

William C. Weinrich, "Cyprian, Donatism, Augustine, and Augustana VIII: Remarks on the Church and the Validity of Sacraments," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 55, No. 4 (October 1991): 267-296.

## **Cyprian, Donatism, Augustine, and Augustana VIII: Remarks on the Church and the Validity of Sacraments**

William C. Weinrich

According to Melancthon in the Apology, the eighth article of the Augustana was added to allay any fear on the part of the Romanists that the Lutherans were sixteenth century Donatists.<sup>1</sup> The Roman Confutation had rejected Augustana 7 because the definition of the church as the "assembly of saints" appeared to suggest that the true church was so abstracted from the visible, sacramental church that one could not speak of evil persons or hypocrites as in any way associated with the church. As the Confutation makes clear, the Romanists had especially in mind the doctrine of the church enunciated by John Hus a century earlier. Hus had taught that the church, as the body of those predestined by God, was essentially invisible and had no head on earth, its head being Christ in heaven. The Council of Constance (1414-1418) had condemned this view as heretical, and now the Romanists smelled the odor of the same view in Augustana 7. No doubt Luther's early insistence on the spiritual and inward character of the church in opposition to the papal, institutional definition of the church fueled Rome's suspicions in this regard. It was, therefore, with regard to Rome's sensitivities to "Donatist" notions that Melancthon added Augustana 8. However, practical considerations also raised the question of "Donatist" exclusivism for the Lutherans. The "evil men and hypocrites" which Augustana 8 had in mind were not just any sinful minister. They were the Roman bishops and especially the pope who, in areas unprotected by evangelical civil authorities, were not allowing the free preaching of the gospel of justification and who were in fact persecuting those who did. The question raised then by many was: "Are we allowed to partake of the sacraments administered by these bishops and their subordinate priests." Augustana 8 in effect answers: "Yes, you may with clear conscience partake at the tables where Roman priests and bishops preside, and you may with complete faith believe that there the true sacraments are being administered. For not the personal quality of the administrant, but the command and ordinance of Christ constitute and make efficacious the sacraments."

## I. The Thinking of the Early Church

### *A. General Considerations*

The historical context which makes sense of the inclusion of Article Eight in the Augustana informs us that Donatism is not an abstract posture but takes shape ever anew as new contingencies arise and raise anew the question of Peter, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John 6:68). Indeed, in the history of the church the answer to Peter's question – "Where can the truth be found?" – has often been as important as the question, "What is the truth?" In fact, to locate the truth goes a long way toward defining the truth. It was not accidental, therefore, that struggles in the early church against the over-spiritualization of the Gnostics resulted in definitions of the truth that were intimately and also inseparably bound to institutional formation, whether that be the canonical shape of the Scriptures, the shape of the creed, or the office of bishop. Indeed, in their application the words of Peter do not distinguish between Jesus, who has the words of eternal life, and someone else to whom the disciples might go. Rather, the question is this: "To whom might we go in order that there we may hear the words of eternal life which are none other than the words of Jesus?" To whom shall we go in order that the words of Jesus ("who hears you, hears Me," Luke 10:16) may be recognized and heard. Where is Jesus – and with Him the Holy Spirit – to be located?

For the early church the answer to the question of where were Christ and the Holy Spirit was simply the church in which apostolic men preach and teach the message of the apostles and distribute the sacraments given to the church by Christ. Apart from that church Christ and the Holy Spirit simply were not accessible, and therefore apart from that church there was no salvation and life. In a passage, complex but wholly typical of the thinking of the early church, Irenaeus writes as follows:

[The dispensation of God which gives the Holy Spirit] has been entrusted to the Church, as breath was to the first created man, for this purpose, that all the members receiving it may be vivified and the communion with Christ has been distributed throughout it, that is, the Holy Spirit . . . "For in

the Church," it is said, "God has set apostles, prophets, teachers," and all the other means through which the Spirit works; of which all those are not partakers who do not join themselves to the Church, but defraud themselves of life through their perverse opinions and infamous behavior. For where the Church is, here is the Holy Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace; but the Spirit is truth.<sup>2</sup>

For our purposes it suffices to note that the church is the place of God's dispensation for our salvation. It is the place where, in analogy with the creation of Adam, those in sin and death receive the life of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, this life-giving Spirit is dispensed through the various offices which Christ has set in the church (see 1 Corinthians 12:28). Apart from this church there is no life, for apart from this church God is not present in His salvific dispensation of word and Holy Spirit through which He brings to pass what He intended from the beginning. What this means in practice is that the church is founded upon and itself dispenses baptism wherein the name of the Triune God is invoked as that God whose full salvific activity is given in the church. In his commentary on the Lord's Prayer, Tertullian recognized that in the words "Our Father" the Son and the church were already implied: "In the Father the Son is invoked, for 'I and the Father are one.' Nor is even our mother the Church passed by, if, that is, in the Father and the Son is recognized the mother, from whom arises the name both of Father and of Son."<sup>3</sup> In his treatise on baptism, Tertullian speaks of the church simply as the place of the Trinity: "wherever there are three (that is, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), there is the Church, which is a body of three."<sup>4</sup> And similarly, in his treatise on modesty, Tertullian speaks as though the church is the divine presence itself: "The very Church itself is properly and principally spirit, in which there is the Trinity of the one divinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."<sup>5</sup>

The early church, therefore, thought of the church in what might be called baptismal terms. The church is the place of the Triune God in the dispensation of His salvific purpose; it is the place where the Father gives His Son through the ministrations of apostolic

preachment and baptism and therein creates sons anew through the vivification of the Holy Spirit. Unless we understand this theological and baptismal understanding of the reality of the church, it will remain a mystery why in the very earliest of creeds both church and baptism for the forgiveness of sins are indispensable elements.<sup>6</sup>

*B. Cyprian of Carthage*

The answer to Peter's question – "Lord, to whom shall we go?" – can, therefore, be recast: "Lord, where is the church and its baptism unto eternal life?" And that question became an issue in the middle of the third century when the question arose whether the baptisms performed among schismatics (Novatian) and heretics (Marcion) were to be recognized as true baptisms. Historically, the discussion revolved principally around two central figures of the mid-third-century western church, Stephen, bishop of Rome, and Cyprian, bishop of Carthage. Some discussion of their respective positions will be helpful, since this dispute provides meaningful background for the Donatist question which would arise at the beginning of the fourth century and which would so significantly engage the energies of St. Augustine of Hippo.

In 255 A.D. and 256 A.D. people from the schism of Novatian and people from the heretical sect of Marcion sought reunion with the catholic church. There was no difficulty with those who had been baptized within the orthodox church and later had entered into heresy or schism. Such persons were received back into the church as were any sinner; they received the laying on of hands as a sign of their reconciliation to the true church. However, the question was different for those who claimed to have been baptized within the schismatic or heretical churches. Were those "baptisms" in fact true baptisms, or were they not? Here the western tradition represented by Rome and the western tradition represented by Carthage (at least since Agrippinus, c. 213) parted company. While both Stephen of Rome and Cyprian agreed that true baptism was with water and in the name of the Triune God, they differed concerning whether that was in itself sufficient. For Stephen of Rome water and the triune name were sufficient to have a real baptism.<sup>7</sup> The "effect of baptism" is attributed to "the majesty of the Name," so that "they

who are baptized anywhere and anyhow, in the name of Jesus Christ, are judged to be renewed and sanctified."<sup>8</sup> Thus, the identity of the officiant giving baptism was unimportant, even if the one giving baptism was a heretic. In a letter sent to him by a certain Jubianus which contained the thoughts of Stephen, Cyprian had read that "it should not be asked who baptized, since he who is baptized might receive remission of sins according to what he believed." The letter had also indicated that "even those who came from him [Marcion] did not need to be baptized because they seemed to have been already baptized in the name of Jesus Christ."<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, concerning those coming from the schism of Novatian, some argued that certainly the baptisms performed among the Novatianists were to be accepted because they used the same baptismal creed and the same baptismal interrogatory as did the catholic church.<sup>10</sup> However, according to Stephen of Rome, that Novatianists and Marcionites could baptize did not mean that their baptisms bestowed the Holy Spirit. Those baptized among the schismatics or the heretics must be joined to the true church, which is the temple of the Spirit, and there receive the laying on of hands for them to receive the Holy Spirit. Baptism among the schismatics and heretics, therefore, does not grant the Holy Spirit and remains barren until such time as it is completed by the laying on of hands through which the Holy Spirit is given. Although Stephen himself did not (presumably) use these terms, there is here an operative distinction between a "valid" baptism and an "efficacious" one, that is, a baptism which is sound in itself and one which actually works what it promises. This distinction would become especially important for St. Augustine in his polemic against the Donatists.

We turn now to Cyprian, whose person and thought became the pre-eminent authority of the North African Church and whose thought on church and sacrament is especially important for understanding both the later position of the Donatists and also the dynamics and implications of the question of the relationship between church and sacrament.<sup>11</sup> Common opinion often holds that what characterizes Cyprian's doctrine of church and sacraments is the centrality of the bishop and the idea that the personal holiness of the bishop is necessary for the rightful and effective administration of the sacraments. This opinion is not false in itself, but it must be

understood correctly, and, more importantly, it must be understood within the more fundamental concerns of Cyprian. As general background to his thought two observations can be made. (1.) First of all, Cyprian continues that early Christian thought concerning the church which has its biblical basis in the Holiness Code of Leviticus. As God is separate and other from the world of idols and false gods, so too are the people of God to be separate and distinct from the world. As God is holy, so the people are to be holy. Central to the Holiness Code is the idea that certain sins – murder, adultery, idolatry – exclude from the people of God, for the commission of them enmeshes a person with the pagan world and destroys the demarcation of otherness which arises from the election of Israel to be God's holy people. (2.) Historically, Cyprian is bishop at a time when the church was still a martyr church, and the need to demark the church over against the culture of the day was a primary task of preaching and discipline. In the third century the Holiness Code served well as a basis for the church's understanding of its status and purpose in the broader political, religious, and cultural world.

We cannot here fully delineate Cyprian's doctrine of church and sacraments. But we do wish to highlight three central and determinative elements within his total thought: (1.) Cyprian's insistence on the unity of baptism; (2.) Cyprian's insistence on the rightful bishop; and (3.) Cyprian's insistence on the relation between true baptism and right faith.

(1.) We noted above the view, represented by Irenaeus and Tertullian, that the church is the place of the unity of the three divine persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. We noted as well that this view was given voice in the baptismal creed which confessed the work of the three persons. The creed expresses the baptismal reality which is nothing other than the life of the church. Baptism, in which and by which the church is constituted, is in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, indicating that it is the work of the one God who is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Baptism necessarily includes the work of the Holy Spirit, otherwise it would not be the work of the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The unity of the church, therefore, was not understood to be merely a social unity of persons, but to be a unity which arises from

the reception of the work of the one God, the Father, Son, and Spirit. The unity of the church is founded ultimately upon the unity of God Himself. The unity of God, the unity of baptism (i.e., that it includes both Christ and the Holy Spirit), and the unity of the church were correlative realities.

This correlation was Cyprian's fundamental conviction too and goes far to explain why he quotes so frequently Paul's words to the Ephesians: "there is one body and one spirit, . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all" (Ephesians 4:4). It was on the basis of the same perspective that Cyprian could not accept Stephen's claim that, while there was baptism among the schismatics and heretics, the Holy Spirit was not among them, but only with the true catholic church. Cyprian was aware of the gospel accounts of John the Baptist and of John 3, according to which the specific gift of Christ's baptism is the Holy Spirit. To speak of the reality of baptism without including necessarily the bestowal of the Holy Spirit was, therefore, nonsense. Baptism is one, writes Cyprian, "for therein a part cannot be void and a part be valid. If one could baptize, he could also give the Holy Spirit. But if he cannot give the Holy Spirit, because he that is appointed without is not endowed with the Holy Spirit, he cannot baptize those who come; since both baptism is one and the Holy Spirit is one and the church . . . is one."<sup>12</sup> The assertion of Stephen, therefore, that it suffices for a true and valid baptism among schismatics and heretics that the name of Christ or of the Triune God be spoken even though it is denied that they possess the Holy Spirit is impossible for Cyprian to accept. Cyprian was not alone. In a letter of strong support, Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, likewise ties the reality of baptism to the presence of the Spirit. There is, he says, neither the forgiveness of sins nor the sanctification of baptism unless "he who baptizes has the Holy Spirit, and the baptism itself is not ordained without the Holy Spirit."<sup>13</sup> The unity of baptism (that is, that a true baptism includes both Christ and the Spirit) was then a major concern of Cyprian and was ultimately grounded in the unity of God which the baptismal creed confesses.<sup>14</sup>

(2.) "The church is constituted upon the bishops, and every act of the church is governed through those placed at the head."<sup>15</sup> This is

a common and well-known theme in Cyprian. What is his point? At its simplest Cyprian's point is that the church rests upon the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit and that, therefore, for the church to exist the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit must actually be administered. For Cyprian the word of Christ which establishes the church is the self-same word which establishes the office of the bishop. Here two passages are of pre-eminent importance. The first is Matthew 16:18, in which Christ founds the church upon Peter. Here in the identical saying Christ establishes the church and establishes the office of Peter, which is the office of the binding and loosing of sins. There is, then, by Christ's own ordination an office within the church whose power it is to forgive sins. It is well-known that for Cyprian the office of Peter is the office of every bishop, not simply that of the bishop of Rome. Each bishop, by what Cyprian calls a *vicaria ordinatio*, a "replacing appointment" or an "appointment with fully delegated power," steps in relation to the people of his place into the place of Peter to whom Christ first and alone gave the keys of binding and loosing. Therefore, when Christ said to the apostles, "He who hears you hears Me, and he who hears Me hears Him who sent Me. And he who despises you despises Me and Him who sent Me" (Luke 10:16), Christ was speaking not only to the apostles but to all future bishops.<sup>16</sup> The second passage is John 20:22-23, where Christ, again speaking to the apostles and by extension to all future bishops, says "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained." This passage indicates that reception of the Holy Spirit is prerequisite for the forgiving of sins and, therefore, implies that only those "who are set over the Church and established in the Gospel law and in the ordinance of the Lord are allowed to baptize and to give remission of sins."<sup>17</sup> Each bishop, therefore, as the one placed into the office of bishop by Christ's ordinance for and on behalf of the people of the church is the one who alone can lawfully and in power administer the things of Christ. It is not then the personal, ethical holiness of the bishop which is significant for Cyprian when he comes to judge the reality of the baptisms of schismatics or heretics. It is a question of who has rightly been established bishop and, therefore, who has been entrusted to administer the things of the Spirit in the church at any one place.



Therefore, although the Novatianist schismatics may have the same baptismal creed and the same baptismal interrogation, yet, argues Cyprian, the Novationists lie in their baptismal questions because they do not in fact possess the church.<sup>18</sup> They are just like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who knew, the right God and invoked the true God and yet they set themselves up "in opposition to Aaron the Priest, who had received the legitimate priesthood by the condescension of God and the ordination of the Lord, and claimed to themselves the power of sacrificing."<sup>19</sup> The church as the temple of the Holy Spirit is established with the office of the bishop, and the office of bishop is the source from which the service of Christ and of the Holy Spirit come. As an office established by Christ in and with the church, the office of bishop is holy and is empowered to bestow the Holy Spirit. Those not lawfully, according to Christ's ordination and judgment, placed into the office of bishop do not hold the Spirit's office and, therefore, not only ought not but cannot give the Holy Spirit. This is the meaning of Cyprian's oft-repeated phrase that one cannot give that which one does not possess. The false and unlawful bishops of the schismatics and the heretics are not in the church, do not possess the Holy Spirit, and therefore cannot give the Spirit in their baptisms.<sup>20</sup> Their baptisms are profane and adulterous, not holy and not of the bride of Christ. For Cyprian it is, therefore, rather clear-cut what the boundaries of the church are and what therefore the boundaries of the true sacraments are. The office of Peter established in the church is the well-spring of the Spirit's ministrations, and therefore the church is the people of God united with their bishop. To be with the rightful bishop is to be in the church. Cyprian quotes Peter's question, "Lord, to whom shall we go?" (John 6:68), and answers the question thus:

here is Peter speaking, upon whom the church had been built, and in the name of the church he is teaching and revealing that, even when a whole host of proud and presumptuous people may refuse to listen and go away, the church herself does not go away from Christ and that, in his view, the church consists of the people who remain united with their bishop; it is the flock that stays by its shepherd. By that you ought to realize that the bishop is in the church and the church is in the bishop, and whoever is not with the

bishop is not in the church.<sup>21</sup>

The sacraments are ecclesial realities and, therefore, can be given only where the church is, that is, where the Holy Spirit is. Therefore, the necessary presupposition for the reality of the sacrament is unity with the church in the person of its bishop. The integrity of the officiant of the sacrament, therefore, is that of the church, not that of the personal holiness of the bishop.

(3.) Finally, it is essential for Cyprian that true baptism be related to right faith. In response to the claim of Stephen of Rome that even the baptisms of the Marcionites be accepted, Cyprian asserts that the Lord instructed "in what manner they ought to baptize," namely, in the triune name (he quotes Matthew 28:18-19). "Does Marcion maintain the Trinity?" asks Cyprian. "Does [Marcion] assert the same Father, the Creator, as we do? Does he know the same Son, Christ born of the Virgin Mary, who as the Word was made flesh, who bare our sins, who conquered death by dying, who by Himself first of all originated the resurrection of the flesh, and showed to His disciples that He had risen in the same flesh? . . . How then can one who is baptized among them seem to have obtained remission of sins, and the grace of the divine mercy by his faith, when he has not the truth of the faith itself?"<sup>22</sup> The logic of Cyprian is that from baptism "springs the whole origin of faith and the saving access to the hope of life eternal, and the divine condescension for purifying and quickening the servants of God."<sup>23</sup> Baptism is an act of the church whereby one is brought into the presence of the acting Triune God. What one receives in baptism is the faith itself, and by this faith Cyprian means not the subjective faith by which we believe but the reality of which the baptismal creed is a summary. What then one receives is what one confesses, and to confess a false creed is indicative of not having received a right baptism. Baptism grants the faith and, therefore, issues forth in a faith which confesses the creed. Against the Marcionites Cyprian's argument is that, if in fact they were baptized by the true minister of the true God, they would believe in the Creator, in the incarnate Word, and in the Holy Spirit who raises the dead:

For if any one could be baptized among heretics, certainly he could also obtain remission of sins. If he attained

remission of sins, he was also sanctified. If he was sanctified, he was also made the temple of God. I ask, of what God? If of the Creator; he could not be because he has not believed in Him. If of Christ; he could not become His temple, since he denies that Christ is God. If of the Holy Spirit; since the three are one, how can the Holy Spirit be at peace with him who is the enemy either of the Son or of the Father?<sup>24</sup>

For Cyprian, just as there is no "outside" of the unity of the Triune God, so too there is no "outside" to the place of His salvific activity, that is, there is no "outside" to the church except that which establishes itself against God and is contrary to His will. Outside God and outside the church there is only sin, not the forgiveness of sin nor the holiness of the Holy Spirit. *Extra ecclesiam non salus est*; "outside the church there is no salvation," and therefore outside the church there is no baptism.

In 303 the Emperor Diocletian, faced with external threat and constitutional crisis, attempted to restore traditional Roman values and with them traditional Roman religion. In the way of this program was the growing Christian church with its increasingly well-organized system of bishops. The result was the most severe persecution which the church had experienced up to that time, with the bishops of the church being the especial targets of Rome's fury. Central to the persecuting policy of Diocletian was the demand that bishops hand over to the authorities the holy books including copies of the Bible. Those bishops which complied with this demand were called *traditores* (those who had handed over something) and were held by most Christians to be guilty of the sin of apostasy. Such was certainly the view of the majority of Christians in North Africa, which from the beginning had had a strong piety of martyrdom. Apostasy in the face of persecution was the great sin according to North African popular piety, and bishops who were guilty of this sin were no longer regarded as bishops and were to be avoided.

This situation was the context for the rise of Donatism which was characterized by a narrow application of Cyprian's doctrine of the church to the problem of the *traditor* bishops. The history of Donatism begins in 312 A.D. in the aftermath of the Diocletian

persecution. The bishop of Carthage, Mensurius, died and was replaced by a certain Caecilian. However, a number of neighboring bishops, especially from Numidia, made the claim that one of the bishops who had ordained Caecilian had been a *traditor* in the persecution of Diocletian and that, therefore, the ordination of Caecilian was null and void. A bishop who was guilty of the serious sin of apostasy was for that reason outside the church and could not bestow the Holy Spirit upon another. We see here the specific focus and interest of the Donatist application of Cyprianic thought: since the church is of the Spirit and the office of bishop is established in the church to bestow the Spirit, one who by serious sin has removed himself from the church cannot be the church's instrument in the ordination of a new bishop. The church is strictly the communion of holy people and cannot abide a serious sinner within it. As in Cyprian, the question is not so much concerning the personal ethical holiness of a bishop as concerning the bishop's legal standing within the church as the temple of the Holy Spirit. The Donatists often appealed to 1 John 2:18-20, where certain people, called antichrists, are said to have "gone out" from the church because "they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us." The apostate bishops by their sin had gone out from the church, were not now in the church, and therefore were not lawfully empowered to perform the acts of the church. However, the Donatists went further and insisted that anyone who remained in communion with an apostate bishop participated in his sin and rendered himself also outside the church. The practical result of this Donatist position was that the Donatists believed that the true, holy church existed only in Africa within the Donatist churches; all other churches were false and adulterous communions, devoid of the Holy Spirit and therefore devoid of the sacraments. This category included the catholic church of North Africa which, containing as it did both saints and sinners, was mixed with the world and had lost its own holy character. It is unnecessary for our purposes to describe more fully the Donatist discussions concerning church and sacrament.<sup>25</sup> Essentially, Donatist views were those of Cyprian, albeit much more narrowly applied and without the charity of Cyprian, who was prepared to remain in communion with other churches and other bishops even if he disagreed with them on

matters of ecclesiastical discipline. However, it is within the context of Donatist schism that St. Augustine developed his own distinctive views about the church and its sacraments, and it is to his views that we now turn.

*C. Augustine of Hippo*

The thought of St. Augustine on the church and the sacraments is extremely complex and multifaceted, and not easy to organize. Furthermore, the writings of Augustine which are of significance for this topic issued not only from his engagement with the Donatists but also from his engagement with the Pelagians. That is, Augustine's thought is formulated and developed over a considerable period of time and makes any purely systematic treatment of his views slightly anachronistic. Nonetheless, in summary we wish to emphasize three central aspects of his thought which are found throughout his writings and which certainly belong to the core of his doctrine of church and sacrament. These are (1.) the idea of the church as *ecclesia permixta*, that is, the church as encompassing both sinners and saints; (2.) the idea of the Holy Spirit as the bond of unity apart from which there is no salvation; and (3.) the idea of the sacramental officiant as minister of the sacrament and not as its giver.<sup>26</sup>

(1.) When Cyprian thought about the church, Christians were still a minority group in the midst of persecution and martyrdom. When Augustine came to think about the church, that situation had changed and Christianity was politically and socially ascendant. Robert Evans makes the point that St. Augustine wanted to adjust the doctrine of the church, which was largely that of his North African homeland, in order to make it serve the new situation created in the fourth century when Christianity became the religion of the empire.<sup>27</sup> The Cypriatic doctrine, maintaining the strong accents of the church's otherness from the world, was not so serviceable in a world in which the worship of the empire was that of the church itself. Also the narrow vision of the sectarian Donatists, which saw the true church as a martyr-church resident only in North Africa, was especially ill-suited to a world where martyrdom was no longer required and the church had taken on truly universal proportions.

Already early on Augustine expressed the enthusiasm of many Christians that the Roman Empire evinced the conversion of the whole world to Christianity and that this was a manifest sign that God was fulfilling His promise in Psalm 2:7-8 that He would give to His Son "the Gentiles for Thine inheritance and the utmost parts of the earth for Thy possession."<sup>28</sup> Indeed, the universal extent of the church was what Augustine primarily had in mind when he spoke of the "catholicity" of the church. Yet the official character of the church within the Roman Empire entailed the fact that the people who attended the church's worship could not be regarded as equally committed to the faith or even as believers at all. The official and universal character of the church required of Augustine that he reflect on the nature of the church and of the sacraments in a context where the holiness of the church was not so visible as it once seemed to have been.

But it was not the apologetic claim that the church's universality was the fulfillment of God's promises which was most important for Augustine's conviction that the church was a mixed society of saints and sinners. Much more important was Augustine's fundamental philosophical and theological perspective. We mention briefly two different aspects of this perspective. First of all, we must be aware that Augustine never fully abandoned his Platonism. For the Christian Platonist the perfect unity and form of every reality exists in God. In empirical reality, therefore, we have but intimations and approximations of that perfect unity and form – also in the empirical church which has its reality in the flux of historical change. In its empirical, historical manifestation the church only imperfectly imitates and participates in Christ. In Christ "the church can be said to 'participate,' just as all the beings of this world possess their identity only through their 'participation' in their intelligible forms. The participation of the empirical church in Christ may be an only imperfect realization of its true nature, but this imperfection the church shares with all empirical entities relative to their archetypes."<sup>29</sup> Thus, Augustine's Platonism made it difficult for him to think of the church as presently holy and one in any but a partial and preliminary way. In this age the church must possess within it both the holy and the impious. Secondly, Augustine's distinction between the *ecclesia sancta* and the *ecclesia permixta* is not a

distinction between distinct or separated realities. It is a distinction between perspectives from which to view and to understand the church. The *ecclesia permixta* is the church viewed in its present reality – mixed, not yet perfect, containing both saints and sinners – and the *ecclesia sancta* is the church viewed from its eschatological end – as it shall be, pure, containing only the saints.<sup>30</sup> For Augustine the church is essentially a pilgrim church, a community in sojourn, on the way, and on the way to becoming what it shall be. Here, too, in typical Platonic fashion Augustine understands the movement which unites God and man to be the movement of man toward God, not the condescension of God toward man. The church, then, is on the way toward unity with God. It has not yet arrived at its end and, therefore, possesses within it both the saints, those destined to arrive at the end, and the sinners, those destined not to arrive at the end.

In any case, for Augustine there is an ecclesiological reality in which both saints and sinners participate. Augustine calls this reality the "communion of the Church and the most holy bond of unity and the most excellent gift of charity," meaning the empirical church in its administration and reception of the sacraments.<sup>31</sup> In this church both saints and sinners partake.

(2.) For Augustine unity of charity and communion is the essential mark of the church, for the unity of mutual love is the distinctive reality of the Holy Spirit who even within the Trinity unites the Father and Son as the bond of charity. Apart from this bond of charity there is no Holy Spirit and no salvation. However, this bond of unity in love is nothing other than the church catholic in which alone the Holy Spirit dwells.<sup>32</sup> The Donatist schismatics, therefore, having left the church catholic and thus being outside it, are devoid of the Holy Spirit. Quoting Romans 5:5 to demonstrate that love for God has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us, Augustine adds: "For this is that very love which is lacking in all who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church."<sup>33</sup> Schismatics and even heretics may administer valid baptisms, but they do not have the Holy Spirit, so that their baptisms remain profitless and useless until one returns to the catholic unity and there receives the Holy Spirit who gives efficacy to that which had been without benefit:

We say that that is Christ's baptism, even outside the Catholic communion, which they confer who are cut off from that communion . . . [The profit of baptism] God really confers and bestows through the Catholic communion on those who come from any heresy or schism in which they received the baptism of Christ; . . . not that they should begin to receive the sacrament of baptism as not possessing it before, but that what they already possessed should now begin to profit them.<sup>34</sup>

The distinctive gift of Christian baptism – namely, the Holy Spirit who forgives sins – is, according to Augustine, not given in schismatic or heretical baptism but is given only in the church catholic. Therefore, in his large anti-Donatist treatise *On Baptism*, Augustine writes:

Men may be baptized in communions severed from the Church, in which Christ's baptism is given and received in the said celebration of the sacrament, but it will only then be of avail for the remission of sins, when the recipient, being reconciled to the unity of the Church, is purged from the sacrilege of deceit, by which his sins were retained and their remission prevented.<sup>35</sup>

Baptism *for the remission of sins* is, therefore, neither among the heretics nor among the schismatics, but only among those who were baptized within the church catholic or who, baptized outside the church catholic, have returned to the unity of the Holy Spirit, that is, the church.

Augustine distinguishes between a sacrament in itself and the right use or benefit of a sacrament. The sacrament in itself is the rite of baptism as such – the water and the baptismal invocation of the divine name; the right use of baptism is the reception of baptism within the catholic unity, which then bestows the Holy Spirit. In one context Augustine calls baptism in itself the baptism "by means of a minister" (*per ministerium*) and baptism with the Holy Spirit the baptism "by means of power" (*per potestatem*).<sup>36</sup> In another context Augustine calls baptism conferred outside the church catholic a baptism "unto destruction" (*ad perniciem*) and baptism conferred



within the church a baptism "unto salvation" (ad salutem).<sup>37</sup>

We should add here that the distinction between those who receive baptism apart from the bond of charity and those who receive baptism within the bond of charity is not a distinction only between those within the empirical church catholic and those in schism or heresy. Also the impious within the "sacramental communion and the most holy bond of charity" are in reality "outside" the holy church. For there are many who do not participate rightly but are deceitful and do not receive the sacrament to their profit any more than do the Donatists or other schismatics.<sup>38</sup> Finally, those who receive the Holy Spirit and so partake in the bond of charity unto salvation are known only to God and are the community of those predestined to salvation by the inscrutable electing will of God.<sup>39</sup>

(3.) Finally, Augustine thinks of baptism and all sacraments as a direct working of God in which the officiant is but a "minister," or, as Optatus of Milevis had earlier said, an *operarius*, one who simply performs the function. The sacraments in themselves belong to God, not to the church, and therefore they are incapable of being defiled even when administered outside the church by schismatics or heretics.<sup>40</sup> Indeed, who baptizes is a totally indifferent matter to Augustine, for God in His freedom is in no way bound to, the sign of the external working. In fact, when God wills to bestow His Spirit through the baptismal sign upon those whom He has elected, it is in an interior and imperceptible act that He does so. Thus Augustine writes against the Donatist Petilian:

For when we say Christ baptizes, we do not mean by a visible ministry . . . but by a hidden grace, by a hidden power in the Holy Spirit [*occulta gratia, occulta potentia in spiritu sancto*], . . . Nor has . . . [Christ] ceased to baptize; but He still does it, not by any ministry of the body, but by the invisible working of His majesty. For in that we say He Himself baptizes, we do not mean He Himself holds and dips in the water the bodies of the believers; but He Himself invisibly cleanses, and that He does to the whole Church without exception.<sup>41</sup>

In this quotation we see quite clearly how uncommitted Augustine

thought God was to what Lutherans are wont to call the external marks of the church. God, through a hidden providence, secretly bestows His Spirit upon those whom He has elected. Baptism administered to any but these unknown elect does not and cannot be the bearer of the Holy Spirit. Baptism given to the unelect remains a mere *sacramentum*, a sign which has no power.

Augustine's total emphasis on God as the direct author of baptism produces some questionable results. First of all, Augustine asserts without reservation that heretics can administer valid baptisms. In his *Epistle 93* he writes: "Between the baptism of Christ which an apostle administers and the baptism of Christ which a heretic administers, there is no difference. For the form of the sacrament is acknowledged to be the same even when there is a great difference in point of worth between the men by whom it is administered."<sup>42</sup> We mentioned earlier that at the time of Cyprian, Bishop Stephen of Rome appeared to accept the baptisms of Marcion, while Cyprian, thinking organically of what was given and what was received, could not believe that communions with heretical belief were giving true baptisms. In this context it is interesting to note that Athanasius, roughly a contemporary of Augustine, is an important opponent of accepting the baptism of heretics. In his *Second Oration against the Arians* Athanasius comes to speak of Arian baptisms and denies that they, believing falsely about the Trinity, can truly baptize in the name of the Trinity:

For if the consecration is given to us into the Name of Father and Son, and they [the Arians] do not confess a true Father, because they deny what is from Him and like His Essence, and deny also the true Son, and name another of their own framing as created out of nothing, is not the rite administered by them altogether empty and unprofitable [*kenon kai alusiteles*], making a show, but in reality being no help towards religion? . . . So the baptism, which is supposed to be given by them, is other than the truth, though they pretend to name the Name of the Father and the Son, because of the words of Scripture. For not he who simply says, "O Lord," gives baptism; but he who with the Name has also the right faith [*pistin orthēn*]. On this

account therefore our Savior also did not simply command to baptize, but first says, "Teach," then thus: "Baptize into the Name of Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost"; that the right faith might follow upon learning, and together with faith might come the consecration of baptism.<sup>43</sup>

Here it is clear that although the proper ecclesiastical form of baptism was apparently being used by the Arians, in the view of Athanasius their heretical faith indicated the emptiness of their rite. The mere naming of the names was not sufficient. "Baptisms" administered in assemblies where the right faith – with regard to the names – was absent were void.<sup>44</sup>

Finally, the particular Augustinian emphasis upon God as the direct worker of baptism has the strange result of making Augustine virtually incapable of conceiving any occasion in which the triune name is invoked which could not be used by God for the outpouring of His Holy Spirit. In his treatise *On Baptism* Augustine comes to the questions of whether there is a true baptism which is received from someone who does not possess the Holy Spirit and who "from some promptings of curiosity" has chanced to learn how it ought to be administered and whether there is baptism if the recipient receives it in mockery, in deceit, or in jest "as in a play." Augustine's general answer is that, since baptism administered within the church is recognized irregardless of whither it was given or received in deceit or in mockery, so also baptism performed outside the church, even if done in deceit or in mockery or in a play, ought be accepted as valid. For there is always the chance that, even "in the midst of acting," someone might "be moved by a sudden feeling of religion" and receive baptism rightly.<sup>45</sup> Behind this general stance of Augustine is his view of the fundamental hiddenness of God's elect upon whom God might pour His Holy Spirit at any time, in any place, and on any occasion. Yet Augustine says he is willing "as the safe course for us" not to advance to any rash judgments about this matter, since neither a regional nor ecummenical council has expressed itself on it. Nonetheless, he says, "if anyone were to press me . . . to declare what my own opinion was . . . I should have no hesitation in saying that all men possess baptism who have received it in any place, from any sort of men, provided that it were conse-

crated in the words of the gospel, and received without deceit on their part with some degree of faith; although it would be of no profit to them for the salvation of their souls if they were without charity by which they might be grafted into the Catholic Church."<sup>46</sup> But what of that circumstance "when there was no society of those who so believed, and when the man who received it did not himself hold such belief, but the whole thing was done as a farce, or a comedy, or a jest"? Even here Augustine finds himself unable to declare such a formal activity not to be a baptism. Yet he is circumspect: "If I were asked whether the baptism which was thus conferred should be approved, I should declare my opinion that we ought to pray for the declaration of God's judgment through the medium of some revelation, seeking it with united prayer and earnest groanings of suppliant devotion."<sup>47</sup> Here it is plainly to be discerned that within the thought of Augustine any thought of determining the proper ecclesial boundaries for valid baptism is impossible. He leaves that question "to the utterance of more diligent research or authority higher than my own."<sup>48</sup> Of course, the "boundary" of effective, beneficial baptism is the unity of the church catholic, which, to be sure, in this age is to be identified with the church in the "sacramental communion and the most holy bond of charity," that is, in the church with its sacramental administrations.

## II. The Thinking of the Lutheran Confessions

Turning now to Article 8 of the Augustana, there is no intention here of anything like a commentary on its contents. However, in the light of the previous discussion of Cyprian, the Donatists, and Augustine, it seems appropriate to mention a few central aspects of Augustana 7 and 8 and to suggest that, while the emphases differ and to some extent also the structure of thought, the Augustana shares interest with Cyprian every bit as much as it does with Augustine. This point is hardly ever appreciated because of the emphasis on the inherent power of the word in Lutheran thinking. Nevertheless, other interests, closer to Cyprian than to Augustine, are also at work in Augustana 8.

We noted that for Cyprian the idea that the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit could be separated was not acceptable. For

him there could be no operative distinction between a valid sacrament and an efficacious and beneficial sacrament. The Lutheran Confessions also lack that distinction, although they are aware that the Holy Spirit works when and where He will. The fundamental reason for the eschewing of any distinction between validity and efficacy is the determinative conviction concerning the power of the word, that is, that the word bestows the Spirit and the Spirit is bound to the word. This conviction is evident already in Article 3 in reference to the person of Christ. There we learn the goal and purpose of Christ's resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of God; it is "that through the Holy Spirit he [Christ] may sanctify, purify, strengthen, and comfort all who believe in him."<sup>49</sup> The Work of Christ is not to be viewed apart from its benefits, that is, apart from the work of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the unity of word and Spirit in the confessions is evidenced by the focus upon the external marks of preaching and the administration of the sacraments and by the focus upon the institution and command of Christ. In writing to Ambrosius Catharinus in 1521, Luther had stated that "the entire life and substance of the church is in the word of God,"<sup>50</sup> and elsewhere he had written that "there is the church where the word of God sounds forth . . . for it is the word of God which constitutes the church."<sup>51</sup> When we read then in the Apology that, properly speaking, the church is "that which has the Holy Spirit," we understand better the significance of the words of Augustana 8 that "both the sacraments and the Word are effectual by reason of the institution and commandment of Christ, even if they are administered by evil men."<sup>52</sup> Where Augustine would only be able to say, "valid," the Augsburg Confession uses the word "effective." Here baptism possesses inseparably both word and Spirit. We might here refer also to Apology 9 (on baptism), where we are told that the baptism of infants is "necessary and efficacious for salvation."<sup>53</sup> Indeed, the distinctive anti-Donatist interest of Augustana 8 is that there be no denigration of Christ's institution and command. Hence, any suggestion that the quality of the minister's faith or life, contributes in any way to the efficacy of baptism is explicitly rejected. The integrity of baptism is wholly apart from faith, for, as Luther wrote in his Large Catechism, "everything depends upon the Word and commandment of God . . . . When the Word accompanies

the water, baptism is valid [*recht*], even though faith be lacking. For my faith does not constitute Baptism but receives it. Baptism does not become invalid [*unrecht*] even if it is wrongly received or used, for it is bound not to our faith but to the Word."

Finally, the unity of word and Spirit is indicated by the very definition of the church which recurs in Articles 7 and 8 of the Augustana and of the Apology. With some frequency Augustine quotes Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 13:2 ("if I have all faith . . . , but have not love, I am nothing") to the effect that, while outside the church there may be faith, yet it is the bond of love with the catholic church which truly demarcates the church. Baptism may therefore be given outside the church, but it is not profitable until the Holy Spirit is given within the church. However, in the confessions the church is explicitly the community of *both* faith and the Holy Spirit. As Augustana 8 puts it, "the Christian church, properly speaking, is nothing else than the assembly of all believers *and* saints."<sup>55</sup> In the Apology one reads corresponding definitions: the church is "the association of faith and of the Holy Spirit in men's hearts"; the church is "the congregation of saints who have among themselves the association of the same Gospel or doctrine and the same Holy Spirit, who renews, sanctifies, and directs their hearts"; the church properly called is "the congregation of saints who truly believe the Gospel of Christ and have the Holy Spirit."<sup>56</sup> Indeed, faith is the distinctive gift of the Holy Spirit, as we learn from Augustana 5, for "to obtain such [justifying] faith God instituted the office of the ministry, that is, provided the Gospel and the sacraments. Through these, as through means, he gives the Holy Spirit, who works faith, when and where he pleases."<sup>57</sup> Not surprisingly, therefore, and otherwise than in Augustine, Luther writes that "outside the Christian church (that is, where the Gospel is not) there is no forgiveness, and hence no holiness."<sup>58</sup> One cannot divide and separate word and the Spirit; the Spirit is bound to the word. In sum, because the confessors could not and did not think of the sacrament as other than possessing inseparably both word and Spirit, the Augustana can assert that the sacraments are "signs and testimonies of God's will toward us."<sup>59</sup> Augustine could never have said that.

Because of the emphasis in the confessions upon the efficacy of

the word and the importance of faith, there is an emphasis on pure and correct teaching and faithfulness to the institution of Christ. Here also the confessions seem closer to Cyprian than to Augustine. Faith is not unrelated to correct and pure preaching and teaching and the right use of the sacraments. We are all familiar with the assertion of the Augustana that "it is sufficient for the true unity of the church" (that is, sufficient for the reception of saving faith through the Holy Spirit) that "the Gospel be preached in conformity with a pure understanding of it and that the sacraments be administered in accordance with the divine Word."<sup>60</sup> It is a point often repeated by Luther and the confessions. For example, in his treatise *On Councils and the Church* (1539), Luther maintains that one recognizes "God's people in the holy sacrament of baptism, wherever it rightly, according to Christ's institution, is taught, believed, and used."<sup>61</sup> According to the confessions, unlike Augustine, the direct action of God in the sacraments is the direct action of the word and the Holy Spirit bound to the word. Thus, the confessions provide a basis for deciding whether sacraments administered here or there are or can be regarded as true sacraments. In his *Confession concerning Christ's Supper* of 1528, Luther asserts, apparently against the Anabaptists, that the sacraments do not stand "on man's belief or unbelief but on the Word and ordinance of God – unless they first change God's Word and ordinance and misinterpret them, as the enemies of the sacrament do at the present time. They, indeed, have only mere bread and wine, for they do not also have the words and instituted ordinance of God but have perverted and changed it according to their own imagination."<sup>62</sup>

There is, then, a boundary for the mishandling and profanation of the sacraments. Regin Prenter seems essentially correct when he argues that the permission given in Augustana 8 to receive the sacraments from unbelieving pastors presupposes that the institution and command of Christ are expressed in such a way that the faithful can hold on to it, can recognize it as that of the Lord, and therefore need have no worry about the character of the pastor.<sup>63</sup> The proclamation of the gospel is not unrelated to the right administration and use of the sacraments. But the Word of God has been made flesh and has dwelt among us. The story of His life, the

accounts of His sacramental institutions, and the record of His words of institution and command are indispensable for the teaching, preaching, and the right use of the sacraments which are the marks of the church and apart from which we would have no reason to believe that the church is present.

#### ENDNOTES

1. Apology 7-8.3: "That is why we added the eighth article, to avoid the impression that we separate evil men and hypocrites from the outward fellowship of the church or deny efficacy to the sacraments which evil men or hypocrites administer." *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Trans. and Ed. Theodore G. Tappert in collaboration with Jaroslav Pelikan, Robert H. Fischer, and Arthur C. Piepkorn (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 168.
2. *Adversus Haereses*, 3.24.1. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to AD. 325*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1885-1887) [henceforth abbreviated ANF], 1, p. 458.
3. *De Oratione* 2 (ANF 3.682); cf. Romans 8:15-16.
4. *De Baptismo* 6 (ANF 3.672).
5. *De Pudicitia* 21; (ANF 4.99).
6. An example is the creedal formula in *Epistula Apostolorum* 5: "in the Father, the ruler of the entire world, and in Jesus Christ, our Savior, and in the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, and in the holy church and in the forgiveness of sins." The *Epistula* dates from c. 140 A.D.
7. Cyprian, *Epistle* 75.9 (ANF 5.392). This letter, although a part of the collection of Cyprian's letters, is in fact a letter to Cyprian from Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who was a strong supporter of Cyprian's position in the East.
8. Cyprian, *Epistle* 74.5 (ANF 5.387); also 74.1; 73.4.
9. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.4 (ANF 5.380).



10. Cyprian, *Epistle* 69.7 (ANF 5.399).
11. For the thought of Cyprian on church and sacrament see Erich Altendorf, *Einheit and Heiligkeit der Kirche: Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung ties altchristlichen Kirchenbegrifs im Abendland von Tertullian bis zu den antidonatistischen Schriften Augustins* (Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1932), pp. 44-116; Geoffrey Grimshaw Willis, *Saint Augustine and the Donatist Controversy* (London: SPCK, 1950), pp. 96-105; Walter Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis: Untersuchungen zur Ekklesiologie und Sakramentenlehre in der Afrikanischen Tradition von Cyprian bis Augustinus* (Frankfurt: Josef Knecht, 1970), pp. 1-23; Ulrich Wickert, *Sacramentum Unitatis: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Kirche bei Cyprian* (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971); Robert F. Evans, *One and Holy: The Church in Latin Patristic Thought* (London: SPCK, 1972), pp. 36-64; Michael M. Sage, *Cyprian* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975), pp. 295-335.
12. Cyprian, *Epistle* 70.3 (ANF 5.376): "neque enim potest pars illic inanis esse et pars praevalere. si baptizare potuit, potuit et spiritum sanctum dare."
13. Cyprian, *Epistle* 75.9 (ANF 5.392): "qui baptizat habet spiritum sanctum et baptisma quoque ipsum non sit sine spiritu constitutum."
14. For parallels between the unity of God and the unity of the church, see Cyprian, *Epistle* 74.4; 75.3; *De Unitate Ecclesiae* 23.21.
15. Cyprian, *Epistle* 33.1: "ecclesia super episcopos constituatur et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur"; cf. ANF 5.305.
16. See Cyprian, *Epistle* 64.4; 75.16. For discussion of this point see Evans, *One and Holy*, p. 50.
17. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.7 (ANF 5.381), also 75.16.
18. Cyprian, *Epistle* 69.7 (ANF 5.399).
19. Cyprian, *Epistle* 69.8 (ANF 5.399).
20. Cyprian, *Epistle* 69.7; 70.1,2.

21. Cyprian, *Epistle* 66.8: "et illi sunt ecclesia plebs sacerdoti adunata et pastori suo grex adhaerens. unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo et si qui cum episcopo non sit in ecclesia non esse"; cf. ANF 5.374-375.
22. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.5: "quomodo ergo potest videri qui apud illos baptizatur consecutus esse peccatorum remissam et divinae indulgentiae gratiam per suam fidem qui ipsius fidei non habuerit veritatem?"; cf. ANF 5.380-381.
23. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.12 (ANF 5.382).
24. Cyprian, *Epistle* 73.12 (ANF 5.382).
25. For Donatist views on church and sacrament see Altendorf, *Einheit und Heiligkeit*, pp. 117-153; Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 23-43; Evans, *One and Holy*, pp. 65-91.
26. For fuller discussion of Augustine's views on church and sacrament see Altendorf, *Einheit und Heiligkeit*, pp. 158-171; Willis, *Saint Augustine*, pp. 113-126, 144-168; Stanislaus J. Grabowski, *The Church: An Introduction to the Theology of St. Augustine* (London: B. Herder Book Company, 1957); Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 75 – 124; Evans, *One and Holy*, pp. 79-128.
27. Evans, *One and Holy*, p. 65.
28. See Augustine, *De Vera Religione* 4.6. For an identification of the Roman Empire as a sign of God's fulfilled promise see *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 13.13: "signum et indicium manifestum." For discussion of this point see Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 76-77.
29. Evans, *One and Holy*, p. 84.
30. Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 84-85.
31. Augustine, *Contra Litteras Petiliani*, 2.81.178. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series*, ed. Philip Schaff (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1887-1890) [henceforth abbreviated NPNF], 4, p. 571.
32. On this theme see especially Grabowski, *The Church*, pp. 230-464. Also Simonis, *Ecclesia Visibilis et Invisibilis*, pp. 79-83.

33. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 3.16.21 (NPNF, 4.442). Augustine consistently understands *hē agapē tou theou* of Romans 5:5 to mean love which is directed toward God, having God as its object, not the love which God directs toward us.
34. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 1.5.7 (NPNF, 4.415); also *De Baptismo* 4.2.2.
35. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 1.12.18 (NPNF, 4.419). See also *De Baptismo* 3.16.21; 5.8.9; 6.5.7.
36. Augustine, *In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus* 5.1.6. (NPNF, 7.33).
37. Augustine, *Epistle* 61.1; see also *De Baptismo* 4.1.1; 4.17.24; 6.1.1. This usage does not mean that baptisms administered outside the church are utterly worthless, Grabowski explains: "Augustine admits the validity of baptism administered outside the church. Baptism so administered produces, in the soul of the recipient, an effect which Augustine calls a 'form' (*forma, forma pietatis*). However, since it is produced outside the church, it is irregular and illicit, and consequently it does not convey the life of grace, it does not bring a rebirth of the soul, it does not effect a participation in the Holy Ghost .... However, on account of the sacramental 'form' impressed on the baptized one, when such a person returns from heresy or schism to the fold of the church, and becomes a member of the mystical body of Christ, he returns to the source of grace, to the fount of charity, and to a participation of the Holy Ghost (*The Church*, pp. 236-237).
38. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 1.10.14: "Nor is it those only that do not belong to it who are openly guilty of the manifest sacrilege of schism, but also those who, being outwardly joined to its [the church's] unity, are yet separated by a life of sin" (NPNF, 4.418); also *De Baptismo* 3.16.21; 3.18.23; 4.3.5.
39. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 4.3.5: "For, according to His foreknowledge, who knows whom He has foreordained before the foundation of the world to be made like to the image of His Son, many who are even openly outside, and are called heretics, are better than many good Catholics. For we see what they are today; what they shall be tomorrow we know not. And with God, with whom the future is already present, they already are what they shall hereafter be. But we, according to what each man is at present, inquire whether they are to be today reckoned

among the members of the church which is called the one dove, and the Bride of Christ without a spot or wrinkle" (NPNF, 4.448).

40. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 3.10.15: "Nor is the water 'profane and adulterous' over which the name of God is invoked, even though it be invoked by profane and adulterous persons" (NPNF, 4.439).
41. Augustine, *Contra Litteras Petiliani*, 3.49.59 (NPNF, 4.621). See also *De Baptismo* 3.16.21: "invisibly and imperceptibly" the Holy Spirit is given. In this passage Augustine distinguishes "the sacrament," which even heretics can possess; "the operation of the Spirit" (such as prophecy), which even the wicked can possess; and "the operation of the Spirit," which "only the good can have" (NPNF, 4.443).
42. Augustine, *Epistle* 93.11.48 (NPNF, 1.399); also *De Baptismo* 6.5.7: "It makes no difference to the holiness of baptism how much worse the man may be that has it, or how much worse he that confers it" (NPNF, 4.481).
43. Athanasius, *Contra Arianos* 2.42. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Second Series, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), 4, p. 371.
44. In *Contra Arianos* 2.43 Athanasius mentions other heresies which "use the words only, but not in a right sense . . . nor with sound faith [*mē phronousai de orthōs . . . mēde tēn pistin hugiainousan*], and in consequence the water which they administer is unprofitable, as deficient in piety, so that he who is sprinkled by them is rather polluted by irreligion than redeemed." He mentions the Manichees, Phrygians (Montanists), Samosatenes, the Gentiles (as atheists), and again the Arians. This viewpoint of Athanasius had earlier been asserted by the Council of Arles (314 A.D.) and was reaffirmed in Canon 19 of the Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.) against the followers of Paul of Samosata.
45. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 7.53.101 (NPNF, 4.512-513).
46. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 7.53.102 (NPNF, 4.513).
47. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 7.53.102 (NPNF, 4.513).
48. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 7.53.102 (NPNF, 4.513).

49. Tappert, p. 30. CA 3.4: "ut sedeat ad dexteram patris et perpetuo regnet ac dominetur omnibus creaturis, sanctificet credentes in ipsum, misso in corda eorum spiritu sancto, qui regat, consoletur et vivificet eos ac defendat adversus diabolum et vim peccati."
50. WA 7.721.12: "tota vita, et substantia Ecclesiae est in verbo dei."
51. WA 43.597.2: "ibi esse ecclesiam Dei, ubi verbum Dei sonat. . . . Sermo Dei enim est, qui constituit ecclesiam"; cf. LW 5.244.
52. Tappert, p. 172. Apology 7-8.22: "Illa vero est proprie ecclesia, quae habet spiritum sanctum." Tappert, p. 33. CA 8.3: "Et sacramenta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi sunt efficacia, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur."
53. Tappert, p. 178. Apology 9.1: "necessarius et efficax ad salutem."
54. Tappert, p. 443. LC IV.53.
55. Tappert, p. 33, italics added. CA 8.1: "ecclesia proprie sit congregatio sanctorum et vere credentium."
55. Tappert, p. 169. Apology 7-8.5: "societas fidei et spiritus sancti in cordibus." Tappert, p. 169. Apology 7-8.8: "congregationem sanctorum, qui habent inter se societatem eiusdem evangelii seu doctrinae et eiusdem spiritus sancti, qui corda eorum renovat, sanctificat et gubernat." Tappert, p. 173. Apology 7-8.28: "congregationem sanctorum, qui vere credunt evangelio Christi et habent spiritum sanctum."
56. Tappert, p. 31. CA 5.1-2.
58. Tappert, p. 418. LC 11.56: "extra hanc christianitatem, ubi huic evangelio locus non est, neque ulla est peccatorum remissio, quemadmodum nec ulla sanctificatio adesse potest."
59. Tappert, p. 35. CA 13.1: "signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos."
60. Tappert, p. 32. CA 7.2.
61. WA 50.630: "kennt man Gottes Volck oder das Christlich heilig Volck an dem heiligen Sacrament der Tauffe, wo es recht, nach Christus ordnung geleret, geglaubt und gebraucht wird"; LW 41.151.

62. LW 37.367 (WA 26.367). In his *Americanisch-lutherische Pastoraltheologie* C. F. W. Walther also emphasizes the connection between true (*giltig*) baptism and right doctrine and faith and expresses opinions like those of Athanasius concerning the Arians (see notes 43, 44). It is not simply the right baptismal formula which makes a true baptism; the church which baptizes must possess the right meaning which the baptismal formula intends: "Allein nicht der Schall der in der heiligen Schrift enthaltenen Worte ist das Wort Gottes, sondern der damit ausgedruckte Sinn." Walther quotes Paul Tarnov (d. 1633), who quotes Basil of Caesarea concerning the organic bond between the baptismal formula, right faith about the formula, and churchly acts: "Wir muessen zwar so getauft werden, wie wir empfangen haben; aber auch so glauben, wie wir getauft werden; aber auch so preisen, wie wir geglaubt haben, nemlich den Vater und den Sohn und den Heiligen Geist" (pp. 120-125; also the quotes from Brenz, pp. 111-112). Beyond the Arians and the Socinians, Walther adds the Swedenborgians, the Unitarians, the Campbellites, and free associations as groups whose baptisms cannot be accepted.
63. Regin Prenter, *Das Bekenntnis von Augsburg: Eine Auslegung* (Erlangen: Martin-Luther Verlag, 1980), p. 119.