

**THE REPLY. BAPTISMAL
REGENERATION AND
SACRAMENTAL JUSTIFICATION
NOT THE DOCTRINE OF THE
ENGLISH CHURCH**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649448289

The Reply. Baptismal Regeneration and Sacramental Justification not the Doctrine of the English Church by James Thomas Holloway

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

JAMES THOMAS HOLLOWAY

**THE REPLY. BAPTISMAL
REGENERATION AND
SACRAMENTAL JUSTIFICATION
NOT THE DOCTRINE OF THE
ENGLISH CHURCH**

THE REPLY.

THE REPLY.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION
AND
SACRAMENTAL JUSTIFICATION
NOT THE DOCTRINE
OF THE
ENGLISH CHURCH.

IN A LETTER ADDRESSED TO

THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON;

CONTAINING RECEPTIONS

AGAINST CERTAIN STRICTURES MADE IN HIS CHARGE

DELIVERED AT

ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, OCT. 10, 1842.

BY THE

REV. JAMES THOMAS HOLLOWAY, D.D.,

MINISTER OF FITZROY CHAPEL, LONDON STREET, FITZROY SQUARE.

LONDON :

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

1842.

963.

A LETTER,

&c.

MY LORD,

MOVING as I do, only among the humbler ranks of the working clergy in the Established Church, it may seem, and I have no doubt will be considered by many, as an act of great presumption in me to address the following paper to you, in reply to certain strictures contained in your Lordship's late Charge at St. Paul's Cathedral. The nature of them, however, is such that they leave me no alternative. If the opinion there laid down as your own, of the doctrine of the English church, and the gospel of the grace of God, be correct, then—and it is but honest to declare it—the whole tenor of my public ministrations for the last thirty years has been nothing but one tissue of fraud and falsehood. And the people among whom I now labour have a right to charge me with having poisoned their minds

with noxious error, instead of feeding them with truth. I feel it to be a duty I owe to them, therefore, and the section of the church of Christ to which I belong, to attempt a vindication of my principles and public ministrations from any such serious allegation. I most earnestly entreat you, my Lord, to be assured I mean nothing personal in this undertaking. Deem it not, my Lord, as an attack upon yourself; I have no such disposition or intention; it would be most unseemly. It is in self-defence I stand up, or rather let me say, in defence of the principles I hold, and labour earnestly to disseminate, because I believe them to be according to the doctrine of the Established Church, the faith of Christ, and the truth of God.

You state, my Lord, p. 23, "that regeneration does actually take place in baptism, is most undoubtedly the doctrine of the English church, and I do not understand how any clergyman, who uses the office for baptism, which he has bound himself to use, and which he cannot alter nor mutilate without a breach of good faith, can deny that in some sense or other baptism is indeed the laver of regeneration." To this you subjoin that there is no justification offered to the church without the intervention of sacraments; i. e. a person must be baptized with water before he can be justified. From which you de-

duce the following inference: "I cannot, therefore, deny it to be the plain doctrine of our church that baptism is instrumentally connected with justification." What then is regeneration? What is justification? To assert that either the one or the other is inseparably connected with, or necessarily dependent upon, the water, the outward sign or form in baptism, is what I have been ever taught to consider, and do contend to be, contrary to God's holy word. If, then, baptismal regeneration and sacramental justification is not the doctrine of the word of God—and if baptismal regeneration and sacramental justification is the doctrine of the Church of England—then the Church of England holds unsound doctrine, and is therefore an unscriptural church. This is what I cannot admit. My object, therefore, is to show, and in dependence upon *Him* for strength to wield the sword in his cause, who has put it into my hand commanding me to "fight the good fight of faith," I will endeavour to prove,

First. That baptismal regeneration and sacramental justification is not the doctrine of the gospel of Christ.

Secondly. It was not the doctrine of apostles in the primitive ages of Christianity.

Thirdly. It is not the doctrine of the Protestant Reformed Church in England.

First. Baptismal regeneration and sacramental justification militate against the word of God.

1st. *Baptismal regeneration.* It is contended by you, my Lord, that regeneration does actually take place in baptism. Yea, "baptism is indeed the laver of regeneration." Then baptism by water, and regeneration, are convertible terms; a baptized person, and a regenerate person, is one and the same thing. It must, then, follow as a necessary consequence, that the operating principle, the fruits and effects, must be in both the same also. What is the moving principle, or efficient cause, of regeneration? The Spirit of God! It is God the Holy Ghost! This will be conceded, and it is, moreover, argued (but that is puerile and a mere evasion of the question) that the disciples of that school do not hold that the water regenerates, but the Spirit of God by the water, the sacramental water in baptism. This, then, amounts to the unscriptural doctrine of sacramental grace, i. e. that the sign and the thing signified, the water and the grace, are consubstantial: indeed, if baptismal regeneration is a scripture doctrine, it must be so. And, how any person advocating such opinion, i. e. consubstantiation, or the presence of God in the water, can escape the imputation of the doctrine of transubstantiation, I see not.

The Papists hold the dogma of sacramental grace in the Lord's Supper because they maintain that the presence of God is there. If water baptism regenerates the soul, the essential presence of God must be there also; for God the Holy Ghost is the efficient cause of regeneration.

If baptism by water is so essentially connected with regeneration, why did not our Lord, in entering upon his ministry, commence with that ordinance? Why did he not administer baptism to his twelve disciples, when he called them? There is nothing in the scripture to justify the assertion that they were ever baptized with water; and yet they were born again of the Spirit. Jesus said unto Peter, "But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."* Peter was born of God, but not regenerated by water, for "Jesus himself baptized not."

If it could be proved that the disciples had been baptized by John, it would not alter the question, that was not Christ's baptism, nor even could it be accepted in the place of it; it was the

* Matt. xvi. 15—17.