

§ xxv. From all that has been said,* it naturally follows that all people, even the heathen, may be saved: for Christ was given as a “Light to enlighten the Gentiles” (Isaiah 49:6). To say that, although they might have been saved, none of them actually were, is too uncharitable.¹ I do not see any reason which could be alleged to support such an idea. On the contrary, even though I admitted (something which really cannot be admitted²) that none of the heathen were saved, it is not a logical conclusion that they could not have been saved, or that no one who is now in that condition can be saved. *A non esse ad non posse no datur sequela*, which means that “it cannot” does not follow logically from “it is not.”³

Objection: Perhaps someone objects (and it is the biggest objection) that “there is no other name under heaven by which we must be saved except by the name Jesus”⁴ and that therefore those who don’t know this cannot be saved.

Answer: I answer that, though they don’t know it outwardly, still if they feel its virtue and power inwardly, they may really know the name “Jesus” (which means a Savior) redeeming them in their hearts from their sins and iniquities, and by it they are saved.⁵ I admit that there is no other name to be saved by: but salvation does not consist of

¹ Latin: *contra omnem charitatem pugnat* “fights against all charity.”

² Latin: *quod tamen falsum est*, “something which is false”

³ The fact that John is not saved does not necessarily mean that John cannot be saved.

⁴ Acts 4:12.

⁵ The rendition of this sentence follows the Latin which is much clearer: *licet non externe noscant, si tamen sentientes vim & virtutem ejus, intus noscant nomen Jesu realiter (quod Servatorem significat) redimens illos in cordibus a peccatis & iniquitatis eorum, per illud salvi fiunt.*

literal knowledge, but of experiential knowledge. Those who have the literal knowledge are not saved by it without this real experiential knowledge, while those who have the real knowledge may be saved without the external. This will be made clearer in the following arguments.

Because if I needed outward and distinct knowledge of the person through whom I benefit, before I could receive any of the fruit of it,⁶ then following the rule of contraries⁷ I would not be able to receive any injury unless I also had a distinct knowledge of the person who caused it. But experience shows that the latter is not true. How many are injured by Adam's fall although they never knew that such a man existed, or of his eating the forbidden fruit? Why can't they also be saved by the gift and grace of Christ *within* them, making them righteous and holy, although they don't distinctly know how that was purchased for them by the death and sufferings of Jesus who was crucified at Jerusalem — especially since God has made that knowledge simply impossible for them? Many people are killed by poison added to their food, though they don't know what the poison was nor who put it there; on the other hand many are also cured of their diseases by good remedies although they don't know how the medicine is prepared and what the ingredients are, and often they don't know who made it. The same may also be true in spiritual things, as we shall prove later on.

§ xxvi First, if this outward knowledge really were absolutely necessary, if it were really one of the essential things for salvation, then no one could be saved without it.

⁶ Latin: *nam si distincta & externa cognitio Christi necessaria mihi esset, antequam beneficium ullum per eum haberem*, For if the distinct and external knowledge of Christ were necessary to me before I could have any benefit through him,

⁷ In formal logic, contrary statements cannot both be true at the same time, although both can be false. A common example: the statements "All people are good" and "No people are good" cannot both be true, although both may be false.

However our adversaries don't deny, in fact they readily admit, that many young children and deaf people are saved without it. Here they break their general rule, and say that salvation is possible without this outward knowledge. And they can't pretend that this is because such people are free from sin, because they also affirm that all children deserve eternal condemnation because of Adam's sin, because they are really guilty in the sight of God. And as for deaf people, we cannot doubt what daily experience shows us, that they are as subject to crimes and sins as much as other people.

Objection: Perhaps someone says that these deaf people are the children of believing parents.

Answer: What difference does that make? They will not say that the parents transmit grace to their children. Don't these people say that the children of believing parents are guilty of original sin, and deserve death as much as others do? How can they prove that this makes up for the loss of all explicit knowledge?

Objection: Perhaps they say that deaf people can learn about the Gospel by signs.⁸

Answer: No signs can give them any explicit knowledge of the history of the death, sufferings, and resurrection of Christ. What signs can inform a deaf person that the son of God took human nature on himself, was born of a virgin, and suffered under Pontius Pilate?

Objection: Perhaps they allege that these deaf people are within the bosom of the visible church, and they partake of the sacraments.

Answer: None of that gives certainty of salvation. The Protestants admit that sacraments do not confer grace *ex opere operato*.⁹ Will they not also admit that many people

⁸ In Barclay's time there was no recognition of sign language as a real language by which complex ideas can be communicated.

⁹ "Because the act has been completed" This refers to the belief that the sacraments are effective without regard to the character or belief of the person who administers

are in the bosom of the church when they obviously are not really members of it? If this charity is extended to people who are located where the Gospel is preached; if it can be considered that deaf people may have access to salvation because they are simply unable to explicitly know the means of salvation — what reason can be alleged to explain why a similar charity may not be extended to people who are not deaf, yet because the Gospel is never preached to them, they are unable to hear it? Shouldn't a person in China or in India be excused for not knowing something which they never heard of, as much as a deaf person here, who cannot hear it? Deaf people are not to be blamed because God has seen fit to place this infirmity on them. The Chinese or the Indian is also excusable, because God has not given them an opportunity to hear. The person who cannot hear a thing because they are absent should be placed in the same category as those who are naturally deaf.

Secondly, this is clearly shown by what Peter said (Acts 10:34-35): "I truly see that God shows no partiality, but rather accepts those who fear him and do righteousness in every nation." . . . In a vision, God showed Peter other ways, and taught him not to call anything common or unclean; therefore, seeing that God heard the prayers of Cornelius, who outwardly did not know the law or Jesus Christ, Peter saw that God had accepted him.

Source: Robert Barclay, *Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, Proposition V & VI § xxv y xxvi (Glenside PA: Quaker Heritage Press, 2002) pp. 157-160; and Roberti Barclaii, *Teologiae verè Christianae apologia*, facsimile (Amsterdam: Jacob Claus, 1676) pp. 113-115.

them; some also say they are effective without regard to the character or belief of the person who receives the sacrament.

