and made heirs of heaven with Him in a manner as full in every way as Himself. Baptism is into the fulness of Christ. In Christ we are received to grace and made by adoption what He is in Himself. "By it we are that we are." Christ's identification by the Holy Spirit in His baptism was for our sakes, said Andrewes, even as the Father's voice was for us. When the Father speaks to Christ in His baptism and calls Him His Son He also speaks these words to us who are in Christ by baptism. We are sons in the Sonship of Christ. Christ is the Son of the Father "and for Thy sake, all that are in Thee, all that by baptism have put Thee on, all and every one of them are to Me, as Thou Thyself art; Filii, dilecti, complacentes."

Baptism for Andrewes was baptism into Christ and into Christ's body, the Church. God had given to man no other means

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, pp. 289, 290.

2. Ibid., p. 262.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., pp. 262, 263.

5. Ibid., p. 263.

6. Ibid., p. 188.

7. Ibid., p. 261.

by which we may enter into Christ's Church. Hence from the side of man there was no Church without baptism.¹ To be baptized into the Church was for Andrewes a baptism into belief itself, into faith.² As we are baptized, said Andrewes, so we believe. He did not qualify the act of baptism by insisting that we validate it by our act of belief. We are given that in baptism; it is given us to believe in Christ. Andrewes used Augustine's definition of 'twin sacrament' for baptism and the eucharist. Andrewes really thought of only one sacrament with baptism and the eucharist as two aspects of the one sacrament. The blood of Christ flowed into baptism and the cup of wine.³ Both sacraments involve us in Christ's atonement. We are incorporated into Christ by baptism and by it are invited to continual participation of His body and blood.⁴ In Andrewes' thought baptism moved to the eucharist. The seal of baptism could only be given once but the eucharist continually signed us over again to our baptism.⁵

Davenant, like Andrewes, related the sacrament to the person and work of Christ. The substance of the sacrament is Christ Himself, and we receive all from the sacraments of Christ by faith which is also God's gift.⁶ Baptism for Davenant was the ingrafting of the baptized into the body of Christ and he regarded it as the sole entry into the Church. Baptism had a two-fold

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, pp. 194, 257, 258.

2. Ibid., pp. 188, 189.

3. Ibid., p. 103.

4. Ibid., p. 203.

5. Ibid., pp. 222, 223.

6. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, pp. 446, 447.

significance for him which he related to the two fold aspect of the Church - grace and glory. In baptism we are dead to sin¹ and our lives are now hid with Christ. The sentence of death is already pronounced against sin in baptism and the execution² is daily worked into us. We die to sin sacramentally and we also receive the Spirit of Christ who works it into our flesh.³ The certain expectation of the life of glory is given when Christ returns.⁴ This new life is now completed, perfected and glorious in Christ our Head but it is hidden in Him.⁵ Our lives are now in the state of grace where they are perfected in Christ but yet imperfect in the faithful.⁶ This really expressed Davenant's concept of grace in relation to the atonement. But he maintained that the state of grace is the childhood of glory and that grace seals us to the state of glory.⁷ The full light of our life in Christ will be revealed in the day of Christ's second coming.⁸ In the sacrament of baptism we, even now, sacramentally partake of the fulness of Christ. In our baptism we are buried with Christ which for Davenant meant the burial of the body of sin or the old Adam.⁹ In baptism we are sacramentally buried with Christ as our Head but even now in our own selves our sins are said to be

1. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., II, p. 16.

2. Ibid., pp. 16, 17.

3. Ibid., p. 17.

4. Ibid., p. 16.

5. Ibid., pp. 19, 20;

6. Ibid., pp. 19, 20.

7. Ibid., p. 20.

8. Ibid., p. 21.

9. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 441.

1 buried in baptism. The resurrection of the body of Christ is our resurrection now in grace. "For, as by the power of the Word he raised from death the humanity united to the Word; so also by the same power he quickens us, who are united and planted in Him, to a new life of grace."² Baptism is the death of sin and the renewing of the life by grace.³ In baptism Christians are consecrated to God and renewed after the divine image of the invisible God; this by the Holy Spirit.⁴ Our baptism is into Christ who is the express image of the invisible God.⁵ The grace of Christ in this life seals us to the life of glory in Christ. Baptism in Davenant's thought fully embodied the backward and forward movement of the atonement which was so important to Andrewes' understanding.

Bishop Downname related both word and sacrament as means of grace to the atoning work of Christ in a clear and definite way. God, said Downname, had, from His own freedom, given to the Church the means of grace by which the righteousness of Christ might be communicated to us.⁶ Downname rightly saw that the word and sacraments did not contain grace inherent in themselves but that they were continually in motion communicating unto us the grace of God. They are means of grace, means by which God com-

-
1. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, p. 442.
 2. Ibid., p. 444.
 3. Davenant, On Justification, op. cit., I, p. 75.
 4. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., II, p. 99.
 5. Davenant, On Colossians, op. cit., I, pp. 179, 180.
 6. Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 9.

communicates grace to us both word and sacrament.¹ It was not the word and sacrament as static things that contained grace but in the ministry of them. The means of grace are the ministry of the word and sacrament. God's saving grace had appeared in Christ who is the deed of our redemption and by the preaching of the word the saving grace appears in word.² God, by His Holy Spirit, begets faith in us by the instruments of word and sacrament and by faith we receive Christ to our justification. The Holy Spirit also confirms our faith as the Spirit of adoption working in us the assurance of our justification.³ In this way the Holy Spirit justifies us because He works faith in us and applies the merits of Christ's justification to us.⁴ Our faith must be grounded on the authority of God speaking in His Word.⁵ True faith must be understood in respect of the object received by faith which is Christ.⁶ The sacrament was the pledge given to the believer by God and therefore every sacrament was a seal of that righteousness by faith which was annexed to the promise of the gospel.⁷ This promise if applied to every faithful believer assures him in particular of his justification and salvation by Christ.⁸ Downname was critical of Rome's concept of ex opere operato which seeks to manipulate God.⁹ Downname rightly grounded the operation of the sacrament on

-
1. Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 9.
 2. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., pp. 34, 58. See also Downname, On Christian Freedom, op. cit., p. 12.
 3. Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 11.
 4. Ibid., pp. 9, 12. See also Pearson, op. cit., p. 576.
 5. Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 318.
 6. Ibid., p. 13.
 7. Ibid., p. 12.
 8. Loc. cit.
 9. Loc. cit.

the promise of God made in the gospel.

Baptism meant incorporation into Christ for Downname and
was a sacramental union with Him.¹ By baptism Downname understood
a sacramental union with the body of Christ and this was related
to the Church in his thought.² Those who are in Christ are those
who were elected by the free grace of God.³ To be in the Church,
meant for Downname, to be in the fulness of Christ; not only the
Church militant of earth but also the Church triumphant in heaven.⁴
There is only one Church and that is the body of Christ. Downname's
concept of the Church embraced the pre-ascension and the post-
ascension era. The Old Testament Church was therefore embraced
in the Church of Christ which was from the beginning of the world.⁵

Downname stressed that our union with Christ had a two-fold
significance which he related to the wholeness of Christ and His
atoning work. In baptism we put Christ on who is our righteousness
and in this union we have not only remission of sin and justifi-
cation but also regeneration and sanctification and are conformed
to Christ's death and resurrection.⁶ Downname emphasized both the
backward and forward movements of atonement in his understanding
of baptism. We are baptized into Christ's death and resurrection
so that we die in Him and rise with Him; we die to sin and rise to

1. Ibid., p. 38. See also Downname, On Christian Freedom, op. cit., pp. 21, 22.

2. Downname, On Christian Freedom, op. cit., p. 22. See also Bramhall, Works, op. cit., II, p. 70.

3. Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 469.

4. Ibid., p. 325.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Ibid., p. 38.

¹
newness of life. This new life was not simply the cutting away of past sin, rather it is related to the fulness of Christ in whom we now live; to Christ on the other side of the cross, the resurrected and ascended Christ. In our sacramental union with Christ the new life of grace is given to us in this life but this is the seal to the life of glory. In our union with Christ He dwells with us by His Holy Spirit; "that hee which raised up from the dead, shall also by the same Spirit quicken, that is, raise up into eternal life our mortal bodies."² Downname dismissed the Roman concept of grace for it conceived of grace as the gifts of grace inherent in us.³ Baptism for Downname meant sacramental union with the fulness of Christ and not infused grace.

Isaac Barrow followed fairly closely to the dominant thought of Caroline theology concerning baptism as incorporation into the body of Christ, the Church. However, Barrow's thought in this concern cannot be compared to Andrewes' for it lacked the depth and richness in theological understanding. The same phrases are often used but Barrow's thought did not have the livingness and creativity that makes Andrewes' works a thrill to read. The form that Andrewes used, of Scripture illuminated by the Fathers had already begun to harden in the Caroline tradition.

Barrow regarded both sacraments as union with Christ,

-
1. Downname, The Covenant of Grace, op. cit., p. 37.
 2. Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 121.
 3. Ibid., p. 97.

acknowledging baptism as the primary union. In baptism the Holy Spirit is given who unites all Christians into one body, the Catholic Church.¹ The Holy Spirit in Barrow's thought was the union between Christ and His Church and also the union between each member of the body of Christ.² The eucharist declares and signifies the union which exists among the members of Christ and also seals that union.³ It proclaims the givenness of baptism. Union with Christ has a two-fold significance in Barrow's thought. The union with Christ was the primary union among Christians and the partaking of the one food also translates them into one body.⁴ The eucharist therefore not only proclaims the unity but it also unifies the body. The eucharist was for those who had been united to Christ in baptism and it was also a uniting sacrament.

Barrow rejected emphatically Rome's doctrine of transubstantiation of the eucharist.⁵ He maintained with the Reformers that we do not receive Christ corporally in the sacrament but at the same time he did not spiritualize our union with Christ. By his understanding of the Holy Spirit's work Barrow rightly maintained that we receive Christ's humanity spiritually in faith in the sacrament.⁶

-
1. Barrow, Works, op. cit., IV, pp. 165, 166.
 2. Ibid., pp. 163, 164.
 3. Barrow, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 561.
 4. Loc. cit., See also Barrow, op. cit., VII, p. 641.
 5. Barrow, Works, op. cit., V, p. 505.
 6. Ibid., p. 506.

Barrow related baptism to justification and sanctifi-
1 cation. He attached the power of remission of sin to baptism
and declared that the ministry of the Church opened and shut
the door of the kingdom when it determined who should be baptized.
2 In baptism the grace of justification was given.
3 Through bap-
tism Barrow secured the backward movement of the atonement but
there was a tendency in Barrow's thought to regard the grace
given in baptism as an ontological essence.
4 Baptism, he thought,
gave us those things by which we could live the life of new crea-
tures. This concept took away from his understanding of union
with Christ though Barrow insisted on baptism as incorporation
into the fulness of Christ. Through the Holy Spirit we are
united with Christ and His salvation. As we are adopted into
His Church and renewed by His grace we are destined to a partici-
5 pation of His glory. This was the forward movement. The effects
6 of renewing grace reach to the kingdom of glory. Baptism bound
the body and its members inseparably together, therefore, where
the Head of the body was there also was the body and all the
7 honour conferred on the Head belongs to the body also. Christ's

-
1. Barrow, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 375.
 2. Barrow, op. cit., VI, pp. 53, 56, 547.
 3. Barrow, Works, op. cit., IV, pp. 387, 388.
 4. Barrow, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 550.
 5. Barrow, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 167.
 6. Ibid., p. 52.
 7. Barrow, Works, op. cit. V, p. 502.

glorification was a certain pledge and earnest of our glorifi-
cation.¹ As the baptized we are adopted into Christ's heavenly
family, born of His grace and destined to a participation in
His eternal glory. The forward movement was sealed to the right
hand of God.

In his concept of the Church Barrow could include the
Old Testament Church, claiming as Downname had, that Christ's
Church was the whole body of God's people from the beginning of
the world to its consummation.² The unity of the Church lay in
Christ and those who were separated from the Head were separated
from the body.³ The sacraments are the seals that bind us to-
gether.⁴ Under the unity of the Church Barrow listed the unity
of doctrine and while he also considered the unity to be maintained
through the Church's discipline he did not make it a mark of the
Church.

Some of Bishop Taylor's best thought regarding his doc-
trine of grace is to be found in his understanding of the sacra-
ments as the means of grace. However, his thinking here as else-
where lacked real consistency. Often passages representing his
best thoughts were so qualified that they tended to nullify the
good which he had said.

Portions of Taylor's doctrine of baptism placed him closer
to the stream of Reformed thought than the rest of his understand-

1. Barrow, Works, op. cit., V, p. 502.

2. Barrow, Works, op. cit., VII, pp. 627, 628.

3. Ibid., p. 641.

4. Ibid., p. 649.

ing on the nature of grace. The relation between grace and glory is perhaps best articulated by Taylor in his doctrine of baptism. He also saw that baptism was primarily incorporation into the fulness of Christ and our adoption as sons in this act entitles us to the promises of God whereby we are made heirs of heaven by grace and faith in Jesus Christ.¹ In the act of baptism God, who is the author of grace, adopts us and incorporates us into Christ by His grace.² God also gives us His Spirit in baptism as a seal and testimony of God that He will give us His glory.³ The presence of the Holy Spirit in the water of baptism is a presence by grace and not by nature; the nature of the water remains the same.⁴ The sacraments of the gospel are means of grace, channels of grace, and in the doctrine of infant baptism Taylor expressed the absolute initiative of God's grace.⁵ The sacrament of baptism is an act of utter grace on the part of God to which we can add nothing.⁶ Taylor acknowledged that infant baptism supplies all the wants of human acts and requires nothing on man's part for the sacrament is an act of God.⁷

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XV, p. 306. See also Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 201.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XI, p. 287. See also Works, op. cit., IX, p. 346.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XI, p. 287.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 424. See also Works, op. cit., XV, p. 308.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XV, p. 506.

6. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIV, p. 359. See also Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 207.

7. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 152.

In relating baptism to the atonement Taylor included both the backward and forward movements of grace far more than we have noted hitherto but even here the stress was on the backward movement of redemption. The continually recurring theme was baptism as the remission of past sin.¹ Of course this forms a most necessary understanding of baptism but the stress in Taylor's thought tended to remain here. The forward movement of the atonement, however, can definitely be seen here in his understanding of baptism; the whole effect of Christ's death is reached to us by the Holy Spirit.² Had Taylor continued in this theme a profound understanding of atonement could have been developed but again Taylor's concept of baptism finally was governed by a doctrine of grace which would not allow for such a development; it qualified and limited his understanding of the sacrament of baptism. Taylor's doctrine of grace always tended towards a strengthening aid given to nature. In baptism man was initiated into a state of grace by the grace of God who cancelled all past sins and gave man the strength of grace to continue in this new life. Man, by the strength of grace, is called/persevere and so to preserve the new state of holiness into which he was baptized.³

It is true that the new life in Christ expresses itself in relation to this newness; that must always be but Taylor saw this expression as a guarantee from the side of man to remain in the

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 247. See also Works, op. cit. IX, p. 346. See also Works, op. cit., XIII, p. 27.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XV, pp. 418, 419. See also Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 171.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., II, p. 401.

state of grace and he attached qualities of salvation to this life of grace. Taylor sought to secure the forward movement of grace in baptism to man's act of repentance. Baptism is a state of repentance where we may receive not only remission of past sins but where we may, by repentance, continue to receive remission of our sins.¹ It was in this manner that Taylor sought to secure the forward movement of the atonement and it is not unlike the Church of Rome's attempt through the doctrine of penitence. Like Rome's attempt Taylor's understanding, though moving forward in the sense that it dealt with post baptismal sins does so by a continual backward reference. Thus Taylor failed to relate the forward movement vitally to Christ and this aspect of his thought appears as an addendum to baptism; it remains man's act which completes God's act. Taylor's understanding of grace lacked a real understanding of the forward movement because he did not sufficiently develop his concept of baptism as incorporation into the fulness of Christ.

Taylor continually brought qualifications to his doctrine of baptism. It is apparent that what he had said about the sheer act of God's grace in infant baptism was toned down somewhat in his comments on adult baptism. Taylor's insistence on the retention of free-will in fallen man placed great emphasis on man's act² in his doctrine of baptism. This can be clearly seen in his understanding of confirmation. Taylor's concept of this doctrine definitely limited the fulness of baptism since he claimed that

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VIII, p.317.

2. Ibid., Pref. cclv.

confirmation was an enlargement of baptismal grace.¹ He also tended to separate the giving of the Holy Spirit from baptism and transfer it to the act of confirmation.² Confirmation is the strength and perfection of baptism and baptismal grace for in baptism we undertake for ourselves to do our duty but in confirmation we receive strength to do it.³ But the emphasis in adult baptism was put on the free-will of man by Taylor. Man, by the act of his free-will ratified the act of baptism. In infant baptism others promise for us but in confirmation we undertake to perform the promise.⁴ It is true that in confirmation we affirm our baptism, we affirm what God has already done for us and in gratitude we accept the new life given to us in Christ but in Taylor's thought confirmation became an act, not of God confirming to us His own work but an act whereby man confirmed by his free-will what in reality God alone could do and did at our baptism.⁵

In Taylor's discussion of the meaning of baptism we notice his concept of a limited fall determining his views on this sacrament. The nature of infants is not spoiled, he claimed, because they have not, by their own reason, sinned as adults do.⁶ As we pursue Taylor's thought on baptism we come again to a full circle

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XI, pp. 245, 269.

2. Ibid., p. 240.

3. Ibid., p. 281.

4. Ibid., p. 281.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., V, p. 493.

6. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VIII, pref. cclv.

and see once more his concept of grace to be an addition to nature. By the addition of grace at baptism man is given a clean sheet of life, so to speak, and by the strength of grace he strives to keep within this new state of innocence. The understanding of baptism as that act of God by which we are incorporated into the fulness of Christ by grace and thus continually stand as new creatures in Him is weak in Taylor's thought. The significance of baptism as that act of grace in Jesus Christ which penetrates to the very source of sin and overcomes it and at the same time an act which reaches to the consummation of the glorified Christ who is exalted at the right hand of the Father formed no integral part in Taylor's concept of baptism.

Bishop Thorndike reiterated the Caroline view of baptism as the gate into the Church. Thorndike also regarded baptism as incorporation into the fulness of the Church, both the visible¹ and the invisible Church. Like Taylor he closely associated remission of sin with baptism and he saw it as the first exercise² of the power of the keys. He likened baptism to the Old Testament Red Sea crossing of the Israelites where sins are drowned³ in the waters of baptism. In Thorndike's thought the stress in baptism was on the remission of sins and in the case of infant baptism it was the remission of original sin. The Church received no power to forgive sins immediately; the act of forgiveness must

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., I, Pt. 11, p. 474.

2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, p. 434. See also Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. 1, p. 192.

3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 32.

be seen in relation to the gospel and not as an act of the Church
itself.¹

Thorndike acknowledged that baptism was into the full communion of the whole Church. It was incorporation into the death of Christ and the Holy Spirit which raised Christ from the dead is given to us in our baptism to dwell with us, raising us from sin to life; a life of grace in this world and a life of glory in the world to come.² Baptism is the assurance of the resurrection of the flesh to glory and since it is only the Holy Spirit who can raise our bodies, baptism also assures us of the Holy Spirit.³ In Thorndike's understanding the grace of God's Spirit was the gift of the Holy Spirit at baptism and the continual dwelling of that Spirit with man. Baptism was related to the ascension by Thorndike for he saw that the Holy Spirit given in baptism was the Spirit of the ascended Lord.⁴ The unity of the Church was the same Spirit so that in Thorndike's understanding of baptism we see the Spirit as both forming the Church and remaining as its unity.⁵

Much of what Thorndike had to say about baptism was indeed well thought out to a point but he like Taylor brought such qualifications to bear on his concept of baptism that he unsaid

-
1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. 1, p. 202.
 2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, pp. 20, 21.
 3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., II, Pt. 1, p. 36.
 4. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 22.
 5. Ibid., pp. 21, 22.

much of the good. His continual reference to the Puritan sects reveals part of the reason why Thorndike's doctrine of grace became rigid and finally detached from the person of Christ. Thorndike maintained that the sacrament of baptism brings us into the Church and the true faith of the Church. ¹ Though he termed this as saving grace it is obvious that Thorndike regarded this saving grace as certain beliefs or truths that the Catholic Church taught. ² This of course was a direct attack on the sects. This became even more apparent when he related baptism to the covenant of grace. The vow of baptism was the enactment of our entry into the new covenant. ³ His denial that the covenant of grace rested on promise alone was motivated by the fear of Antinomianism. ⁴ Thorndike claimed that the concept which bred the sects of the Church was the denial that the covenant of grace had conditions attached to it. ⁵ The covenant presupposed terms which a man is called upon to accept and perform. He interpreted justification by faith as the acceptance by a baptized person of the faith taught by the Catholic Church. ⁶ In the case of infant baptism Thorndike declared that the Church was responsible for the child but he insisted that man by a deliberate act of his own will must

-
1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, p. 351. See also Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. 1, p. 153.
 2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., II, Pt. 11, p. 411.
 3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, p. 363.
 4. Ibid., p. 400. See also Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 16.
 5. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, p. 491.
 6. Ibid., p. 528.

make a profession of acceptance of the conditions of the covenant of grace.¹ It is true that this act of man will require the grace of God in Thorndike's understanding but even admitting this he could not rescue his doctrine of baptism from making its final appeal for validity to man's confirmation of it by his own free-will. Man, he insisted, must have the freedom of the will in accepting the conditions of his release from sin.² The covenant of grace assures us that God, by the sacrifice of Christ, has declared to mankind the terms of peace by the gospel and has promised the help of His grace to perform the conditions which justifying faith signifies.³ Thorndike unconsciously slipped into an anthropological sphere when he spoke of justifying faith for the stress was placed upon man's act. Thus man was justified by his own faith; by his acceptance of and obedience to the conditions of the covenant. Christ secures the conditions of release but man by grace fulfills these conditions. Such an understanding rejects any concept of substitutionary atonement and in fact limits the entire work of Christ because, as Hall said in his objection to Rome, it denies the words of Christ - 'It is finished'.

The presence of the strong Antinomian tendencies among the Puritan sects made Thorndike qualify his doctrine of baptism in moral terms. If a Christian, said Thorndike, is justified by the obedience of Christ, imputed from everlasting to them whom He came to save it would nullify the covenant of grace. It would convert

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, p. 528.

2. Ibid., p. 528.

3. Ibid., pp. 400, 528.

it to a mere promise on God's part requiring no conditions to be performed by man to qualify him for it.¹ Though Thorndike objected to Rome's doctrine of works he was nevertheless implicated in an understanding that was essentially the same.

Thorndike objected to the doctrine of predestination to glory because it secured the believer in Christ to the fulfillment of grace without man fulfilling any condition at all. It tied God to fulfilling the conditions without any consideration to Man's will.² His criticism of predestination to glory can be taken seriously when it was directed at the distortions of the doctrine but it is obvious that Thorndike failed to understand the Pauline doctrine and unfortunately rejected it almost completely. In Thorndike's understanding it by-passed the conditions that the covenant imposed on man. Of course that is precisely what it does and rightly so; it refuses to allow man to qualify God's grace; His complete and completed act of redemption in Christ. Both Thorndike and Taylor saw the works of man as fulfilling the conditions of salvation. It was not salvation that was free but rather the conditions of salvation and the helps of grace to perform these conditions that were free. This tendency in the Carolines after Andrewes came about largely because of the Puritan sects which seemed to dismiss the ethical life of the regenerated man. This was coupled with the rationalistic spirit which placed its emphasis on the will in matters of salvation. Hence there developed a strand of thought in the Carolines

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. 1, p. 16.

2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, p. 531.

that was at variance with Reformed thought.

However, even while this tendency was developing Bishop Beveridge retained the main concerns of Andrewes. The concept of baptism as incorporation into the body of Christ was not only affirmed by him but he carried the implications of this understanding into his doctrine of grace. Thorndike and Taylor of course affirmed it but it formed no integral part of their doctrine of grace. The sacrament of baptism, said Beveridge, is appointed by Christ as the means by which the Holy Spirit inserts us into the body of Christ.¹ Baptism into Christ is baptism into the Church as the body of Christ.² Christ and His Church, which for Beveridge meant the congregation of all Christian people, are one body; Christ is the Head and all believers are members of that one body.³ The unity of the Church for Beveridge was the unity of the one body into which we are baptized by the Holy Spirit.

Baptism implies the use of water and the gift of the Holy Spirit for those who are in Christ; "members of His body, must needs partake of the Spirit that is in them their Head."⁴ In the very act of baptism the Spirit unites us to Christ and makes us members of His body. To be a member of the body of Christ means membership in the Church and also in the kingdom, "that being all His body."⁵ Beveridge emphasized that both the militant Church upon

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 443. See also Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 441.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 62.

3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 21.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 183.

5. Loc. cit.

earth and the triumphant Church in heaven is called the king-
dom of God.¹ This distinction within the one Church was the
Church visible and invisible. When Beveridge spoke of the Church
he referred to the two aspects of the one Church. We can only
see the Church as it exists on earth under the forms of grace
for the Church crowned with glory in heaven is not for the eyes of
earthly man.² Nevertheless, Beveridge conceived of baptism as
entry into the one body of Christ, the Church. He thought of
the gift of the Holy Spirit in baptism as uniting us to Christ
and also as forming the Church itself. In this act Christ sets
His seal upon us and so makes us out for His own and distin-
guishes us from the rest of the world.³

The very act of baptism had great significance for Bever-
idge but he emphasized that the act must rest firmly on the promise
of God.⁴ It is God who promises to send the Holy Spirit and only
God can give Him and not man.⁵ Those who are born of water, that
is, baptized according to the institution of Christ are made mem-
bers of the holy Catholic Church.⁶ Beveridge here thought of the
external communion of the Church to which all the baptized belong.
He went on to make the distinction between those who went through

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, pp. 178, 179.
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 357.
 3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 442.
 4. Ibid., p. 68.
 5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, pp. 230, 231.
 6. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 384.

the form of baptism and those who were truly born of the Spirit. This distinction was the Church as visible and invisible. The baptized who were born of the water and the Spirit received the Holy Spirit from the Head of the Church.¹ Beveridge thought that the Holy Spirit is communicated only to those who truly believe but he did not separate this from the act of baptism itself. He rebuked Rome, however, for attributing all to the act alone. Beveridge saw that it was the grace of God and the Spirit of God which allowed us to use water as the means of grace.² It is the grace of God and the Spirit of God that makes the means of grace efficacious for us.³

The word and sacraments are called means of grace because by them Christ grants His grace and Holy Spirit to us.⁴ By His Holy Spirit Christ is presented to us.⁵ We must pray for God's presence in the sacrament.⁶ The means of grace did not allow us to concentrate our gaze on them rather they lifted our eyes to Christ.⁷ We are called to use the means of grace but they point us to Him. We should aim at receiving grace that by His grace we might glorify Him.⁸

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 384.
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 458.
 3. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, pp. 296, 263, 264.
 4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 121.
 5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 8.
 6. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 459.
 7. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 188.
 8. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., V, p. 111.

Incorporation into the body of Christ by the Holy Spirit at baptism was directly associated with new birth by Beveridge. In baptism we are incorporated into the kingdom of God and only those who are born of the Spirit can enter it.¹ The sphere of the redemptive act of Christ was the body of Christ, the Church.² To truly receive the righteousness of Christ we must therefore be in Christ. Beveridge pointed out that St. Paul in Rom. 8:1 emphasized this. Not those who are in the Church, that is the external communication with form, but those who are in His person are free from condemnation.³ Beveridge did not separate Christ's Church from His person but he felt the need to stress forcibly the reality of incorporation into Christ. Christ saves only those who are His and those who are His belong to His body.⁴ Thus for Beveridge the insertion into the redemptive act of God in Christ was by baptism. He related grace to the whole activity of God in the redemption of fallen man.⁵ Beveridge associated baptism with the person of the Trinity; God the Father God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are active in our redemption and therefore we are baptized in the name of all three; into the fullness of redemption.⁶ We are baptized into the fulness of God. To receive the grace of God in Christ is to receive the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit.⁷

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 180.

2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 444.

3. Ibid., p. 345.

4. Ibid., p. 444.

5. Ibid., p. 456.

6. Ibid., p. 217.

7. Ibid., p. 220.

The eschatological dimension of grace can be seen in Beveridge's doctrine of baptism. It is by the grace of Christ¹ that we are brought to Him in glory. As we have already seen Beveridge did not separate the two concepts - grace and glory. He saw that the age of glory impinges upon us in our baptism. He emphasized this in his interpretation of John 5:40. In our new² birth by baptism we are made sons of God by adoption and grace. In baptism we do come to Christ and we do have life in Him. This new life is the breath of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of life, and He is given to us for eternal life, not only for hereafter³ but even now.

Beveridge did not condition the act of God's grace in baptism as did Taylor and Thorndike. Man was not required to fulfill certain conditions to complete the circle of grace. Beveridge realized and stressed the need for man's acceptance of Christ and his obedience to Him but this in no way added to the redemptive grace of God in Christ. All was complete in Christ, He is the full atonement and man is baptized into this fulness of grace.

Andrewes' doctrine of the eucharist, as we have already noted, was a doctrine of the real presence. Again we must consider his concept of the Holy Spirit if we are to understand his thought aright on this subject. In the incarnation it was the Holy Spirit who communicated the Word into our flesh and this

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 66.
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., II, p. 192.
 3. Loc. cit.

Spirit continually communicates to us the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. The Holy Spirit makes alive the flesh of Christ and He makes alive the body and blood of Christ to us in the eucharist. Without the Holy Spirit the body and blood of Christ are dead.¹ In baptism we are baptized with the Spirit and in the eucharist we drink the Spirit again and again.² The eucharist continually extends to us in sacramental form the atonement of Christ. It is the Holy Spirit that communicates to us the saving grace of Jesus Christ.³ It is the Holy Spirit who anointed the flesh of Christ at His conception and sent it to us with the fullness of grace.⁴ The pouring out of the same Spirit at Pentecost was the communicating of Christ to man spiritually. Andrewes called this the second Epiphany of Christ because the fulness of Christ was given to the Church.⁵ The Holy Spirit communicates to us the eternal union of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, of God and man, of Christ and His body. Thus through the Holy Spirit we have a holy communion; Holy because the Spirit of God is Holy; Communion, because the Holy Spirit is the unity of the Trinity. In the eucharist, which Andrewes called the artery of the Holy Spirit, we receive the Father and the Son in the unity of the Holy Spirit.⁶ To receive the Holy Spirit is indeed to receive grace. The real presence for Andrewes meant the reality of the eternal union be-

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 172.

2. Ibid., p. 128.

3. Ibid., pp. 135, 289.

4. Ibid., p. 290.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Ibid., p. 293.

tween God and man in Jesus Christ and this was the Holy Spirit. The real presence was a spiritual presence. It was the presence of Christ by His Holy Spirit.

The eucharist as a means of grace meant for Andrewes our participation of Christ. It was a participation of Christ once we had been incorporated into Christ by baptism. The eucharist, like baptism, was the seal of Christ's atonement upon us. The two-fold aspect of the atonement in Andrewes' thought can be seen in the eucharist. There is both freedom from the law and adoption¹ into Christ as sons in the eucharist. In the eucharist the Holy Spirit works into us the fulness of Christ - grace upon grace.² Not only the redemption from the law but the fulness of redemption; the redemption of our bodies from the corruption to which they are still subjected and the fruition of the inheritance to which we are now adopted.³ The eucharist seals us to the 'perfect, complete, absolute fulness'⁴ when we shall be filled with the fulness of God. The eucharist sets our mind where our bodies will be set, even at the right hand of God.⁵ God is gracious "in offering to us the means by His mysteries and grace with them, as will raise us also and set our minds, where true rest and glory are to be seen."⁶

The eucharist was a sacrifice for Andrewes, a sacrifice of

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 62.

2. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 63.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., II, p. 327.

6. Loc. cit.

thanksgiving. That is why he emphatically stated that the service was not complete without the eucharist. "But our thanks are surely not full without the Holy Eucharist, which is by interpretation thanksgiving itself."¹ Our thanksgiving is to God:

To the Father for His mission, the Son for His redemption, the Holy Ghost for His adoption; for by Him it is wrought. He that made Him the Son of man, doth likewise regenerate us to the state of the sons of God. And this for our thanksgiving. --2

Our thanksgiving to God is by the cup of salvation "and with it in our hands give thanks to Him, render Him our true eucharist, or real thanksgiving indeed."³

Bishop Hall stated that the sacraments of grace were given before the law; the manna and the water from the rock pre-figured Christ in the gospel.⁴ The means of grace were not divorced by Hall from the Old Testament. The atoning work of Christ is represented to us in both sacraments. The water is His blood in baptism and the wine is His blood in the eucharist.⁵ Hall also related the redemptive work of Christ to the preaching of the word; the word of reconciliation.⁶ In the eucharist the same word is present; Christ is sensibly crucified before our eyes.⁷ There was, however, no concept of transubstantiation in Hall's thought.⁸ He repudiated it with vigour. Hall contended that it

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., I, p. 62.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 117.

5. Hall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 607.

6. Ibid., p. 616.

7. Ibid., p. 607.

8. Ibid., p. 418.

was not the means in itself that gives life but that which it represents.¹ Hall stressed that the humanity of Christ was not corporally present in the sacrament but it was present spiritually and thus we do receive Christ in His fulness spiritually and not corporally.² The sacrament has to be understood sacramentally and thus we receive Christ spiritually. These two terms, sacramentally and spiritually, are closely related in Hall's thought. He thought of the grace of the eucharist as a spiritual or sacramental union with Christ.³ Hall lacked as adequate an understanding of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as we find in Andrewes' writings so that Hall's concept of union with Christ by faith was too closely related to faith as an act of man and therefore his tendency at times was to make the real presence of Christ in the eucharist dependent on man's faith, his believing.⁴ At other times, however, he understood union by faith more correctly, acknowledging that by the grace of faith we appropriate that which is given to us in the means of grace.⁵

Andrewes dismissed the concept of ex opere operato. He placed the emphasis of the sacramental validity not on the elements or on the powers of man as priest but rather on the presence of the Holy Spirit. The presence of the Holy Spirit was related by

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 106.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., VIII, pp. 769, 770.

3. Hall, Works, op. cit., VII, pp. 122, 123. See also Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 771.

4. Hall, Works, op. cit., VIII, p. 775.

5. Loc. cit.

Andrewes to Christ's promise; to His prayer, that He would send the Holy Spirit to the Church. In Andrewes' thought the reality of Christ's presence was always thought out in the structure of his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In his controversy with Bellarmine, Andrewes stated that no man was head of Christ's Church on earth. The Holy Spirit and not the pope was the vicar of Christ¹ in the Church.

Though Archbishop Laud placed the eucharist centre^Xmost in his thought he failed to understand it properly in relation to the incarnation and hence failed to see its relation to the fullness of Christ - word and sacrament. However, Laud explicitly denied the doctrine of transubstantiation in every shape and form maintaining that there was a real and vital difference between transubstantiation and the real presence of Christ in the eucharist.² Laud set forth Calvin's understanding of the real presence in the eucharist as the true Protestant position "And the Church of England is Protestant too."³ Laud's lack of discretion in the use of form and his bifurcation of word and sacrament made him appear close to Rome in the eyes of many of the Puritans and they feared his elaborate rituals in the eucharistic celebration as a return to Rome. Laud's doctrine of the eucharist, though unfortunately separated from the word, stands far closer to Reform thought than it does to that of the Church of Rome.

In his lengthy refutation of the Roman doctrine of trans-

-
1. Watkin-Jones, op. cit., pp. 20, 223, 224.
 2. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, p. 329.
 3. Ibid., pp. 327, 328.

substantiation Bishop Cosin showed that the early Church never accepted that view of the eucharist. Cosin, standing in the Reformed tradition advocated by Andrewes, reiterated that the real presence of Christ in the eucharist is by the Holy Spirit. The elements of the eucharist "are neither changed as to their substance, nor vanished, nor reduced to nothing; but are solemnly consecrated by the words of Christ, that by them His blessed Body and Blood may be communicated to us."¹ In the eucharist the body and blood of Christ are present sacramentally.² The body and blood of Christ is received by faith but Cosin rightly understood faith as the receiving and apprehending what the eucharist communicated but faith itself did not perform.³ It is not faith itself, therefore, that makes present what is promised. The presence is performed by the word and promise of God upon which faith is grounded.⁴ Cosin objectified the real presence in the eucharist and did not make it dependent upon man's faith while at the same time he denied that the presence of Christ was in the sacrament apart from its communication to the faithful. God is faithful to His promise and comes to His people by the means ordained by Him. Those who receive the eucharist with faithful hearts receive the Lord's body as torn and His blood shed for the redemption of the world.⁵ But those who receive the eucharist

1. Cosin, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 155.

2. Ibid., p. 204.

3. Ibid., p. 162.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Ibid., p. 174.

unworthily eat and drink damnation to themselves.

In Bishop Downname's discussion on the eucharist he continued to stress the concept of union with Christ even as he did in his doctrine of baptism. The Lord's Supper meant a holy communion with Christ; being united to Him as bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.² In this union we receive grace from Christ as our Head and His merits by imputation.³ By the ministry of the word and sacraments we are continually sanctified in this life by the Holy Spirit so that He may present us to Christ as a glorious Church at the marriage of the Lamb.⁴

Taylor joined the long line of Anglican divines in refuting Rome's doctrine of transubstantiation. In this particular understanding Taylor was at one with the Reformed heritage. He maintained as Ridley had done that the real presence of Christ in the sacrament was one of grace. The concept of grace as an addition and heightening of nature, prevalent in his thought elsewhere, is surprisingly absent at this point. The bread and the wine, by grace, present us with the body and blood of Christ but the elements remain the same in nature.⁵ The doctrine of the Protestants, declared Taylor,⁶ affirmed that the bread is bread and it is also Christ's body. The consecration of the elements by prayer sacramentally or spiritually presents us with Christ really and

1. Cosin, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 174.

2. Downname, On Justification, op. cit., p. 38.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., p. 93.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 424.

6. Ibid., p. 470.

effectually.¹ Christ is really given to the faithful as the symbols are really given and Christ really nourishes and satisfies the soul as the elements do the body.² Taylor maintained that the real presence of Christ in the eucharist is a spiritual presence for Christ is present by His Holy Spirit.³ The body that is sacramentally presented to us in the eucharist is the body of Christ that was born, crucified, dead, buried and glorified. Christ has only one body, a natural and glorified body.⁴ The body of Christ is the sacrament.⁵ The same body of Christ in heaven is given to us at the eucharist but sacramentally and not corporally.⁶ The words sacramentally and spiritually were interchangeable in Taylor's thought. The body of Christ was eaten by faith maintained Taylor.⁷ He objectified the real presence so that it was not dependent on faith but received by faith.⁸ However, the moralistic connotation of faith in Taylor's thought made the distinction between the faithful and the unworthy one based on moral perfection.⁹

The relation of the eucharist to the atoning work of

-
1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, pp. 474, 424.
 2. Ibid., p. 424.
 3. Ibid., p. 425.
 4. Ibid., p. 431.
 5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., X, p. 27.
 6. Ibid., p. 27. See also Works, op. cit., XV, pp. 433, 435.
 7. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 454.
 8. Ibid., p. 424. See also Works, op. cit., XV, p. 433.
 9. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XV, pp. 434, 436, 516.

Christ was more closely related in Taylor's thought than it was in baptism. He stated that the eucharist, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, is designed for our reconciliation and was an atonement in the hand of God.¹ By our sacramental participation of the body of Christ in the sacrament we are united to that body which is His Church.² In scripture both the sacramental bread and the Church are called by the name of Jesus Christ for they are both His body.³ By the participation of this bread, His body, the faithful are united into one body, the body of Christ - the Church.⁴ The union between Christ and His body, the Church, is a spiritual union and Taylor insisted that this union is the most real event in the world.⁵ By this union with Christ we receive all the blessings of His grace, the fruits of His passion.⁶ Those who worthily receive the eucharist receive the fruits of it also which is the continual union with Christ in His Church triumphant in heaven.⁷ Here, more than anywhere else in Taylor's thought the grace of Christ meant a complete involvement in the fulness of Christ.

The eucharist is a declaration of Christ's death and a sacramental participation of His body and blood offered in atonement for us.⁸ By our sacramental participation of Christ's body

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XV, p. 433, 43

2. Ibid., pp. 433, 434.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Ibid., p. 434.

7. Loc. cit.

8. Ibid., pp. 435, 439.

our bodies are joined to Christ and made capable of resurrection¹ to eternal life. Being joined to the Head who died and rose again is our assurance that the members shall not see eternal corruption forever but will rise again as did Christ and enter² into glory. The backward and the forward movement of the entire drama of redemption; the remission of sin and the sacramental participation of the ascended Christ stands out quite clearly in this part of Taylor's thought and shows a good understanding of the eschatological dimension of grace. However, in the light of what we have already seen of Taylor's thought it must be added that this did not form an integral part of his thought. And even at this point Taylor continued to associate grace with the new principle of life by which we worked out our redemption thus limiting the concept of union with Christ.³ The computation⁰ of repentance as the good work that man does in order to receive pardon of his sins and participation in Christ greatly conditioned Taylor's doctrine of grace.

Most of the Carolines made baptism the criterion for participation in the eucharist and Thorndike followed in this understanding. At the eucharist the faithful feast on the flesh and blood of Christ spiritually. The real presence which Thorndike advocated was worked out in relation to the ascension of Christ in our humanity and the sending of the Holy Spirit who inhabits⁴ the flesh of Christ. The Holy Spirit who first dwelt in the

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XV, pp. 440, 441.

2. Ibid., p. 441.

3. Ibid., pp. 400, 434, 436.

4. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV. Pt. I., p. 32.

humanity of Christ is sent to the Church that Christ may dwell in the hearts of His people and by the gift of the Holy Spirit the flesh and blood of Christ is present spiritually in the eucharist and also spiritually eaten.¹ By the Holy Spirit we receive the Lord's body and blood and by receiving the eucharist we also receive the Holy Spirit.² The real presence as a spiritual presence did not mean for Thorndike a spiritualized presence. In the eucharist the faithful receive nothing less than the body and blood of Christ who is in their midst by the presence of the Holy Spirit. There is some similarity between Thorndike's thought here on the Holy Spirit and Andrewes but a close comparison shows Thorndike's understanding meagre in relation to Andrewes'.

Thorndike showed a willingness to acknowledge any point of agreement between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, regarding the doctrine of the eucharist. He pointed out that the Council of Trent had said that the flesh and blood of Christ were sacramentally present in the eucharist.³ However, much as he desired to show the resemblance he was quick to see the difference. He denied that the dimensions of the elements became the dimensions of Christ's body and blood; there could be no identity between the elements and the thing signified for that would destroy the very nature of the sacrament.⁴ At the same time he

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. 1, p. 32.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p. 35.

4. Loc. cit.

insisted that the sacramental presence of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist could not be properly maintained without acknowledging the true being and presence of the thing signified.¹

Thorndike thought it best not to say that the eucharist was the body and blood of Christ by virtue of a hypostatic union for it suggested an extension of the incarnation.² Andrewes, however, could and did say it because he understood the hypostatic union in this regard as one of grace which was the gift of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, Thorndike rightly insisted on the real presence as a parallel to a hypostatic union which was based on the promise of Christ's presence in the eucharist.

The union between the elements and the body of Christ had to be seen in the same light as the union between Christ and His Church.³ It was a spiritual union. Unfortunately Thorndike did not elaborate this vital understanding of the eucharist nor did he understand, as Andrewes did, that the Holy Spirit, as the union between God and man in the God-man Jesus Christ, was the given unity of the Church. Thorndike suggested this but it was never an integral part of his thought. Unity in the Church for the sake of unity alone seemed to be sufficient for Thorndike.⁴ The Puritan presence was always in his thought. The highest law of the Church was unity.⁵ Thorndike saw with clarity that unity

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV. Pt. 1, p. 35.

2. Ibid., pp. 43, 46, 47. 3. Ibid., p. 27.

4. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., II, Pt. 1, Pref.

5. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., I, Pt. II, p. 574.

was a command to the Church from God, but he singularly failed to relate this to the unity given in Christ.

The meaning of the eucharist must finally rest on Christ's institution of it and the promise of His presence whenever we do this in remembrance of Him. Thorndike quoted St. Chrysostom to show that the consecration of the elements depends upon the words of our ¹ Lord. The Church prays to God in the act of consecration to send the Holy Spirit upon them that by His presence they may be the body and blood of Christ. ² It is not faith that makes the body and blood to be sacramentally present, rather faith receives by relying on the ³ promise of God.

The sacraments, by the promise of Christ's presence, have also the promise of grace of which the gospel speaks. ⁴ In the eucharist the sacrifice of the cross is communicated to those who faithfully receive. ⁵ Thorndike rejected the sacrificial aspect of the mass as elaborated by the Church of Rome and declared that the New Testament witnesses to the believer's participation in the one sacrifice which Christ carried into the holy of holies. ⁶ There is also a sacrifice in the sacrament which involves the sacrifice ⁷ of our bodies in obedience.

The uttering of the words of consecration by the priest do not make them his words; they do not belong to man. There is

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, p. 63.

2. Ibid., p. 60

3. Ibid., p. 37.

4. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. II, p. 737.

5. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., I, Pt. II, p. 476.

6. Ibid., p. 477.

7. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. I, p. 118.

no identity between the priest and the words he utters even as there is no identity between the elements and the body of Christ. The priest does not take upon himself the character of Christ whose words he recites. ¹ "Christ's priesthood and the Church's priesthood cannot be spoken of in univocal terms any more than Christ's sacrifice and the eucharistic sacrifice." ² The reciting of Christ's words is not an act done in the person of Christ though it is in the name of Christ. ³ Thorndike made such a distinction to show that the Church's priesthood ministered to the Church the redemptive act of Christ and thus the celebration of the eucharist cannot be termed a sacrifice in itself.

In Thorndike's understanding of baptism man was initiated into the covenant of grace and the eucharist which commemorates and represents the propitiation for the sins of mankind is a continual renewal of that covenant. ⁴ It is at this point that Thorndike must be criticized for his concept of the eucharist. His understanding of the covenant of grace was not so much incorporation into Christ, into His death and resurrection, but an entry into a state of enabling grace. The Church was entrusted with the grace that Christ had purchased to save mankind and He ⁵ also gave to the Church the sufficient means to do it.

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. I, p. 114.

2. T. F. Torrance, "Eschatology and the Eucharist", Intercommunion, ed. by D. Baillie & J. Marsh, New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1952. 303-350. p. 343.

3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. I, p. 114.

4. Ibid., p. 105.

5. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., III, Pt. II, p. 440.

Thorndike said that to the faithful the eucharist was the seed of the life of grace and glory both to the soul and body but nevertheless it was the 'seed of grace' and not sacramental incorporation into the fulness of Christ. The concept of the 'seed of grace' is essentially the same as the aids of grace by which the baptized keep the conditions of the covenant of grace; something is given but man must then nourish it or in some way complete the act of redemption by what he does. At the eucharist the participant was given that grace by which he could fulfill the terms of the covenant. The covenant was between God and man; "God on His part granteth them power to perform that which they on their part profess to undertake."¹ This was Thorndike's interpretation of Rom. 6:3. It cannot be denied that Thorndike made baptism into the covenant of grace the institution of a new law and his eucharistic understanding was a continuation of this thought.

There was greater emphasis on the proclamation of the word in Beveridge's concept of the Church's ministry than can be found in either Taylor or Thorndike though the latter maintained that the preaching of the word was the most important part of the ministry. Thorndike's doctrine of the word was never fully related to the task of the Church as were the sacraments. Beveridge did not formulate his concept of the word and sacraments in as thorough a manner as Andrewes but he was conscious that both, as the divine means of grace, conveyed the divine presence unto us.

1. Thorndike, Works, III, Pt. I, p. 128.

Beveridge related the task of the preaching of the word as a means of grace to the purpose of grace as expressed in Eph. 4:13. The word of God builds us up in grace ¹ till we come in the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ' and this said Beveridge is the task of the ministry of the word. He emphasized that the word had to be received in faith, that is, it must be received not as the word of man but as the Word of God. ² To understand the word as means of grace so as to really obtain grace by it we must look to God whose word it is. ³

Beveridge applied this understanding to the eucharist also. The bread and wine pointed beyond themselves. We must look higher than the bread and wine and trust upon God according to the promise which He made concerning it. ⁴ Though Beveridge did not elaborate the understanding of the eucharist as communion with God he definitely noted it. The bread and the wine is the communion of the body of Christ to the faithful communicant. ⁵ We must pray for God's presence in the sacrament. ⁶ As we partake of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament we are made one body and blood with Christ. ⁷

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 169.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p. 188.

4. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 68.

5. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., III, p. 171.

6. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 459.

7. Ibid., p. 468.

Bishop Andrewes considered Pentecost as the confirmation of the Church and its ministry of word and sacrament. The Holy Spirit was the confirmation of Christ's words before His ascension - 'receive Ye the Holy Ghost'. Andrewes made a distinction between the saving grace which the Holy Spirit brought and the grace of office or holy orders.

There is gratum faciens, the saving grace of the Spirit, for one to save himself by, received by each without respect to others; and there is gratis data, whatever become of us, serving to save others by, without respect to ourselves. --1

The calling of one to be Christ's ministers was by Christ Himself and without Christ's call no man can be sent. ² The primary form of the call to the ministry came from Christ Himself. The Church could send those who had been thus called but he contrasted this grace to the saving grace which the Church could not give; "none but God can give that." ³ This meant for Andrewes that in the ministration of the means of saving grace the power did not lie in man or things but in God Himself. The power of remitting sins is God's power. It is sovereign in God and in Jesus Christ in whom the Godhead and manhood are united. ⁴ God's power is absolute in this regard while the power that He gives to His ministers is ⁵ dependent and ministerial.

This power being thus solely invested in God He might without wrong to any have retained and kept to Himself, and without means of word or Sacrament, and without Ministers either Apostles or others, have exercised immediately by Himself from heaven. --6

1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, pp. 281, 121, 122.

2. Ibid., p. 281

3. Loc. cit.

4. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 92.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Loc. cit.

Andrewes believed in the originality of the three-fold order of the ministry: "1. Presbyteri, to teach; 2. Diaconi,¹ to help; 3. Episcopi, to govern. And never any other." This² ministry was prescribed by God for His people. But the interpretation of this ministry set Andrewes apart from the later claims made for episcopacy. The essence of this three-fold ministry is derived from the lowest - that of the Diaconi, which was *Διακονία*, and Andrewes rightly interpreted this to mean ministry or service. Episcopi no less than Diaconi distinguished themselves in service. Andrewes had sharp words for those who exalted the order of the Episcopi to mean lordship.

An ill word of pride, who had rather hear of words sounding of dominion than service, specially this service; for it be but the order of Deaconship, and pride would be at least more than a Deacon. Yet so we are styled here, and no other name for any, The very highest are but so. The king himself twice made 'a Deacon,' God's Deacon; - no other title. The best king that was, David, is said to have served his time. 'Served,' that was all. The glorious lights of Heaven are said to be created In ministerium, but 'for our service.' The Angels of Heaven are but 'ministering Spirits;' nay, Christ Himself is styled no otherwise, but that 'He was a Minister of the circumcision.' He that is Lord of all, and gives all the offices, calls His own but so."--3

Andrewes' interpretation of episcopacy clearly reflected the concept held by the early Church and rejected the hierarchical structure of the Medieval understanding.

Andrewes' high concept of the ministry was derived from the fact that God had chosen this means to communicate the saving

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., III, p. 393.
 2. Loc. cit.
 3. Loc. cit.

grace of Christ to men. But Andrewes always kept the stress on the essential nature of the Church's ministry which, as he so rightly put it, was Diaconia. This understanding prevented Andrewes from making absolute claims for episcopacy which others made. There is no doubt that Andrewes believed episcopacy to be the original order instituted for the Church but he denied that it therefore followed that without it there could be no Church or salvation. A man must be stone blind, said Andrewes, if he does not see Churches standing without it.²

There are two opposing views in Hall's writings concerning the meaning of the Church's ministry. Under Laud's influence Hall made some absolute claims for Episcopacy but Hall also shared in those sentiments of Laud which acknowledged that episcopacy, though desirable, was nevertheless not a necessary mark of the Church. We have already noted this latter emphasis in Laud's controversy with Fisher where he explicitly denied that a visible continual succession was a necessary mark of the Church.³ He also repudiated Rome's claim that apostolic succession meant a divine, infallible power.⁴ The criticism, that such statements represent Laud's earlier thoughts on the subject has to be set aside when we remember that Laud republished this work only a few years before his death and it therefore represents both his

-
1. Andrewes, Works, op. cit., V, p. 92.
 2. Watkin-Jones, op. cit., p. 224.
 3. Laud, Works, op. cit., II, p. 109.
 4. Ibid., pp. 109, 112.

earlier and last thought on the subject. The emphasis on episcopacy in Laud's thought must be seen in the light of the Puritan controversy.

Naturally, as the Puritan revolt gathered impetus, it became necessary to insist more strongly upon this external succession, for episcopal ordination was the Anglican rule, and disaffected extremists could not be allowed to defy it with impunity. --1

Hall's thought can best be understood in this regard when we consider his attitude to the Puritans on the one hand and his concern for the Reformed Churches on the Continent on the other. Against the Puritans, Hall made some extreme claims for the necessity of episcopacy. In his work 'Episcopacy by Divine Right', which was revised by Laud who introduced more extreme elements into it, Hall declared that episcopacy was nothing less than a divine institution. ² Hall also attached to episcopacy alone the power of sacramental ministration thus strongly suggesting that sacramental grace could only be administered by one so ordained.

Let me instance in that power, which we that are evangelical ministers have by virtue of our sacred orders given to us alone for the consecration and distribution of the holy eucharist; a point not more highly than justly stood upon by all orthodox divines, yea Christians. --3

This statement was for the Puritans but even for them Hall made great qualifications. He admitted that by divine right he did not mean there could be no Church without episcopacy. Some indeed

1. G. W. Bromiley, "Anglicanism and the Ministry", Scottish Journal of Theology; Vol. 7, No. 1, March 1954. p. 76.

2. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, pp. 149, 188.

3. Ibid., p. 208.

had stated this but it was an error of a few, said Hall.

My defence is, that no such consequence can be drawn from our opinion: forasmuch as the divine or apostolic right which we hold goes not so high as if there were an express command, that upon an absolute necessity there must be either episcopacy or no Church; but so far only, that it both may and ought to be. —1

Hall made the distinction between the being and the well-being² of the Church and he placed episcopacy in the latter category. Some of the Puritans hold their discipline to be "altogether essential to the very being of a church; we dare not be so zealous."³

Hall's great concern for the Reformed Churches on the Continent continually held him from making exclusive claims for episcopacy. There was no difference in any essential matter between the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation.⁴ These Churches were in accord in every point of doctrine without the least variation and their confession witnessed to the world of their full and absolute agreement.⁵ The only difference was in the form of outward administration but even here there was agreement insofar as all professed that this form was not essential to the being of the Church.⁶ Hall made the plea that the two Churches could come closer to one another by resolving to meet in

that primitive government, whereby it is meet we should both be regulated, universally agreed upon by antiquity;

-
1. Hall, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 356.
 2. Ibid., pp. 356, 291.
 3. Ibid., p. 356.
 4. Hall, Works, op. cit., VI, p. 610.
 5. Loc. cit.
 6. Ibid., pp. 357, 610.

wherein all things were ordered and transacted by consent of the presbytery moderated by one constant president thereof. --1

These words may be regarded as Hall's last message to the Church and they indicate that he accepted the concept of a corporate episcopate elaborated by Cyprian which concept could very well bring all the Reformed Churches into a greater harmony and this was Hall's desire.

Bishop Bramhall followed fairly closely in Hall's understanding of the Church's ministry in relation to the question of validity of orders. Bramhall did not claim that episcopacy was instituted by Christ Himself but he asserted that it was of Apostolic initiation and that it had been approved by Christ.² It was a form of government ordained in the early Church as a safeguard against schism.³ Bramhall was convinced that episcopal ordination was preferred but he did not question the validity of the non-episcopal Protestant Churches. He termed episcopacy⁴ ordination as the ordinary means of the ministry but he said that he dared not limit the extraordinary grace of God.⁴ There was a sense in which Bramhall thought of ordination as a sacrament but he did not place it on the same level as baptism and the eucharist which he said were generally necessary to salvation.⁵

1. Hall, Works, op. cit., VI, pp. 610, 611.

2. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., I, p. 271.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., II, p. 26. See also Works, op. cit. III, p. 476.

5. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., III, p. 81.

Bramhall explicitly denied that episcopal divines had unchurched most of the Protestant Churches by their interpretation of episcopacy; "They unchurch none at all, but leave them to stand or fall to their own Master."¹ Nor, he added, do they deny those Churches to be true Churches in which salvation may be had.² The Church of England neither rebaptizes³ ^{those} or reordains those (who have been baptized) or admitted into holy orders in their Church.³ That there was but one form or precise manner of ordination in the whole Catholic Church was altogether denied by Bramhall.⁴ He believed that there was a great latitude given to particular Churches in the constitution of their ecclesiastical organization.⁵ Episcopal ordination was not divorced from right doctrine by Bramhall. Holy orders were ordained by God for the conversion of man and they were an excellent grace but if those who were ordained preached error rather than truth and therefore adulterated the faith by addition of new articles they were no longer true pastors but wolves and 'worse than laymen'.⁶ This judgment was for the benefit of Rome and the Puritans. The reference to the laymen showed Bramhall's disgust for the Puritan sects who adhered to lay preachers.

-
1. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., III, p. 517.
 2. Ibid., p. 518.
 3. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., II, p. 35.
 4. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 187.
 5. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., III, p. 476.
 6. Ibid., p. 136.

Bramhall, like Andrewes, stressed the ministering aspect of ordination. Christ's power was sovereign while the priest's was derivative, delegated and ministerial.¹ Bramhall claimed that the original power of holy orders as well as all authoritative mission was from Christ.² He further stated that Christ had committed a ministerial power to the Church to ordain and therefore the grace given in holy orders is derived from Christ and given to those ordained by a line of perpetual succession.³ This he claimed should be interpreted as the act of Christ Himself. This meant that the succession was always directly related to Christ but he stressed that holy orders meant precisely ministers of Christ and not successors of Christ.⁴

Bramhall held the opinion that ordination was necessary for sacramental grace since divine grace given by ordination is required for the institution of a sacrament.⁵ However, Bramhall did not think of this with regard to a particular form of ordination but rather to an ordination; one which conformed to the minimum limits of ecclesiastical discipline.⁶ He undoubtedly thought that episcopal ordination filled the maximum requirements of holy orders but he based this on the historical significance; that episcopacy was instituted by the Apostles and hence

1. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., II, p. 455.

2. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., V, p. 262.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Ibid., p. 225.

5. Bramhall, Works, op. cit., II, p. 71.

6. Ibid., p. 26.

was most conformable to the will of God but not on directly doctrinal considerations.

Pearson shared in the concern for the continuity and unity of the Church. "The Church is not of such a nature as would necessarily once begun, preserve itself for ever."¹ Pearson grounded the continued existence of the Church upon the sustaining promise of God which brought the Church into being.² The life of the Church cannot be arrogated to the Church itself. The promise of Christ's assurance that He would be with His Church is the assurance of the continued existence of the Church.³ The primary unity of the Church is given in Jesus Christ. Pearson recognized this. In this connection he spoke of the external and internal communion of the Church; Christ was the Church and His presence was the continuity of the Church. Union with Christ by His Holy Spirit was the basic unity of the Church.⁴ Besides this unity Pearson listed six other forms of unity built upon this one foundation. (1) The promise of Christ to the disciples was given to all the disciples but in giving it to Peter it showed the unity of the Church.⁵ (2) There was also the unity of the faith and Pearson thought of this in relation to doctrine. (3) The third form of unity was the sacraments; we are baptized into one Lord and one faith by one baptism and we are continued in this one unity of the Church by the partaking of the one food in the

1. Pearson, op. cit., p. 601.

2. Loc. cit.

3. Ibid., p. 602.

4. Ibid., p. 596.

5. Ibid., pp. 596, 599.

Lord's Supper. (4) Pearson also listed charity as a form of unity of the Church and he thought of this as the manifestation of our given unity in relation to the members of the same body.

(5) Hope: we are united by the same expectation of eternal life. (6) Pearson's last sign of unity was the discipline and government of the Church. The ministry, said Pearson, by God's appointment is authorized, sanctified and set aside by the direction of the Holy Spirit to lead God's people in the same way of eternal salvation. Therefore, he concluded that there is no Church where there is no order or ministry and where there was the same order and ministry there is the same Church.¹

The essential mark of unity for Pearson was the union with Christ by the Holy Spirit and this was the saving grace by which the Church on earth being perfectly sanctified shall be eternally glorified.² Pearson deliberately set the unity of the Church in its Head before the other marks of unity in the Church. He also distinguished between the external communion and the internal communion of the Church and he regarded the six forms of unity, even word and sacrament, as belonging to the external communion of the Church.³ Pearson did this because he felt that many were baptized and partook of the eucharist but could not be considered part of the body of Christ if the essential unity was not present, Pearson stressed the internal communion with Christ as that living relation which the members have through the Holy

1. Pearson, op. cit., pp. 596 - 599.

2. Ibid., pp. 605, 606.

3. Ibid., p. 630.

1

Spirit with their Head. In Pearson's thought baptism was essentially related to the Holy Spirit. Though he considered the word and sacraments to be of the external communion Pearson also thought of them in a particular way related to the internal communion of the Church for he repeatedly stated that through the sending of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples the Church was constituted and by the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments the Church was added to and sustained.

2

3

What this Church was is easily determined, for it was a certain number of men, of which some were apostles, some the former disciples, others were persons which repented, and believed and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the sacraments administered, joining in the public prayers presented unto God. —4

This leads us to conclude that Pearson recognized the word and the sacraments as most clearly related to the primary unity of the Church in Christ its Head. His insistence that the ministry was also a mark of the Church must also be fully acknowledged but it must be seen always in relation to the doctrine of the Apostles.

5

Taylor considered the ministry as the ordinary means or channel of grace. God conveyed grace either immediately as the author and fountain of grace or by the minister. Taylor's concept of the ministry was related to the office of the apostles and

6

1. Pearson, op. cit., p; 623.

2. Ibid., p. 582.

3. Ibid., pp. 597, 622.

4. Ibid., p. 592.

5. Ibid., pp. 16, 8.

6. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIV, p. 480.

was the power to govern the Churches as a successive and perfected ministry.¹ It was a comprehensive commission for they also received power to give the Holy Ghost in confirmation and to perpetuate holy orders.² Taylor's early views on the ministry as expressed in 'The Liberty of Prophesying' were not consistently held by Taylor after the restoration. After this period Taylor made some exclusive claims for the episcopal ministry and he made sacramental grace dependent on such an ordination:

I will not receive communion from the hands of him, who was ordained by presbytery without a bishop; because his hand is a dead hand, and it reaches me nothing: but because he is my brother, I will not refuse to give him the communion, if he will receive it by my hand, which was made sacred by the Holy Ghost, invoked by the prayer and the lifting up of the bishop's hand. --3

The concept of grace in Taylor's thought as an addition to and a heightening of nature opened the way for a hierarchical understanding of orders which the Reformers had feared and repudiated in Rome's position.

By episcopal ordination the ordained are made ministers of the gospel but Taylor went on to say that the priest is separated by God in this act and made to be the gracious person who stood between God and His people.⁴ The concept of the priest as mediator is not absent in Taylor's thought. There is no greater power in the world than to remit and retain sin or to consecrate the sacramental symbols into the body and blood of Christ; nor a

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VII, pp. 35, 36.

2. Ibid., pp. 35, 36.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIII, p. 606.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIV, pp. 466, 467.

greater honour than that God in heaven should ratify what the priest does on earth "and should admit him to handle the sacrifice of the world, and to present the same, which, in heaven, is presented by the eternal Jesus."¹

The numerous qualifications that Taylor made regarding his understanding of the ministry showed very clearly that Taylor was not prepared to fully stand by the above statements. He pointed out that the validity of the priest's ministrations were dependent on Christ's continual intervention before God.² He also maintained the gift of the Holy Spirit had been first given to the whole Church in general, then to particular Churches and single persons, therefore, those who were members of the Church were entitled to the promises of the Holy Spirit.³ Taylor, as we have noted, affirmed that the ministry was the ordinary means of grace but he stated also that Christ was Lord over the means of His grace and God could not be bound to the means by man.⁴ In this regard Taylor cited cases illustrative of this point: Christ had given Ananias a special commission to baptize and confirm Paul; He had given Cornelius the Holy Spirit before he was baptized and St. Paul was ordained an apostle without the ministry of man.⁵ In the question of lay baptism Taylor frankly

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIV, p. 458.

2. Taylor, Works, op. cit., IX, p. 182.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., VII, pp. 352, 353.

4. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XI, p. 273.

5. Loc. cit.

admitted that he was not certain about his position but he pointed out that in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI lay baptism was permitted.¹ He went on to say that baptism, in view of lay baptism existing in the Church, made it very difficult to uphold that ordination placed an inherent and indelible character on the ordained person.²

Taylor also vigorously denied that the Church ever did or ever could delegate the Holy Spirit to any representative or pass the power of infallibility by commission.³ Christ gave all the privileges and gifts of grace to His Church and not a part of it and therefore no part of the Church could make pretensions to be the Church.⁴ Scripture would not allow us to make such a judgment. Even though Taylor claimed that ordination was in the power of the bishop alone he nevertheless related this power to the Church. In the consecration of the elements not only the priest but the people also declare the Lord's death. He related this power of declaration to ordination where "the consecrator does declare power to descend from God upon the person to be ordained."⁵ He stressed that the whole action is 'but a ministry'; a declaration of the effect and grace of God's gift.⁶ The consecrator is the external means which makes visible what God does

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIV, p. 450.

2. Ibid., p. 448.

3. Taylor, Works, op. cit., X, p. 353.

4. Ibid., p. 353.

5. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIV, pp. 464, 465.

6. Ibid., p. 465.

and what man of himself cannot do.

The inconsistencies and confusion in Taylor's thought in this connection arose from his failure adequately to distinguish between grace and the gifts of grace. The criticism that Downname made against Rome for confounding the meaning of χάρισμα and χάρις must be sustained against Taylor. Though Taylor's views on the Church's ministry varies greatly much of his misunderstanding can be traced to his doctrine of grace. Taylor wrongly interpreted the gift of the ministry to the church as χάρις-as grace itself.² This grace is left as a 'despositum' to the Church until the second coming of Christ.³ Taylor related this despositum to the doctrine and discipline of Christ.⁴ The consistent understanding of grace as a quantum, an object, appears in Taylor's thought; it is a thing that the Church can have in itself and can give it to others. Of course we have seen how this was qualified time and again by a more true understanding of grace but it still represents the dominant note in Taylor's doctrine.

The doctrine of the ministry in bishop Cosin's thought was akin to Andrewes'. He stood in the tradition which regarded the episcopal order as the lawful government of the Church. Cosin, like Andrewes, did not maintain that episcopal ordination was necessary for sacramental grace. Cosin's action speaks for itself. He would never have entered into full communion with the French

1. Taylor, Works, op. cit., XIV, pp. 464, 465.

2. Ibid., p. 481.

3. Ibid., pp. 481, 482.

4. Ibid., p. 481.

Reformed Church during his exile had he questioned the validity of that Church's sacramental ministrations. Cosin revealed that he was fully aware of the difficulty but he recommended to those who had sought his advice on this matter to follow the same course he had taken - to communicate with the French Reformed Church, a non-episcopal Church.

The concept that controlled Thorndike's discussion on the Church's ministry was his concern for the visible unity of the Church. His affirmations concerning episcopacy can generally be seen as effecting this interest in unity. He maintained that the commission to Peter was in reality given to the rest of the Apostles also but the commission itself was to rest in the Church¹ though not all the congregation shared in the office. The ministry was given to the Church.² This is important to note for Thorndike did not separate the ministry from the Church or make the ministry itself the Church as Rome tends to do. Thorndike saw the place of the bishop in the realm of unity for the visible Church.³ The fear of the Puritan division sounded a strong note of authority in Thorndike's works and he placed the power of the visible unity into the hands of the bishops.

Thorndike sounded the voice of the early Church citing Ambrose who had stated that laymen had the right to preach the gospel and baptize. Such procedure in preaching was retracted

-
1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. 1, p. 402.
 2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., I, Pt. 1, p. 17.
 3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. 1, p. 466.

because lay preaching gave rise to schism.¹ Only the Church can license a man to preach and Thorndike placed the authority in the hands of the bishop.² The celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was also included in the sphere of the bishop's prerogative by Thorndike and for the same reason. Agreeing with Ignatius he claimed it was celebrated under the bishop for the protection of unity.³

When the primacy of the bishop's powers were exalted Thorndike, like Hall, used the works of Ignatius extensively. St. Jerome, whose interpretation of the bishop's powers did not enhance episcopal claims, proved a source of difficulty for both. Hall dismissed Jerome as one who had a peevish nature but Thorndike took Jerome's position more seriously. Thorndike noted that Jerome had maintained that bishops and priests were both the same thing under the apostles and that the difference between them is a human distinction made by the custom of the Church.⁴ Thorndike said he would allow the name of bishop in the New Testament to include priests also because their function is common to both though with the chief power in the bishop.⁵ Thorndike thought of this power as delegated to the bishops and there is no indication that he attributed to it any direct theological significance. His

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. 1, pp. 390, 391.

2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. II, p. 593.

3. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., I, Pt. 1, p. 221.

4. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. 1, p. 375.

5. Ibid., p. 378.

primary concern at this point was the question of maintaining unity against the threat of schism. Thorndike also affirmed that sometimes the Fathers held that presbyters had succeeded the apostle.¹ Thorndike could well accept this without it proving a source of trouble for his understanding of episcopacy because first and foremost his concern was for the unity of the Church under the authority of the bishop. If the bishop could ordain and license to preach and if the eucharist could be celebrated in the unity of this ministry it would mean that the strength and life of the sects - the Puritans - could be undercut.

Thorndike saw that it was useless to contend for personal succession without also maintaining succession of the true faith. To ensure the latter he advocated that Holy Scripture be interpreted through the early Church but he unfortunately reversed this order and alleged in fact that an ordered ministry preserved the faith from corruption.² However, when Thorndike spoke of the essential marks of the Church he did not include the orders of the Church. The ministry was included only as it did what it was called to do.

The preaching of the word and the ministering of the sacraments which the tradition of the whole Church confirmeth the sense of the Scriptures to contend; is the only mark of the Church, that can be visible. --3

Of course the concept of the ministry was very important in Thorndike's thought but he never made the ministry essential to

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. 1, p. 397.

2. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., IV, Pt. II, p. 905.

3. Ibid., p. 895.

the being of the Church insofar as it was limited to one particular form.

In his discussion concerning the French Reformed Church Thorndike said he would not take it upon himself either to justify or condemn the holy orders of that Church since his superiors had recognized them to be valid.¹ He added that he had very great reason to hope and presume that God accepted their ordination even though it was not according to rule, which for Thorndike meant episcopacy. However, he made this plea which really informed his thought in this matter; that the Reformed Church of France establish episcopacy in its government in order that unity might be restored and preserved.² Episcopal government seemed to be the touchstone of unity for Thorndike and he seemed convinced that unity could be maintained and division overcome if episcopacy was enforced. Of course it can do much to preserve order but Thorndike seemed oblivious to the fact that the Puritans came precisely from a Church which had episcopacy as its form of government. In discussing the French Reformed Church Thorndike never raised the question of reordination. It was no issue for him.

There is a disturbing element in Beveridge's thought when we consider his views on the Church's ministry. At almost every point in our discussion thus far we have noted that Beveridge's thought was consistently Reformed. Regarding the question of the ministry there is a decided break in his thought at times.

1. Thorndike, Works, op. cit., V, p. 430.

2. Loc. cit.

In a sermon of Matt. 28:20 Beveridge interpreted the promise of Christ to the Apostles to be uniquely related to the Apostle's office and not to the Church as a whole.¹ He limited Christ's words to an office of the Church and not to the Church itself - the body. The Holy Spirit is promised to the office apostolical and He accompanies and assists those in the office to discharge their office.² Of course we must really affirm with Beveridge that without the gift of the Holy Spirit there can be no ministry but Beveridge's contention went further than this. The Holy Spirit at this point of his thinking tended to become some thing parceled out and enclosed in a function. Beveridge expressed this unfortunate concept in reference to Deacons and Presbyters. The Holy Spirit is lodged in the office of the Apostles but to the Deacons and Presbyters there was transferred only "so much of the Spirit upon them as was necessary to that office."³ In this particular discussion Beveridge tended to make the gift of the Holy Spirit quantitative.

This aspect of his thought appears only in this particular sermon which was directed at both the Puritans and Rome. It is evident throughout that Beveridge was anxious to make clear to the Puritans that in the matter of the ministry the Holy Spirit was given to the office of the bishop and that the deacons and presbyters had only a measure of the Holy Spirit. Beveridge, in this sermon even identified the Church with the office of the

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 4.

2. Ibid., p. 8.

3. Ibid., p. 10.

bishop: the Church, that is, the governors. However, the position that Beveridge upheld in the face of the non-conformists was entirely denied by what he said to Rome.²

The same sermon as well as his other writings reveal that the particular opinion of the Church's ministry as given above was not an integral part of Beveridge's thought concerning his doctrine of grace. We cannot deny that it is there nor would we want to for it goes a long way to show that in the face of the Puritan threat the bishops took a stand regarding their orders which had no real theological significance to it.

At one point Beveridge spoke of the Apostles as supplying the place of Christ on earth until He comes again but his severe criticism of the pope on this same matter reveals that Beveridge had qualifications to make^{on} his own statement. There is a very real sense in which the ministers of Christ speak and act in His name, as if Christ Himself spoke and acted but we must always see this as an act by grace and not something that is man's right. The grace of Christ which allows sinful man to be made in the image of His righteousness allows men of flesh to speak and act in His name. His name is signed to their words and acts. But it is another thing to claim this as a possession, as a right. It is not strange to note that Beveridge was aware of this distinction.

He emphasized that the power of the Apostles was only ministerial. Whatever power they had was still Christ's power

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 10.

2. Loc. cit.

and they received it continually from Him. ¹ The concept of the Aaronic priesthood, as passing from one to another, did not apply to the Christian ministry, said Beveridge. The Christian ministry is sustained by Christ Himself in His own person. ² Beveridge also claimed that there was nothing "more necessary to the right administration of the means of grace than that they who administered them be 'rightly ordained' and authorized to do it, according to the institute and command of Him that did establish them." ³ His interpretation of Acts 13:3 was that an episcopal ordination was involved. Others may

 speak the same words, deliver the same truths, press the same duties, as they do who are really God's ministers; but this is not preaching, properly so called: they do not publish and proclaim the will of God with any power or authority over their hearers, for they have received none from God, as not being called and sent by Him. --4

Having said this on the one hand Beveridge altogether denied it in his consideration of the Church of Rome. First of all he admitted that the Apostolic Succession had been continued in the Church of Rome. ⁵ But simply because they had preserved a historic continuity in their ministry was no guarantee that she would be faithful; her doctrine had corrupted the faith and quenched the Spirit and therefore Christ's promise was not fulfilled in them. ⁶ Though Beveridge had maintained that right ordination, which he interpreted to be episcopal ordination,

1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 14.

2. Ibid., p. 330.

3. Ibid., p. 158.

4. Ibid., p. 27.

5. Ibid., p. 21.

6. Ibid., p. 21.

was the most important element in administering the sacraments and having admitted that Rome had maintained the Apostolic Succession he denied the sacramental ministrations of Rome. The great means of grace, the word and sacraments as administered¹ by Rome is of no use at all to the people. It is obvious from such statements as this that Beveridge had more to say about the validity of ordination and his doctrine of grace as we have seen thus far does not support theologically an episcopal exclusiveness.

In his extremely critical attitude to Rome Beveridge was blind to the mightiness of God's grace for in spite of Rome's sin, in spite of her prostitution of the faith God's grace was mightier than the sin of Rome. Beveridge's criticism of Rome showed most clearly that he was not finally prepared to claim sacramental validity on the basis of a particular interpretation of orders within the Christian Church. He further criticized Rome on her departure from the faith and her innovations and claimed that the only standard of truth for the Holy Catholic Church was Holy Scripture. The mark of the Church, said Beveridge, is where the word of God is truly preached and the sacraments of Christ² duly administered.

-
1. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., I, p. 23.
 2. Beveridge, Works, op. cit., VII, p. 363.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrewes, Lancelot, Ninety-Six Sermons. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1865. Vol. I.
- _____, Ninety-Six Sermons. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1860. Vol. II.
- _____, Ninety-Six Sermons. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1861. Vol. III.
- _____, Ninety-Six Sermons. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1853. Vol. IV.
- _____, Ninety-Six Sermons. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1865. Vol. V.
- _____, A Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine and Other Minor Works of Lancelot Andrewes, Sometimes Lord Bishop of Winchester. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1846.
- _____, Two Answers to Cardinal Peron, and Other Miscellaneous Works of Lancelot Andrewes, Sometimes Lord Bishop of Winchester. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1854.
- Barlow, T., Two Letters Concerning Justification By Faith Only. London: L. B. Seeley and Sons, 1828.
- Bosher, Robert S., The Making of the Restoration Settlement. London: Dacre Press, 1951.
- Beveridge, W., The Theological Works of William Beveridge, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1850. Vol. I.
- _____, The Theological Works of William Beveridge, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1851. Vol. II.

- Beveridge, W., The Theological Works of William Beveridge, D.D.
The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford:
John Henry Parker, 1851. Vol. III.
- _____, The Theological Works of William Beveridge, D.D.
The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford:
John Henry Parker, 1852. Vol. IV.
- _____, The Theological Works of William Beveridge, D.D.
The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford:
John Henry Parker, 1854. Vol. V.
- _____, The Theological Works of William Beveridge, D.D.
The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford:
John Henry Parker, 1847. Vol. VII.
- _____, The Theological Works of William Beveridge, D.D.
The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford:
John Henry Parker, 1856. Vol. VIII.
- Bromley, G. W., Baptism and the Anglican Reformers. London:
Lutterworth Press, 1954.
- _____, Thomas Cranmer Theologian. London: Lutterworth
Press, 1956.
- Browne, E. H., An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles.
London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1874.
- Bull, George, Harmonia Apostolica: Or Two Dissertations.
The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford:
John Henry Parker, 1844. Pt. I.
- _____, The English Theological Works of George Bull.
Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844.
- Baillie, Donald and Marsh, John, Intercommunion. New York:
Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1952.
- Barrow, I. The Theological Works of Isaac Barrow. Oxford:
At the University Press. 1830. Vols. IV, V, VI,
VII.
- Barnet, Bishop, Bishop Barnet's History of His Own Time.
Oxford: At The University Press, 1833. 3 Vols.
- Benham, W., The Prose Works of the Right Reverend Thomas Ken,
D.D. London: Griffith, Farran, O'Kendan &
Welsh, 1889.

Bethune-Baker, J. F., An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1903.

Bramhall, J., The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842. Vol. I.

_____, The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842. Vol. II.

_____, The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844. Vol. III.

_____, The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844. Vol. IV.

_____, The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1845. Vol. V.

Carter, T., Nicholas Ferrar His Household and His Friends. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1893.

Calvin, John, The Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by Thomas Norton. Glasgow: Alexander Irvine, 1762.

_____, Commentary Upon the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romans. Edited by Henry Beveridge. Calvin Translation Society, Edinburgh: 1844.

_____, Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians, Translated by Rev. William Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1854.

_____, Theological Treatises. Translated by Rev. J. K. S. Reid, Library of Christian Classics, London: SCM Press, 1954.

Carleton, George D., An Examination Wherein the Author of the Late Appeale Holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the Doctrine of the Church of England. London: William Turner, 1626.

Christology of the Later Fathers, Library of Christian Classics. Edited by E. W. Hardy, and C. C. Richardson. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1954. Vol. III.

- Collier, Jeremy, An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain.
edited by Thomas Lathbury. London: William Straker,
1852. Vols. V, VII, VIII.
- Cosin, J., The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God,
John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham. The Library of
Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker,
1843. Vol. I.
- _____, The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God,
John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham. The Library of
Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker,
1845. Vol. II.
- _____, The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God,
John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham. The Library of
Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker,
1849. Vol. III.
- _____, The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God,
John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham. The Library of
Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker,
1851. Vol. IV.
- _____, The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God,
John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham. The Library of
Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker,
1855. Vol. V.
- Cradwell, Edward, The Two Books of Common Prayer, Oxford: At
The University Press, 1841.
- Cross, F. L. and P. More, Anglicanism: The Thought and Practice
of The Church of England, Illustrated from the
Literature of the Seventeenth Century. London:
S.P.C.K. 1951.
- Crisp, T., The Complete Works of Tobias Crisp, D.D. Edited by
Dr. Gill. London: J. Murgatroyd, 1791. Vol. I.
- Davenant, John, A Treatise on Justification. Edited by Josiah
Allport. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co; 1844.
Vol. I.
- _____, A Treatise on Justification. Edited by Josiah Allport.
London: Hamilton, Adams and Co; 1846. Vol. II.
- _____, An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the
Colossians. Edited by Josiah Allport. London:
Hamilton, Adams and Co; 1831. Vol. I.

- Davenant, John, An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians. Edited by Josiah Allport. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co; 1832. Vol. II.
- Dibdin, Sir Lewis, Establishment in England. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1932.
- Dillenburger, John and Claud Welch, Protestant Christianity. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1954.
- Downame, George, The Covenant of Grace, Dublin: Society of Stationers, 1631.
- _____, (Downham) The Christian Freedom, Oxford: William Webs, 1635.
- _____, A Treatise of Justification, London: Nicholas Borune, 1639.
- Early Christian Fathers. The Library of Christian Classics. General Ed. John Baillie, John T. McNeill, Henry P. Van Dusen, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1953. Vol. I.
- Fitzgerald, William, Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, London: John Murry, 1885. Vol. II.
- Gardiner, S. R., The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625 - 1660. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1906.
- Gilfillon, Rev. George, The Poetical Works of George Herbert. Edinburgh: James Nickol, 1853.
- Harrison, A. W., The Beginnings of Arminianism. London: University of London Press Ltd., 1926.
- _____, Arminianism. London: Duckworth, 1937.
- Hall, J., The Works of the Right Reverend Joseph Hall, D.D. Edited by P. Wynter. Oxford: At The University Press, 1863. 10 Vols.
- Heylin, Peter, The Historical and Miscellaneous Tracts. London: Printed by M. Clark, for Charles Hamper, 1681.
- Henson, H. H., Studies in English Religion in the Seventeenth Century. London: John Murry, 1903.
- _____, The Relation of the Church of England to the Other Reformed Churches. London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1911.

- Henson, H. H. Puritanism in England. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1912.
- Higham, Florence, Lancelot Andrewes, London: SCM Press Ltd. 1952.
- Huehns, Gertrude, Antinomianism in English History, 1640 - 1660. London: The Cresset Press, 1951.
- Hughes, Philip, The Reformation in England. London: Hollis & Carter, 1954.
- Hunt, J., Religious Thought in England. London: Strahan & Co., Publishers, 1870. Vol. I.
- _____, Religious Thought in England. London: Strahan & Co., Publishers, 1871. Vol. II.
- Innes, Arthur D., Cranmer and the Reformation in England. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900.
- Isaacson, Henry, An Exact Narration of the Life and Death of Lancelot Andrewes. London: John Stafford, 1650.
- Jauncey, E., The Doctrine of Grace, London: The Macmillan Co., 1925.
- Jewel, John, The Works of John Jewel. Edited by John Ayre. Cambridge: The University Press, 1847. The Four Portions.
- Joyce, J. W., England's Sacred Synods. London: Rivingstons, 1855.
- Knappen, M. M., Tudor Puritanism. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Lathbury, Thomas, A History of the English Episcopacy. London: John W. Parker, 1836.
- _____, A History of the Nonjurors. London: William Pickering, 1845.
- Laud, W., The Works of William Laud, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847, Vol. I.
- _____, The Works of William Laud, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1849, Vol. II.
- _____, The Works of William Laud, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1853. Vol. III.

- Laud, W., The Works of William Laud, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1854. Vol. IV
- _____, The Works of William Laud, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1857. Vol. VI. Pt. I.
- _____, The Works of William Laud, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1857. Vol. VI. Pt. II.
- _____, The Works of William Laud, D.D. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1860. Vol. VII.
- Lewis, J., The Reformation Settlement. Cambridge: Dughtion, Bull and Co., 1885.
- Luther, Martin, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Text Prepared by Philip S. Watson. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1953.
- _____, The Works of Martin Luther. The Philadelphia Edition. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942. Vol. I.
- _____, The Works of Martin Luther. The Philadelphia Edition. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942. Vol. II.
- MacColl, M. The Reformation Settlement. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1899.
- Maclean, Douglas, Lancelot Andrewes and the Reaction. London: George Allen & Sons, 1910.
- McLachlan, John H., Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Miller and Johnson, The Puritans. New York: American Book Company, 1938.
- Miller, Perry, Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630 - 1650. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1933.
- _____, The New England Mind in the Seventeenth Century. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Mountague, Richard, Appello Caesarem: A Just Appelle From Two Unjust Informers. London: Mathew Lownes, 1625.
- _____, Acts and Monuments of the Church. "London", 1700.

- Moorman, John, A History of The Church in England. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953.
- Morton, Thomas, A Catholic Appeale for Protestants. London: 1610.
- _____, The Institution of the Sacrament. London: Robert Mylbourne, 1631.
- Mozley, William J. F., William Tyndale. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937.
- Neal, D., Neal's History of the Puritans. Edited by Edward Parsons, London: Robinson and Son, 1811. 2 Vols.
- Nuttall, G. F., The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.
- Pearson, John, An Exposition of the Creed. Oxford: At The University Press, 1857.
- Pearson, A. F. Scott, Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535 - 1603. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1925.
- Perry, G. G., The History of The Church of England. London: Saunders, Otley and Co., 1862. Vol. I.
- _____, The History of The Church of England. London: Saunders, Otley and Co., 1862. Vol. II.
- Procter, Francis and W. H. Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1929.
- Ogg, David, England in the Reign of Charles II. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1934. Vol. I.
- Overton, John Henry, The Church in England. London: Gardner, Darton & Co., 1897. Vol. II.
- Ridley, N., The Works of Nicholas Ridley. Edited by Henry Christmas. Cambridge: The University Press. 1843.
- Rouse, Ruth and Stephen L. Neill, A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517 - 1948. London: S.P.C.K. 1954.
- Rupp, Gordon, The Righteousness of God. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953.

- Saltmarsh, John, Free Grace; or the Flowing of Christ's Blood Freely to Sinners. London: 1646.
- Shiple, Rev. D., The Liturgies of 1549 and 1662. London: Joseph Masters, 1866.
- Sanderson, R., The Works of Robert Sanderson, D.D. Edited by Wm. Jacobson. Oxford: At The University Press, 1854. Vol. I, II, V.
- Sherlock, William, A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God. London: W. Rogers, 1697.
- _____, A Discourse Concerning the Knowledge of Jesus Christ. London: W. Kittilly, 1678.
- Stoughton, John, History of Religion in England. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1881. Vol. I, II, III.
- Stranks, C. J., The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor. London: S.P.C.K. 1952.
- Sykes, Norman, The English Religious Tradition. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1953.
- _____, The Crisis of the Reformation. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1938.
- _____, The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches, in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. London: S.P.C.K. 1949.
- Thorndike, H., The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844, Vol. I. Pt. I.
- _____, The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844, Vol. I. Pt. II.
- _____, The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1845. Vol. II. Pt. I.
- _____, The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1846. Vol. II, Pt. II.
- _____, The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1849. Vol. III. Pt. I.

- Thorndike, H., The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1851. Vol. III. Pt. II.
- _____, The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1852. Vol. IV. Pt. I.
- _____, The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1853. Vol. IV. Pt. II.
- _____, The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1854. Vol. V.
- _____, The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike. The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1856. Vol. VI.
- Thilluson, Thomas, The Doctrine of the Priesthood in the Church of England. London: Joseph Masters, 1863.
- Taylor, J. J., Religious Life in England. Edited by J. Martineau. London: Trubner & Co., 1876.
- Torrance, T. F., Calvin's Doctrine of Man. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- _____, The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1948.
- _____, The Eschatology of the Reformers. Eschatology: Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 2. pp. 36 - 62. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1954.
- _____, Royal Priesthood. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 3. Oliver and Boyd, 1955.
- _____, Kingdom and Church. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956.
- Tuве, Rosemond, A Reading of George Herbert. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- Tulloch, John, Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1844. 2 Vols.

- Taylor, J. The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor, D.D. Edited by Reginald Heber. London: J. Moyes, 1828. 15 Vols.
- Walker, George, Socinianism. London: Phelomo Stephens and Christopher Meredith, 1640.
- Watkins-Jones, Howard, The Holy Spirit from Arminius to Wesley. London: The Epworth Press. 1929.
- Wallace, Ronald S., Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1935.
- Welch, Claude, The Trinity in Contemporary Theology. London: The SCM Press Ltd., 1953.
- Whitley, W. T., The Doctrine of Grace. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1932.
- Whitgift, John, The Works of John Whitgift. Edited by John Ayre. Cambridge: The University Press, 1852. 2 Vols.
- Willey, Basil, The Seventeenth Century Background. London: Chatto and Windus, 1934.
- Woodhouse, H. F., The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547 - 1603. London: S.P.C.K. 1954.
- Walton, Izaak, The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker. Oxford: Thomas Tegg, 1843. 2 Vols.

ARTICLE

- Bromiley, G. W., Anglicanism and the Ministry. Scottish Journal of Theology. Vol. 7. No. 1. March 1954.