



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600026643R

126.d.8


~~~~~  
**AN APOLOGY,**  
**&c.**  
~~~~~

ADVERTISEMENT.

THIS Work has been ready for the Press above twelve months, but its appearance has been delayed by causes over which the Author had no control.

The length of the Corrigenda List, which might have been considerably obviated by the Author's inspection of the Press, will, it is hoped, find some excuse in his unavoidable distance from the place of Publication.

Jan. 27th, 1817.

Rev. William Bailie
AN APOLOGY

FOR THE

United Church of England and Ireland;

OR,

A VINDICATION

OF THE

DOCTRINES OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH,

FROM

THE CALVINISTIC SENSE ASCRIBED TO THEM,

IN A WORK ENTITLED,

“ AN INQUIRY INTO THE DOCTRINES

OF THE

REFORMATION,

AND OF THE

UNITED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND,

RESPECTING THE RUIN AND BECOVERY OF MANKIND

BY THE REV. B. W. MATHIAS, A. M.

CHAPLAIN OF BETHLEDA, &c.”

BY THE REV. WILLIAM EAMES, A. M.

CURATE ASSISTANT OF KILBRIDE, TULLAMOORE.

“ Ἡ ἀπολογία τῆς σαρκὸς.....ἰλιθίζουσι ἢ ὁ γνωμαίη σαφὲς τῷ λόγῳ πλάσει
“ ἀνδραπόνητος.” κ. τ. λ. ATHAN. C. ARR.

“ Ἀπόστασις ἢ ὁ μωτισμὸς ἀπόστασις ἢ ἑγγύς· ἢν ἀπειρήθη τιτὰς ὁ λόγος· φῶς
“ ἔστι· ποτὴν, ἐπιλάμμεται πᾶσιν ἀνδραπόνοις· ἴδιαις Κιμμείριος ἐν λόγῳ.”

CLEM. ALEX. PROTREP.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED FOR W. WATSON, CAPEL-STREET.

1817.



TO
THE MOST REVEREND AND RIGHT HONORABLE

WILLIAM,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH,
PRIMATE OF ALL IRELAND AND METROPOLITAN,

THIS APOLOGY

FOR

THE UNITED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND,

IN WHICH

THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINES OF THIS REFORMED
CHURCH ARE VINDICATED,

AND

THE MODERATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THIS
VENERABLE ESTABLISHMENT ARE DEFENDED,

IS, WITH HIS GRACE'S PERMISSION,

MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED,

BY HIS GRACE'S

MOST DUTIFUL AND FAITHFUL

SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Preface	v
Introduction	1
CHAP. I.—Unconditional Election is not the Doctrine of the United Church of England and Ireland	11
CHAP. II.—The Doctrines of Redemption and Grace, witnessed by the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland, are incompatible with the Interpretations affixed to her Tenets by the Abettors of the Absolute Predestination Scheme	159
CHAP. III.—The prevalence of the Doctrine of Absolute Decrees in England is to be attributed, not to an unbiassed Investigation of their Merits, but so essentially to the sole Authority of Calvin, that the credit which is apparently derived upon the doctrine, from its general reception, during the Reigns of Elizabeth and James the First, should not enhance its title to acceptance	209
CHAP. IV.—The INQUIRY, in asserting that the United Church of England and Ireland demands from her Clergy and Laity “an unfeigned belief of her doctrines,” and enjoins it “as the only way of salvation,” ascribes to this Reformed Church pretensions not more injurious to her character, which has been distinguished for moderation, than repugnant to the principles by which she vindicated her own dissent from the erroneous determinations of Councils	233
Conclusion	279

CORRIGENDA.

PREFACE.

- Page x line 11, 'Advocatea'
 xvi line 8, dependence
 INTRODUCTION.
 Page iv line 4, authority? Is
- Page 19 — 9, a — Predestination
 21 — 11, premises.
 32 — 1, congruity" —
 44 — 11, admitted; —
 51 — 19, deny; "...which
 52 — 20, 'advocated'
 53 — 15, colleagues
 56 — 5, (Part ii. pp.
 59 note, line 4, men's
 60 line 19, conformity
 — — 21, consonance
 65 — 14, the earlier Produc-
 tions of the Fathers of our
 Church,
 68 note, line 11, tenendum
 69 line 23, doctrine
 73 — 25, Sons of God.
 74 — 16, works
 83 — 24, nor
 — — 35, nor.
 86 — 13, nor
 97 — 26, totally."
 116 — 16, it
 117 — 13, Cranmer
 124 — 32, Mal. i.
 125 — 25, (Mal. i. 2. 3.)
 — last line, xxv. 23.
 131 — 11, such a writer's
 137 — 16, contained in
 150 — 34, (in some copies)
 escape.
 154 — 9, (in some copies)
 assorted.
 — note, (in some copies) 1 Peter
 iii. 15.
 155 — 7, it's
 156 — 22, (in some copies) *dele*
 why

- Page 158 line 2, 'advocated'
 159 last line, (in some copies)
 worship. This form of wor-
 ship it is,
 160 line 4, (in some copies) *dele*(c)
 — — 9, (in some copies)
 understood"(c)
 — — 33, (in some copies) *dele* (d)
 — note, (in some copies) Inquiry,
 Part 2d. p. 187.
 — note, (in some copies) *dele* (d)
 Fuller's Church History, &c.
 163 line 20, Guests.
 166 — 13, xxxiii. 11.
 174 — 11, particular"?
 176 — 31, this.
 190 — 12, shewn that
 196 — 7, special preventing,
 200 — 10, obstinacy.
 — — 13, concluded...conclusion?
 209 — 16, *dele* and
 237 — 22, evidence,
 246 — 32, acquiescence in.
 247 — 7, do.
 — — 19, corporal.
 254 — 24, constructions.
 257 — 33, maintained.
 288 — 21, already.
 290 note, line 2, sancte.
 291 line 8, how the
 294 — 13, taught
 — note, last line, hebetudinem.
 298 line 10, "earnestly.

ADDENDA.

- Page 13, line 9, saved" (bb)
 (bb) A Christian Letter, &c. p. 15.
 — last line, then." (dd)
 (dd) Appendix to the Life of
 Hooker, Dublin, 1721.
 156 — 30, (in some copies)
 answered." (m)
 (m) Inquiry, Part 2d. pp.
 250—252.

PREFACE.

THE Apology for the United Church of England and Ireland is on the eve of publication; and, as the hour approaches when it is to be transferred to the public hand irrevocably, the Author feels anxieties, with which he was not visited during the progress of the Work. He perceives, with pressing solicitude, the responsibility of the charge which he has undertaken, and he is proportionably apprehensive of his having failed to do ample justice to the cause which he defends. He is aware that it must be indebted to its intrinsic excellence, and not to his name, or to the power of his talents, for its success. But if he finds in this reflection a source of fear, he finds in it a source of comfort also. He is convinced of the goodness of the cause; he is satisfied of the abundant sufficiency of the materials which he possessed for establish-

ing its merits; and he, therefore, rests assured that any injury, which its interests may sustain from his deficiencies, will not prove fatal.

Should his defence fail to place the real doctrines of this Church beyond the reach of assault hereafter, she can send forth from her sons another, and another, and another, who will correct his unskilfulness, retrieve his failures, and accomplish her security. For himself, he will say, that he is conscious that the importance of the cause, and the dignity of this Established Church, will not allow him to expect for this Work indulgences, which might be justly solicited for compositions that are candidates merely for public favour: and he will, in his own vindication, declare, that he has imparted to the subject all the energy of mind which, in the intervals of arduous and almost incessant occupations, he could lend it, and, that he never withheld from it all the assiduity, which, in his circumstances, he could bestow. He begs leave to state that, in the conclusion, he availed himself of Bishop Tomline's Refutation of Calvinism, to select from it some Extracts from Calvin's Works; and, that to Mant's Bampton Lectures he is indebted for the quotations from Overton. The Bishop has given only Translations of the Original; but, in

pursuance of the plan uniformly adopted throughout this Apology, it has been thought expedient to quote the corresponding parts of the original; and they are accordingly given in the Notes. Having mentioned these two books, the Writer thinks it incumbent on him to state, that neither of the Authors is responsible for any of the sentiments expressed in this Apology. He could not cite them as authorities; he would not dare to use the fruits of their labours without acknowledgment; and, in fact, they were never consulted till the conclusion presented itself to be drawn up. Should a conformity of ideas in any instances be found between these publications and this now in the hands of the Reader, the discovery will be highly gratifying to the Author of this Apology. There will be a sufficient difference observable to vindicate the originality of this Work, while the agreement will give additional strength to the common sentiment.

To enable such of the Readers of this Apology as are not familiar with the pages of the Inquiry, to enter upon the perusal of this Work, with some portion of the satisfaction which is derived from a previous acquaintance with the subject to be discussed, it is thought advisable to put them,

in a few words, in possession of the plan of that 'Treatise.'

The Author of the Inquiry, in his Preface, states, "Since the sentiments advocated in this Treatise are stigmatized under the name of Calvinism, it is his object to shew, that they are not the opinions of Calvin only, but of all the reformed Divines." The imputation of these his sentiments being stigmatized under the name of Calvinism he rebuts, not because it is untrue, but because its partiality associates to it a stigmatizing singularity. The accomplishment of this object is, towards the conclusion of the Treatise, announced by saying, "We have now laid before the Reader a series of evidence respecting the tenets under consideration, extending from the first attempts at Reformation by the Waldenses, to the final establishment of it in England, in the days of Elizabeth; a series of evidence which, though but part of what might be adduced, is, we hope, sufficiently strong to satisfy an unprejudiced mind, that these tenets, so far from being novel, sectarian, or opposed to the sentiments of our Church, are ancient and orthodox; the very principles of the Reformation, and the very doctrines of the Church, as by law established." (a)

(a) Inquiry, Part ii. page 239.

It is then to be understood to be the object of the Author of the Inquiry to shew, that the doctrines of the Church, as by law established, are the sentiments which are stigmatized under the name of Calvinism; and that the tenets of this Church are not those of *Calvin only*, but of *all* the reformed Divines. The form of argumentation which is adopted in the Inquiry to establish this position is Induction. As in that argument, "the position of the whole is concluded from the position of *all* the parts, and the universal conclusion is overturned, if there can be shewn a contrary instance," it will, we think, occur to our Readers, that "scanty means of reference," complained of in the Preface, do not very well accord with this extensive project; and that it would be almost miraculous, if, in so extensive a range as that which *all the reformed Divines*, furnishes, the conclusiveness of the Induction could not be defeated by producing 'a contrary instance.' Objections, too, might be taken to the indefinite phrase, "reformed Divines," rendered still more indefinite by the Author's ascending to a period greatly anterior to that which is usually denominated the *Æra* of the Reformation. But these observations are made rather to intimate what has been scrupulously avoided, than what the Reader may

expect to find in the following pages. All technical objections have been waved, because it is not the defeat of an opponent that should be desired, but the victory of truth; and the validity of the conclusion insisted upon by the Inquiry will be questioned, not by overturning its universality, but by establishing its contradictory on, as the writer thinks, the most certain principles.

That series of evidence on which the Author of the Inquiry relies, not only for effacing from the sentiments which he advocates, the stigma of their being solely Calvin's, but for proving that the doctrines of the united Church of England and Ireland are identified with those maintained by Calvin, is drawn up in two parts, of which the Inquiry consists. The former part is assigned to Extracts expressive of the sentiments "of the early opponents of the Church of Rome, and of the foreign Reformers, and reformed Churches on the subjects of Inquiry;" the latter part "to those of our own Reformers, and to what is professed by our national Church." (b) What the sentiments of Calvin were, will be ascertained by referring to the conclusion of this Apology: what the sentiments of the Author of the Inquiry, con-

(b) Inquiry, Part ii. page 3.

curing with those of Calvin, are, will be found in the 49th page of this Work; and, on turning to the 19th page, it will be seen, in the words of the Inquiry, that they who maintain these tenets hold that the doctrines of Redemption and Grace are inseparable from that of unconditional Election. The plan of the Inquiry has accordingly been, to furnish proofs of the existence of that relation whenever it was practicable; but if, in any instances, it has not been able to shew, that they who held the doctrines of preventing Grace, Justification without Works, &c. held that of unconditional Election also, in all those instances, the only plan which could support the positions of the Inquiry has not been executed; it has failed of attaining its object.

It is to be presumed that our Readers know that there are two species of Election spoken of by Divines; the conditional and the unconditional. Keeping this distinction in mind, they will perceive, that the bare mention of *Election*, in any of the Extracts made by the Inquiry, as connected with preventing Grace, &c. will not appropriate to that Work the support which it seeks from those Extracts. The Election spoken of must expressly exclude the *foresight of the co-operation of man's will with God's Spirit*.

The former part of the Inquiry opens with a brief account of that interesting body of Christians, the Waldenses, and with a few short Extracts from Confessions, presented by those who succeeded to that title, as they held their doctrines in 1120, 1508, and 1551. Wickliffé, Huss, and Jerome of Prague, alone appear in the interval between them and Luther. Luther, Melancthon, Martyr, Bucer, and Zuinglius, five altogether, constitute the whole number of the 'foreign Protestant Divines,' by whose testimonies the allegations of the universal conclusion of the Inquiry are sustained. The remainder of this former part is occupied by Extracts from ten Confessions of Faith, drawn up by "foreign Protestant Churches," and by a few notices of the "tenets of the Church of Rome, as decreed by the Council of Trent." A short review of these Extracts will evince with what degree of success the plan of the Inquiry has accomplished its project. It will manifest, too, that had it been the design of this Apology to protest against the conclusiveness of the Induction of that 'Treatise,' materials would not be wanted; it would be only necessary to pursue its steps.

There is something imposing in speaking of a "series of evidence extending from the first at-

tempts at Reformation, by the Waldenses, to the final establishment of it in England, by Elizabeth."

Such a description would lead us to expect an unbroken continuity of numerous and unequivocal testimonies, sustaining so triumphant an issue. When it is found, however, that the links which hitch the Waldenses, and the intermediate authorities to the Reformers, are but *three*, and that they may be reduced to *one*, and that there is no compensation in strength for the smallness of the number, we cannot help suspecting that there was an attempt at display, in parading the Waldenses at the origination of this series. Indeed the Extracts confirm the opinion. The imagination of the Author of the Inquiry must have been a little heated, when he cited passages from the Confessions of these Christians, which do not contain one syllable of *unconditional Election*; no, nor the slightest intimation of any doctrine which affixes to the Election professed by them, the construction of its being unconditional.

The Extracts from Bradwardine, whose sentiments are quoted as Wickliffe's, because Wickliffe is *said* to have imbibed them, and, in effect, as those of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, who are *asserted* to have embraced Wickliffe's doctrine, unsatisfactory as such transmitted testimony is,

yet these Extracts, which next make their appearance, will not obtain for the Inquiry a right to the brilliant origination of its series with any attempts at reformation before the days of Luther. There is, indeed, nothing on the face of them to enable us to affirm positively to what species of Election Bradwardine alludes, nor are we much concerned to discover; but it is, to our apprehension, probable from the following passage, in which, as he is quoted in the Inquiry, he speaks of the *prescience* of the Deity, that *conditional* Election was that which he entertained.—“ But,” says he, “ afterwards, when I reflected on the nature of the divine character, on the knowledge of God, and his *prescience*, I began to perceive some few distinct rays of light concerning this matter.” But had they been abundantly sufficient to support the statement in the Inquiry, it was rather hardy in the Author to remind his Readers of the age in which Goteschalculus appeared. Did he not fear, that the Monk of Orbais, with his distinguished followers of the ninth century, all fervent adherents to the Church of Rome, and unquestionably the advocates of Absolute Predestination, would suggest, that the tenets of the Roman Church and Absolute Predestination could harmoniously subsist together, and that this Asso-

ciation must necessarily mar the project entertained by the Inquiry, of vitally uniting that doctrine to the principles of the Reformation?

Arrived at the æra of the Reformation, the Author of the Inquiry has exposed his Induction to still greater hazards. Melancthon, it is well known, was an anti-absolute Predestinarian. Zuinglius's Predestination embraced all natural, civil and moral, as well as spiritual actions—it was a philosophical Predestination, resulting from the consideration of the Divine Providence being extended to the minutest incident in creation, and exhibiting, in successive developement, the operations of that incomprehensible Being who is but a single act. The human will could not, in any instance, disturb, much less control, the sovereign fiat of his eternal decree; and, in this theoretic view of Providence, Zuinglius considered every action of man, whether criminal or innocent, to be absolutely predestinated. But this is a Predestination which extends too far for the purposes of the Inquiry, because spiritual actions are no more controlled by it, than the most ordinary actions of life. It is a Predestination, which has no especial reference to the Gospel dispensation, except so far as that forms a part of the whole providential dispensation. Nor is it

a Predestination which, in any instance, affects the liberty of the human will. It takes away from man, in every case, the independent *origination* of a single idea; the *liberum arbitrium*, or free choice, as Zuinglius calls it; the capability of attaining by man's sole power and efforts, to instance in his own examples, wisdom, riches, &c: but though this total dependance of the creature on the omnipotence of the Creator, who constituted this immutable order of things, leaves no room for the operation of the *liberum arbitrium*, it does not impair the *voluntas* or faculty of willing, which he defines to be the faculty of embracing or rejecting any thing according to the determination of the understanding: or if it affects it in any movement of the mind, it affects it in all. A careful collation of the passages of his writings, to which the learned Reader is referred in the Note, will, we have no doubt, satisfy him that this view is correct. It may be added, that the terms in which Zuinglius speaks of the Fall and of the Redemption, making the latter as extensive in its remedial, as the former in its noxious effects; the rejection or præterition to which a man, *who through neglect will suffer himself to become an instrument unfit for God's providential purposes, is justly exposed, and which he has merited for*

himself; the assured reception of an abundant supply of the grace of Christ, should any one hearken to that internal voice which speaks even to the most impious of men, issuing from that portion of the Divine Image which still left struggles against sin; the falling from grace, and the necessity of perseverance,—will confirm the truth and justice of the statement. (c) As the line of argument laid down in this Apology leaves out of its limits the opinions of any foreign Divines, this notice of Zuinglius's sentiments is deemed sufficient here. But there are *facts* stated in the third chapter of this Work, which will briefly ascertain, without the labour of prolonged discussion, that the opinions of Melancthon and Zuinglius, these most distinguished men, were adverse to Absolute Predestination, irresistible Grace, &c.—Luther, there is strong reason to believe, had relinquished, before his death, the scheme of Predestination which he once supported. But this, at all events, is certain, that the Confession of Augsburgh, which was penned by

(c) *Dei Providentia (Sermo primus Bernæ habitus in Symbolum). De Providentia Dei.—Ad Carolum Imper. Fidei ratio. In Evangel. Mat. Cap. vii. Brevis Pastorum Isagoge. In Epist. Heb. C. xii. &c. and Dallæi Apologia pro duabus Ecclesiis Alensone et Carem, Amstelodami, 1659.*

Melancthon, was submitted to Luther, who enjoyed the protection of a neighbouring fortress during the Diet; and that it was with his advice and approbation (*Consilio et Consensu*) that that Confession was presented to the Diet. (d) It will be seen by a short Extract from that Confession given in the 33d page of this Apology, in what terms he could permit Predestination to be spoken of at that time. These three being withdrawn from the Inquiry, of all the 'Foreign Reformed Divines' there remain but two—Martyr and Bucèr—and these two we resign: Bucer, the friend of Martyr; and Martyr, the disciple of Calvin.

The Ten Confessions, our Readers must foresee, will follow the distribution of the 'Foreign Reformed Divines.' Of the Ten Confessions, there are but three, which are so much as quoted on the capital point of Election: viz. those of Helvetia, Basil, and Belgium, all belonging to the Genevan Form. The 33d page of this Apology, already referred to, will shew why the rest were not appealed to. How, then, it may be asked, are 127 pages octavo occupied in the former part of the Inquiry? Not in commentary, for none is given. These 127 pages are devoted to what we

(d) *Luthèri Vita a Melchior Adam. Heidelberg, 1620.*

would call a Work of Supererogation,—to Extracts which prove that the reformed Divines insisted upon Original Sin—on the guilt of a fallen world—Redemption of mere Grace—Justification by Faith alone—the inability of a fallen nature to help itself—and the necessity of preventing Grace to minister to salvation. The Reader will see in the first Chapter, and in the Conclusion of this Apology, why testimonies on these subjects have been thought essentially necessary to the plan of the Inquiry, and why we deem their production perfectly superfluous.

Strictures on the former part of the Inquiry have been indulged in with some latitude, as it will not hereafter be brought before the Reader, except for the purpose of stating why its authority is declined, though it is pretty plain that the advantages which it would afford to the cause, were its authority admitted, are not much to be dreaded. As the plan and arrangements of the first are pursued in the second part of the Inquiry, without alteration, no additional observations are necessary for putting the Reader in possession of the character of its contents, which he has been already informed are drawn from “what was taught by our own Divines, and from what is professed by our national Church.” The matter

accumulated in this part, and the weighty assertions which it is imagined it sustains, will be the subject of examination in the following pages.

This Apology is now hastening before the Public, and awaits its judgment.

INTRODUCTION.

DIFFERENCES, which divide the sentiments of the Ministers of the Established Church, are announced in a publication to which Mr. Matthias has given the sanction of his name. The fires of controversy, which have been for some time smouldering, have thus at length burst forth; but we trust the appearance of the flame will facilitate its extinction: until, by their issue upon the public eye, their nature and extent were ascertained, they could scarcely be subjected to a process calculated to restrain their progress. The explicit avowal of Mr. Matthias's opinions, and those of his party, by leaving no room for the suspicion of misstatement or mistake, by removing uncertainty, and presenting a definite object for examination, admits of precision in determining the point against which operations may be directed, and inspires the hope, that those parts of the edifice which have hitherto

escaped may, by timely intervention, be preserved. To speak without figure, it is, perhaps, on the whole, advantageous to the cause of peace, that Mr. Matthias has given his book to the public: he has furnished us with an authentic statement of his opinions; he has thereby afforded an opportunity of comparing them with those generally received among the Clergy of the Established Church; he has thus opened a way for cool discussion, and candid explanations, which, it is hoped, may allay, if they do not suppress the fervor of party rage, by shewing, that differences have been imputed where they do not exist, and that where they do really exist, and agreement is impracticable, dissent can be justified; and therefore, that they are such as demand rather the exercise of forbearance, (a) than the weapon of controversy. Much certainly is the necessity, imposed upon one part of the Clergy of defending themselves against the imputations of brethren of the same establishment, to be deplored. The sensations, therefore, with which the 'Inquiry' was at first perused were those of unmingled regret; never did the (b) Song of Sion, which celebrates the unity of the

(a) The Conferences at Charenton and Leipsic, 1631, at Thorn, 1645, Cassel, 1661, &c. though conducted with charity, yet proved abortive. The only benefit they have bequeathed is the experience of the fruitlessness of the most hopeful attempts to reconcile the parties, and the consequent duty of lessening the misfortune of a difference of opinions by forbearance.—*Mosh. Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvii. Sect. ii. Part 2.*

(b) Psalm cxxxiii.

Tribes of Israel, appear, more lovely; never did its tranquil images steal with a more thrilling softness on the soul, than when the present occasion forced upon the observation, the striking contrast of our differences with their holy concord, and the melancholy prospects that rose before the mind suggested the mournful inquiry, " Shall we never keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace?"— These feelings were rendered more distressing by the reflection, that while for our divisions " there are great thoughts of heart," a man distinguished among the " thousands of Israel" should have given vigour to a controversy, which, after having agitated the strongest passions of the human breast, was at length suffered to sink into a peaceful rest, in which it slumbered undisturbed for above one hundred years.(c) What great ultimate good, that should outweigh the heavy evils with which controversy is invariably attended, this zealous and pious Christian proposed to himself, could he succeed in establishing his system of tenets to be exclusively the doctrine of the Church of England, it is no wonder that an ordinary understanding was at a loss to discover. Can it, it was asked, be his design, to repel the charge of the incompatibility of his opinions with the tenets of the Established Church?—What! has it ever been denied that they were, at

(c) Burnet, 17th Article.

one period, the opinions of the majority of her members, and that, of course, they are not now inadmissible? Or to vindicate them by an array of authority; is not Mr. Matthias too well read in Ecclesiastical History not to know, that array can be marshalled against array, and that those who adopt the doctrine, in later times called *Arminian*, will not suffer in the comparison?—Or, under the protection of the venerable authorities he has adduced, to procure to his own opinions currency from the pulpit or the press? We should have taken Mr. Matthias to be too zealous an admirer of the Reformers, both on the Continent, and in England, not to imitate the most judicious of them, by observing a prudent reserve on a subject which has been heretofore the source of extensive evils.—Or to insinuate such scruples into the minds of his conscientious brethren, as would compel them, if they could not receive the doctrine of Absolute Decrees, to abandon the administration of a Church which imposed articles at variance with their judgments? Such a design, we are persuaded, is too criminal, we had almost said too atrocious, to be laid to Mr. Matthias's charge. So unhappy an effect he would surely be himself among the first to lament, when he saw flocks bereft of some of the most zealous shepherds of the Lord. These, however, are the only actuating motives which could be imagined; and as these must be laid aside, because of

the inutility, the imprudence, or the criminality of the design, it only remains, that he do himself assign some other, which may justify the imperious necessity of engaging in an enterprise attended with so many hazards and perils to the Church of Christ. In the mean time, if the benefits which, upon more mature consideration, have been contemplated above, as eventually resulting from the publication, should be realized, the pernicious consequences which, how unintentionally soever, it is adapted to produce, will be in a great measure redeemed.

That differences have been imputed where they do not exist, if we judge correctly in saying, that all those which are blended together in the same publication, without any notice to the contrary, are equally imputed, and that where they do really exist, and agreement is impracticable, dissent can be justified, it is the expectation of the writer to be able to evince to every impartial judge. But though these, and these only, are the objects, and this the expectation of the present Apology; though the perplexed intricacies of the predestinarian controversy will, as far as it is possible, be avoided; yet it is not without some anxious forebodings, that even this approximation to controversy is regarded, and this Apology committed to the press.

The history that records controversies, records only their deplorable evils, and marks their vestiges by moral desolation; Christian

communities devoid of Christian charity; infuriated with the most violent passions, panting only for victory, forgetful of every other consideration, except the defeat of an antagonist, and, in numerous instances, literally converting the field of controversy into a field of blood. (*d*) How lamentable, as we take a retrospect of these scenes, to behold the mind absorbed in these controversial disputations; to see the whole attention rivetted upon that single contested point; the undivided energies of the soul enlisted in its service; controversial skill acquiring an uncontrolled ascendancy; every other talent and every other literary pursuit neglected, save that alone which could minister to the success of the favourite object; and with what result? Alas! it is easily anticipated. The great purpose for which Christ came into the world, viz. "to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works," (*Tit.* ii. 14.) seemed to be wholly unconnected with the purposes of Christian societies; it was not merely the Christian temper of bearing and forbearing that was lost sight of; morality in general was forgotten to be inculcated by the preacher, and to be practised by the people; (*e*) men

(*d*) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvii. Sect. ii. Part 2, § xi.

(*e*) "Dr. William Ames, who filled with great reputation, during the space of twelve years, the Divinity Chair, in the University of Franeker, in the Dedication and Preface of his famous book, *De Conscientia et ejus Jure*, observes, (*Præfat.*

were deemed religious in proportion to the clamorous vehement zeal with which they supported a darling doctrine, while specious; and, it is not denied that they might have been sincere; pretexts were not wanting to give an air of justice to their zeal. The love of truth, it was urged, would not allow them to be indifferent to its interest; they felt the tenets to be true; they were assured of their importance; they heartily embraced them; and, in proportion to their persuasion of their truth and magnitude, they deemed it incumbent on them, as they would not incur the guilt of lukewarmness, to prosecute the sacred cause. (*f*) Thus the support of truth became an argument for discharging pestilential vapours, before whose noxious breath the refreshing verdure of the graces of the Gospel, which is truth itself, shrivelled up and died. At different periods, a few indeed appeared both on the Continent, (*g*)

p. 3.) that an *excessive* zeal for *Doctrines* had produced an unhappy neglect of morality; "Quod hæc pars Prophetiæ (*i.e.* morality) hactenus minus fuerat exulta, &c."—*Mosh. Eccl. Hist. Cent.* xvi. Sect. iii. Part. 2, § xxxvii. *Maclaine's notes* [F] & [Q].

(*f*) "Thus the love of truth was unhappily found to stand in opposition to the love of union, piety, and concord: and thus, in the present critical and corrupt state of human nature, the unruly and turbulent passions of men can, by an egregious abuse, draw the worst consequences from the best things, and render the most excellent principles and views productive of confusion, calamity, and discord."—*Mosh. Eccl. Hist. Cent.* xvii. Sect. ii. Part 2, § xx.—"Nay, in their narrow views of things, *their very piety* seemed to suppress the generous movements of fraternal love and forbearance."—*Ibid.* § xiii.

(*g*) Mosheim, *Cent.* xvii. Sect. ii. Part 2, § iii. et alibi.

and among ourselves, (*h*) who used great and unremitting efforts to mediate between the parties; but, unsuccessful in the attempt, they were not only mortified with finding their schemes of reconciliation prove abortive, and the hopes they entertained of the blessings of peace blasted, but they were even pursued by calumny, and driven to their only refuge—a conscience void of offence. When, indeed, we reflect upon the single fact of Latimer, Cranmer, Ridley, Taylor, &c. who sealed the sincerity of their professions with their blood, being styled “devil’s martyrs” by the Lutherans of Frankfort, because they differed with them in opinion concerning Christ’s presence in the Eucharist; (*i*) we have evidence, amounting to volumes, before us, of the fearful opinions to which the excesses of party zeal give birth. If similar symptoms, how remote soever from these violent appearances, indicate a nascent distemper similar in kind, though, blessed be God, not in degree, it is not without solicitude, how conscious soever a man shall be of purity of views, that he can venture to offer any thing which may be converted into the

(*h*) Hall, &c.

(*i*) Mosh, Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Part 2, c. 2, § xvii. Maclaine’s Note, “Vociferantur quidam Martyres Anglicos esse Martyres Diaboli. Nolim hac contumeliâ afficere Sanctum Spiritum in Latimero, qui annum octogesimum egressus fuit et in aliis sanctis viris quos novi.”—*Melancthon to Camerarius*, *Epist.* lib. iv. p. 259.

exasperating cause of so irritable a disease. Is it not notorious, that in every society, in which the adepts of this newly-revived system appear, doctrinal arguments exclusively occupy the conversation? Do we not see those, who have laid out their time to much better purpose in the practice of the weightier matters of the law, "Judgment, Mercy, and Faith," (*Mat. xxiii. 23.*) than in barren speculations, unequally matched with those who have been long handling the weapons of controversy; and silenced, if not convinced, by the lofty tone of confidence with which favourite positions are urged, by the dexterous application of authorities, whether from human writings or the Scriptures, and the supercilious contempt with which the ignorant or the unawakened state of those who differ from them is frowned down? And though we would say to those who are thus assailed, as the wise Melancthon did to his pious mother, when, repeating her simple creed and form of devotion, she inquired "how she should believe, and how she should pray, amid these religious disputes?" "Continue to believe and to pray as you do at present, and do not trouble yourself about controversies;" (*k*) yet, it is not without apprehension for its effects, in compelling the most moderate to lay aside their moderation, and become partisans, that we

(*k*) Camerarius and Watkin's Biog. Dict. ad verbum.

view the present state of society ; and therefore, while we deprecate the situation, and are alarmed at its progress, cannot but dread that even this Apology may be used as nutriment to the distemper.—But let us indulge happier prospects, and more pertaining to the peace of Sion, though we thus speak.

AN APOLOGY,

§c.

CHAPTER I.

*Unconditional Election is not the Doctrine
of the United Church of England and
Ireland.*

THE method employed by the Author of "the Inquiry," for stamping upon his own opinions exclusive characters, that should appropriate to them the doctrines of the Established Church, unquestionably possessed attractions sufficient to invite its adoption. The names of the Reformers are justly consecrated in the veneration and gratitude of an admiring posterity. It is not surprising, therefore, that he should endeavour to make his cause their cause, and secure it from violation by committing it to the custody of men whose extraordinary merits claim solemn respect, and whose authority might thence be deferred to in silent submission. Whether this mode of ascertaining the signification of the Articles has been attended with the expected success, will be considered hereafter. In the mean time, of its advantages we are too sensible, in not merely abashing the modesty, but constraining the understanding, of an opponent within

the circle described by the magic wand of high authority, not to endeavour at the outset, before we proceed farther, to derive countenance to this Apology from some powerful name.

A more powerful than that of Hooker can scarcely be required; Hooker, one would almost say, against a World; and Hooker is one of the first extant names in the catalogue of those who are asserted to compromise their conscience by subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles. So early as the year 1599, a tract entitled "*a Christian Letter of certaine English Protestants unfained favourers of the present state of religion, authorised and professed in England unto that reverend and learned man Maister R. Hoo. requiring resolution in certayne matters of doctrine, &c.*" (a)—professing themselves devotedly attached to the external establishment of the Church, charges this unfoiled champion of our Ecclesiastical Polity with inculcating doctrines contrary to all the articles of religion, and especially the seventeenth, concerning Predestination. "All the articles of our Religion," says this tract, "and many parts of our Church Government, checked, blamed and contradicted." "The Church of England believeth, that Predestination unto life is the eternal purpose, &c. but you Mai. Hoo. seem to us to affirme contrarie, when you saye, "if any man "doubt how God should accept such prayers in "case they be opposite to his will, or not grant "them, if they be according unto that which him- "self willeth, our answer is, that such suits God "accepteth, in that they are conformable to his "general inclination, which is that *all men might*

(a) *A Christian Letter, &c.* 1599, quarto, (London,) it is supposed; the place of publication is not expressed: and Izaak Walton's *Life of Hooker*, in Wordsworth's collection, London Edit. 1810, Vol. iv. p. 269, Editor's note.

“be saved; yet always he granteth them not, for
 “as much as there is in God sometimes a more
 “private occasioned will which determineth the
 “contrarie.”(b) Here we begge your ayde to
 make manifest unto us howe God eternallie pre-
 destinateth, by a constant decree, them whom he
 calleth and saveth, (as our Church professeth,)
 and yet hath as you say; a general inclination
 that *all* men might be saved.” This is the erro-
 neous doctrine with which they charge him,
 and which, as well as the sin of his attachment
 to “philosophie,” makes it their imperative duty
 to call upon him, “to be careful not to corrupt
 the English Creede and pure doctrine whereunto
 he hath subscribed.”—Of the doctrine certainly
 he is guilty; he maintains it in his Ecclesiastical
 Polity, after having ushered it into the world
 “with his first public appearance to it from the
 pulpit of St. Paul’s Cross, A. D. 1581, in the
 presence too of Ælmer, Bishop of London,” (c)
 and again in his disputations with Mr. Travers.
 The sum of them is, “that *Predestination* is not
 of the absolute will of God, but *conditional*;
 that the doings of the wicked are not of the will
 of God, but only permissive; that the repro-
 bates are not rejected, but *for the evil works*
 which God did *foresee* they would commit.”(d)
 “That in God there were two wills, an ante-
 cedent and a consequent will; his first will, that
all mankind should be saved; but his second
 will, that those only should be saved, that did
 live answerable to that *degree of grace* which
 he had offered or afforded them.” Undoubtedly

(b) Ecel. Polity, Book v. § 49.

(c) Walton’s Life of Hooker, Wordsworth’s Ecel. Biog.
 Vol. iv. p. 205.

(d) Ibid. p. 255.

if the doctrine, *now* usually called *Arminian*, contravene the Article, this contravenes it; yet the learned Ælmer, his auditor, did not refuse to be his "advocate when he was afterwards accused for it."^(e) And Archbishop Sandys, a reviser of the Liturgy, and one of the Translators of the Bishops' Bible,^(f) was not afraid to recommend him to the mastership of the Temple, a patent place, ^(g) in which Archbishop Whitgift observes, "a man well directed and taught, might do much good, as also much harm,"^(h) and which, however, he was instrumental in procuring for him. To find this doctrine delivered from the Pulpit, in about nineteen years after the revision of the Articles, in the presence of one of the most distinguished Bishops of that time, by a man of a meek and quiet spirit, who shunned contention; to learn that it was published in opposition to the current dogmas of the day; to know that it was restated and confirmed in a work, the production of his riper mind, his most balanced judgment, and mature consideration, in defence of the Ecclesiastical Polity of that very Church—in a work that has perpetuated his fame and her glory, and rendered both inseparable; to find, I say, this doctrine of such a man excepted against, not simply for its non-conformity to truth, for which it was attacked by Travers, but for its contrariety to the Articles of that Church, of which he was the champion;—under such cir-

^(e) Walton's Life of Hooker, Wordsworth's Eccl. Biog. Vol. iv. p. 255.

^(f) Biographia Britannica, Watkin's Biog. Dict.

^(g) Izaak Walton's Life of Hooker, Wordsworth's collection, Vol. iv. p. 209.

^(h) Ibid. Letter to Queen Elizabeth, p. 212.

cumstances—at so early a period—and by some obscure writer—is no small encouragement to lead us to believe, that, let the private opinions of some of the Divines of that day have been what they might, neither Hooker, nor his ecclesiastical superiors, (some of whom, we repeat, were revisers of the Articles and Liturgy,) imagined, that *the Church of England* had definitely declared her sense of the doctrine of absolute decrees.

Nor is Hooker an isolated instance. Him, his well-known meekness, which would lead us to believe that he would not, and his profound attachment to the Church of England, which would argue that he did not infringe her institutions, intimate the propriety of placing foremost, in vindicating to his brethren of this day that liberty of conscience which he enjoyed, and which, at a period of very irritable popular sensibility to the slightest deviation from the dogmas of absolute decrees, he firmly exerted too.—But Cheney, Bishop of Gloucester, who held Bristol in commendam, affords an earlier testimony. In the year 1568, he, when avowing his agreement with the opinion of Erasmus concerning Free-will, asserts, “that he dissented not from the Fathers of this realm, in that Article, when it was offered him to be subscribed in Latin.”⁽ⁱ⁾ The Bishop of Gloucester then affirms the tenth Article, which involves the interpretation of the seventeenth, not only to coincide with the sentiments of Erasmus, but, what is greatly more important, that in that interpretation he dissents not from the Fathers of this realm: and for the truth of the assertion, he

(i) Strype's Ecclesiast. Annals.

appeals to "the Lord Bishop of Sarisbury, (Jewel) and others, being great learned men, and well treated in antiquity, who well knew what had been taught of this matter in the Primitive Church with great consent. Their judgment, (he adds,) he could better like, than the impugnors of this time." These assertions, if they could be disproved, were peculiarly hazardous. They were made in a letter to Cecil, the Lord Treasurer, and were urged as the Bishop's answer to articles presented by his parishioners of Bristol to the Ecclesiastical Commission, charging him with supporting the opinion of Erasmus concerning Free-will. And what defence does he adopt? The truth of the charge he admits, but its infringement of the Article he denies. Here the true sense of the Article was put to issue; and does any decision, censure, or reprimand, rebuke the Bishop's formal declaration of the sense in which he expressly subscribed the Article? No such thing. It does not appear that any proceedings whatever were taken against him in that jealous Court. No; though he was no favourite with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who shewed his dislike to him, both in opposing his translation to Chichester, and in excommunicating him for his absenting himself from a Convocation after summons.^(k) In Cheney, then, himself an exile from the persecution of Queen Mary's inextinguishable rage against the reformed Religion, and one of the most distinguished of these sufferers, we find an unimpeachable witness of a construction of the tenth Article, hostile to

(k) He was afterward absolved, but not till his Chaplain had made oath that he was then so ill as to be confined to his bed.—*Strype in loco.*

one of the inseparable concomitants of absolute decrees.

Harsnet, too, who was raised by successive preferments from a Fellowship of Pembroke Hall in Cambridge, to the Archiepiscopal See of York, in October of the year 1584, stood forth at St. Paul's Cross, the earnest combatant of absolute decrees. He states, "that, at that time, the opinion of reprobation had grown high and monstrous, and like a Goliath; and, that while men do shake and tremble at it, yet never a man reacheth to David's sling to cast it down." Armed with the text from Ezekiel xxxiii. 11. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the sinner," &c. he encounters this formidable giant, deducing from his sermon six consequences in direct opposition to the Predestinarian tenets of the school of Geneva. From that pulpit, then, which was usually attended by Bishops and Statesmen, Harsnet, in the face of the popular reception of these tenets, commits himself in the most unequivocal manner, maintaining, "the redemption of mankind without exception, the free offer of effectual grace to all, denying reprobation in all its parts, and ascribing to the contempt and neglect of grace alone, the exclusion of any soul from God's kingdom."^(l) He was then but Fellow of Pembroke Hall, and yet, his opinions neither rendered him obnoxious to Ecclesiastical censures at that time, nor presented an obstacle to his subsequent administration of the Church, as one of her highest executive ministers, as Bishop, and finally, as metropolitan.^(m)

^(l) Mr. Harsnet's Sermon at Paul's Cross, bound up at the end of Dr. Steward's Three Sermons, printed 1658, p. 183, &c. quoted by Heylin.

^(m) Heylin's Quinq. History, Part iii. pp. 33—37. London, 1660.

We shall not detain our readers by citing more witnesses than these, to the unimpeached freedom, with which the doctrines of reprobation, unconditional election, and irresistible grace were opposed, at a period, when the adversaries of them had to encounter the violence and animosity attendant on the unremitting zeal, with which these tenets were then propagated, and when the penalty of a breach of the Articles would no doubt have been rigidly enforced.

If direct proofs of the import of the Thirty-nine Articles on the Predestinarian doctrines, had perished, we take the facts here adduced to be sufficiently strong, to intimate the certain negation they would give to the Calvinistic interpretation of that code. Employed here, as precursors to extant evidence, they enable us to regard, without dismay, the imposing attitude of the voluminous quotations of the Inquiry, and impress an irresistible persuasion, that it will be found, upon examination, that the most considerable of those of our Reformers, who in that production are ranged against us, occupy the station assigned them there only by compulsion, and that, "they who are for us, are more than they that be against us."

In proceeding to the production of these authorities, we congratulate our readers on the paucity of the objects, towards which they will be directed, and the consequent hope, that they will not oppress their patience with their magnitude. We congratulate the religious world indeed at large, that, with what factitious importance soever, differences of opinions are invested, the leading doctrines of our religion are acquiesced in by all the Churches that adhere to the primitive institutions of the Reformers. The differences are confined to speculative tenets,

which would involve no important practical consequences, were their respective members wise and moderate.

The only points at issue between the Author of the Inquiry, and the Ministers of the Established Church who differ from him, may be reduced to this single question—Does the seventeenth Article of the Church of England, which *describes* Predestination and its good and ill effects, at the same time enjoin the *belief* of absolute decrees, and their concomitants, upon her Ministers? The Author of the Inquiry maintains the affirmative; the great majority of the Clergy since the Synod of Dort, A. D. 1618, including some of the most pious and learned men who ever adorned the annals of any Church, have maintained the negative. The construction of the Article is the *sole* point at issue, but, as this will not be granted, before we proceed farther, the truth of the allegation must be proved.

“There are,” says the Author of the Inquiry, “certain sentiments on the subject of salvation, which usually and *naturally* go together. If a man be not sensible that by nature there is *no* health in him, he will, of course, conceive that he possesses some portion of *spiritual strength*, and on the use which he makes of that, he will consider his salvation to be *suspended*: he of *course* regards his redemption as a *matter of compact* between God and himself, and will *therefore* divide the business of it between the two contracting parties; *grace alone* he cannot consider as sufficient for his salvation, without the co-agency of his own free-will; nor *faith* as competent to his justification, without the addition of his own works; his *election* and *perseverance* he will consequently *consider as conditional*, the one resulting from the use which *God foresaw*

he would make of the portion of spiritual strength which he possessed, together with such aid as he should conditionally give him; the other suspended on the actual use which he makes of his strength, and the conditionally acquired aids of grace: considering his salvation as thus suspended on the portion of spiritual strength which he originally possessed, he *cannot but attach* some degree of merit to the right use which he makes of it, and to the works which spring from that use." (n)

How naturally soever the Author of the Inquiry may conceive, 'these sentiments go together,' there are others, who can neither perceive the connexion nor admit the consequence; they cannot perceive why, because the hand, as the servant of the will, is stretched forth to administer the prescribed medicament to a diseased constitution, the consequent cure should be ascribed, not to the skill of the physician and the efficacy of the medicines altogether, but should be divided between them and the will of the patient, which put the hand in motion merely to apply them; and still less reason can they see, if the *rational powers* minister to the cure of spiritual distempers, by embracing the suggested remedy, that, either the preparation of the medicament or the efficacy of its application will be in the least ascribed to them. Indeed so far are they from perceiving this natural and indissoluble connexion, that, on the other hand, in the annihilation of the "co-agency of his own free-will," they not only conceive the total abolition of moral agency to be involved, but they are utterly at a loss to imagine with what order of beings man should be ranked, when bereft of those

(n) Part ii, pp. 246, 247.

powers that constitute him a rational creature. And though such a man is represented by the Author of the Inquiry, as, "regarding his redemption of course as a matter of compact between God and himself, and thence dividing the business of it between the two contracting parties," there are others, endued with less sagacity, who cannot discern any compact between the grateful receiver of a favour freely bestowed, and a generous unsolicited benefactor. And as they do not admit these premises, they also deny the conclusion—for, while it is peremptorily deduced, that "he *cannot but attach some degree of merit* to the right use which he makes of it, and to the works which spring from that use," they can disclaim all merit from the interest granted to them in their redemption, which was accomplished by him "who trode the wine-press of God's wrath *alone*," and can therefore undividedly refer the praise, the glory, and the merit of it to him "who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." (o) What therefore the Author has indissolubly united, others behold separated, and in the separation, while they can discover no extenuation of the glory of God's *free* grace, they can with delight behold a brighter lustre shed on both his justice and his mercy, when they see the refreshing waters of the gospel of unbounded love, bestowed on moral agents thirsting after righteousness, than when irresistibly conferred on the struggling slaves of his power, who would reject it if they could.

That unconditional election has neither a natural nor an evangelical union with the great principles of the Christian Religion, viz. Original Sin, Justification by Faith alone, and Free Grace,

(o) 1 Cor. i. 30.

these observations may serve to shew, so far at least as to introduce quotations from two Prelates of the Established Church, whose acknowledged piety and profound learning will invest their sentiments with a representative character, as the organs of those who deny the connexion. These are Taylor and Beveridge—Taylor, (*p*) who, in the language of Dr. Rust, is described as having had the humour of a gentleman, the eloquence of an orator, the fancy of a poet, the acuteness of a schoolmaster, the profoundness of a philosopher, the wisdom of a chancellor, the sagacity of a prophet, the reason of an angel, and the piety of a saint. (*q*) Beveridge, whose labours in the ministry were crowned with so great success, that he was styled, “the great reviver and restorer of primitive piety,” and whose writings received from Doctor Henry Felton the testimony of “being written in that plainness and solemnity of style, that gravity and simplicity, which give authority to the sacred truths he teacheth, and unanswerable evidence to the doctrines he defendeth. That there is something so great, primitive, and apostolical, in his writings, that it creates an awe and veneration in our mind.” (*r*)

(*p*) His (Taylor's) excellent treatises are highly valued for the exactness of wit, profoundness of judgment, richness of fancy, copiousness of invention, and general usefulness to all the purposes of a Christian. After the Restoration he was made Bishop of Down and Connor, where he further displayed his mighty talents, and shewed with an unbounded imagination all the eloquence of orators, all the flights of poetry, together with all the strictness and regularity of the deepest casuists.”—*Echard's Hist. England.*

(*q*) Preface to Holy Living, London Ed. 1810.

(*r*) Life prefixed to Private Thoughts, London Ed. 1808.

Names which need only to be mentioned to command respect.—Quotations from them are deemed sufficient for the object in view: but were it necessary to confirm the position by authorities, with what abundant evidence could it be established.

The following extracts from Taylor will not, we imagine, extenuate the fidelity of these lofty characters, nor disappoint the expectations of their readers. “Our nature is too weak in order to our duty and final interest, that at first it cannot move one step towards God, unless God, by his preventing grace, puts it into a new possibility.—We were born heirs of death, which death came upon us from God’s anger for the sin of our first parents, or by nature;—our nature of itself is a state of opposition to the Spirit of Grace; it is privately opposed, that is, that there is nothing in it that can bring us to felicity; nothing but an *obediential capacity*; our flesh can become sanctified, as the stones can become children unto Abraham, or as dead seed can become living corn. And so it is with us, that it is necessary God should make us a new creation if he means to save us; he must take our hearts of stone away, and give us hearts of flesh; he must purge the old leaven, and make us a new conspersion; he must destroy the flesh, and must breathe into us the celestial breath of life, without which we can neither live, nor move, nor have our being. “No man can come unto me, said Christ, unless my Father draw him.” The divine love must come upon us, and snatch us from our imperfection, enlighten our understanding, move and stir our affections, open the gates of heaven, turn our nature into grace, entirely forgive our former prevarications, take us by the hand and lead us along; and we only contribute our assent unto

it, just as a child when he is tempted to learn to go, and called upon, and guided, and upheld, and constrained to put his feet to the ground, lest he feel the danger by the smart of a fall ; just so is our nature and our state of flesh. God teaches us, and invites us ; he makes us willing, and then makes us able ; he lends us helps, and guides our hands and feet, and all the way constrains us ; but yet so as a reasonable creature can be constrained—that is, made willing with arguments and new inducements, by a state of circumstances and conditional necessities. And as this is a great glorification of the *free grace of God*, and declares our manner of co-operation, so it represents our nature to be weak as a child, ignorant as infancy, helpless as an orphan, averse as an uninstructed person, in so great degrees, that God is forced to bring us to a holy life by arts, great and many, as the power and principles of the creation ; with this only difference, that the subject matter, and object of this new creation, is a *free agent*. In the first, it was purely obediential and passive ; and, as the passion of the first was an effect of the same power that reduced it to act, so the *freedom* of the second is given us in our nature by him that only can reduce it to act ; for it is a freedom that cannot therefore choose, because it does not understand, nor taste, nor perceive the things of God ; and therefore must, by God's grace, be reduced to action, as, at first, the whole matter of the world was by God's almightiness—for so God “worketh in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.”(s) “The natural man and the natural child are not the same thing in true divinity. The natural child, indeed, can do

(s) The Flesh and the Spirit, Vol. i. pp. 178, 179, 180, London Edit. 1807.

no good, but the natural man cannot choose but do evil ; but it is because he will do so, he is not born in the second birth, and renewed in the baptism of the spirit.”(t) As in the state of nature, no good thing dwells within us ; so when Christ rules in us, no evil thing can abide—“ For every plant, that my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up,” and cast away into the fires of consumption or purification. But how shall this come to pass, since we all find ourselves so infinitely weak and foolish ? I shall tell you : —“ It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven,” saith Christ. It is impossible to nature—it is impossible to them that are given to vanity—it is impossible for them that delight in the evil snare : but Christ adds, “ with men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible.” What we cannot do for ourselves, God can do for us and with us. What nature cannot do, the grace of God can—So that the thing may be done, not indeed of ourselves, but *gratia Dei mecum*, saith Saint Paul ; God and man together can do it.”(u) “ Natural corruption can make us criminal, but not innocent : for though by him that willingly abides 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 portion, 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

(t) The Christian's Conquest over the Body of Sin, Vol. iii. p. 34, London Edit. 1807.

(u) Ibid. pp. 36, 37.

made it up, by his grace, if we will make use of it.”(x) “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 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.”(y) But of absolute decrees, he writes, “We are taught to believe, that the events of things do not depend upon our crucifying our evil and corrupt affections, but upon eternal and unalterable counsels; that the promises are not the rewards of obedience, but graces pertaining only to a few Predestinates—and yet men are saints for all that; and that the laws of God are of the race of the giants, not to be observed by any grace, or by any industry. This is the catechism of the ignorant and the profane.”(z)

Beveridge’s sentiments are next subjoined. Of original sin he writes, “Not only the worst of my sins, but the best of my duties, speak me the child of Adam, insomuch, that whensoever I reflect upon my past actions, methinks I cannot but look upon my whole life, from the time of my conception to this very moment, to be but as one continued act of sin. And whence can such a continued stream of corruption flow, but from the corrupt cistern of my heart? And whence can that corrupt cistern of my heart be filled, but from the corrupt fountain of my nature? Cease,

(x) Conquest over the Body of Sin, Vol. iii, p. 33.

(y) Fides Formata, or Faith working by Love, Ibid. p. 70,

(z) Conquest over the Body of Sin, Ibid. p. 34.

therefore, O! my soul, to gainsay the power of original sin within thee, and labour now to subdue it under thee. But why do I speak of my subduing this sin myself? Surely this would be both an argument of it, and an addition to it. 'Tis to thee, O my God, who art both the searcher and cleanser of hearts, that I desire to make my moan. 'Tis to thee I cry out, in the bitterness of my soul, O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? Who shall, O! who can do it but thyself? Arise thou, therefore, O! my God, and shew thyself as infinitely merciful in the pardoning, as thou art infinitely powerful in the purging away my sins." (a) Of justification he acknowledges, "I look upon all my righteousness as filthy rags; and 'tis in the robes only of the righteousness of the Son of God, that I dare appear before the Majesty of Heaven. To say a man of himself can merit any thing from God, is as much as to say, that he can merit by that which of himself he doth not do; or, that one person can merit by that which another performs, which is a plain contradiction." (b) But that preventing grace was co-operating also, we have his testimony. "Truth itself, and mine own woeful experience, hath convinced me, that I am not able, of myself, so much as to think a good thought, and how then shall I be able myself to resolve upon rules of holiness, according to the Word of God, or to order my conversation according to these resolutions, *without the concurrence of the divine grace*? Alas! should the great God be pleased to leave me to myself to resolve upon what is agreeable to my corrupt nature, what strange kind of resolution should I make?—How to live holily,

(a) Thoughts on Religion, Part i. Article iv. p. 42, London Ed. 1803.

(b) Ibid. p. 52.

righteously, and godly, in this present world, to deny my own, that I may fulfil the will of God; alas! such resolutions as these would never so much as come into my thoughts, much less would they discover themselves in my outward conversation.”(c) “ Though God offer Heaven to all that will accept of it in the Holy Scriptures; yet none can accept of it, but such whom himself stirs up by his Holy Spirit to *endeavour* after it.”(d)

And that he, who thought thus of man’s natural impotency, thought also, that redemption is a boon offered to all, and which all are capable of accepting, we have his explicit testimony. “ In consulting the word of God, to find out the reasons of this so strange assertion, that many are called, but few chosen, I know no better or fitter place to search for them than this parable, which gave our blessed Saviour the occasion of asserting it; in which it is very observable, that he meddles not at all with any reasons, *a posteriori*, drawn from the disposition and carriage of men, why so many of them are called, but few chosen; for the opening whereof we must know, that the end and intent of this parable (Matt. xxii. 1. to v. 14), was only to shew, that the entertainment which his gospel had then, and should still meet with in the world, many refusing to embrace it at all, and of those who embrace it, many still walking unworthy of it; so that the issue and consequence of it will be, that though many be called to it, there are but few chosen.”(e)

Here follow the reasons, which are too long to be transcribed, but they are well worth a careful perusal. It follows:—“ What then should be the

(c) Thoughts on Religion, Part i. Article iv. p. 92, London Ed. 1803.

(d) Ibid. p. 61.

(e) Thoughts upon our Call and Election, Part ii, p. 165.

reason that so many of them should be called and invited to the chiefest good, the highest happiness their natures are capable of; yet so few of them should mind or prosecute it, so as to be chosen or admitted into the participation of it? What shall we ascribe it to?—The will and pleasure of Almighty God, as if he delighted in the ruin of his creatures; and, therefore, although he wills them, he would not have them come unto him?—No, that cannot be; for in his revealed will, which is the only rule that we are to walk by, he hath told us the contrary in plain terms, and hath confirmed it too with an oath; saying, ‘As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that he should turn from his way and live,’ (Ezek. xxxiii. 11.) And elsewhere he assures us, that he would ‘have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth,’ (1 Tim. ii. 4.) And, therefore, if we believe what God saith; nay, if we believe what he hath sworn, we must needs acknowledge, that it is his will and pleasure, *that as many as are called should be all chosen and saved*; and, indeed, if he had no mind we should come when we are called to him, why should he call us all to come? Why hath he given us his word, his ministers, his ordinances, and all, to invite and oblige us to repent and turn to him, if, after all, he was resolved not to accept of us, nor would have us come at all? Far be it from us, that we should have such hard and unworthy thoughts of the great Creator and Governor of the world; especially considering, that he hath told us the contrary as plainly as it was possible for him to express his mind to us.” (f)

These selections will serve, instead of many, to shew, that there have been profound and

(f) Thoughts upon our Call and Election, Part ii. p. 163.

spiritually-minded men, who could recognize the total inability of a fallen nature to help itself; who could thence acknowledge the necessity of preventing grace; who could look to the atoning death of the Redeemer, and an imputed righteousness, as the only meritorious causes of salvation; who could regard themselves as debtors to free grace alone, for ability either to embrace the Gospel or to obey its commands, and yet utterly deny unconditional election and irresistible grace. But they are deemed inseparable by the Author of the Inquiry; the whole constitution of his work owes its subsistence to the certainty of this connexion, and the entire frame of the Inquiry will therefore suffer dissolution by the separation. The ligaments which unite absolute decrees, &c. to the doctrines acknowledged by all the Churches which received the principles of the Reformation being burst, the vitality of their separate existence may appear questionable; but, at all events, we trust to convince all who are not inaccessible to conviction, that these doctrines form no part of the essential tenets of the Protestant Churches. Certainly they were not contemplated as such by the Patriarchs of the Reformation, Zuinglius and Luther.

We are indebted to the piety of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, for a document expressive of their unanimity in all the principal Articles of the Christian Religion.^(g) It is preserved by Melchior Adam, in his Life of Zuinglius, and is said by him ^(h) to be an exact transcript of the original. It consists of fourteen articles—of which the three first relate to an acknowledgment of the Trinity:

(g) Quandoquidem in præcipuis religionis capitibus idem sentirent.

(h) Si ipsa verba ascripserimus—sic igitur habent.

the fourth treats of Original Sin—describes it, as deriving from Adam condemnation upon all men, and attributes to the life and death of Christ, such efficacy, that if he had not relieved *us*, we should be subject to everlasting death, and could not be partakers of the kingdom of Heaven, and salvation.—The fifth, ascribes a participation in the benefits of the death of Christ, to the reposing of our trust in him, who died for us, to the exclusion of works and monastic rules of life, which have no power to liberate from any sin.—The sixth, denominates this faith to be the gift of God alone, obtained by no precedent work or merit of ours, or acquired by our own natural powers; but a faith bestowed and effected by the Holy Spirit, according to his good pleasure in our hearts when we hear the Gospel, or the word of Christ.—The seventh, imputes our justification to faith alone, independently of all works and merit of ours, and, therefore, condemns all vows, and the whole monastic order, as contributing any thing to the meriting of salvation.—The eighth, assigns the ordinary actings of the spirit to the instrumentality of the word.—The ninth, vindicates to Baptism the dignity of being an exciter of our faith, and the organ of our *regeneration*, in opposition to those who reduced it to the level of being esteemed a mere naked symbol by which Christianity was designated.—The tenth, affirms the manifestation of the spirit to be made by good works.—The eleventh, relates to confession. The twelfth, to magistrates.—The thirteenth, to traditions.—And the fourteenth, to the sacrament.

Here then we are presented with the grand articles of consent between Protestants and the grounds of their opposition to the Church of Rome. The school authors' dictum, "that works

deserved grace of congruity''(i) the merit attached to monastic rules of life, which robbed the Redeemer of the glory of his sole redemption of the world, by dividing the efficacy of his meritorious sufferings with the monks—the communion in one kind only, and the celibacy of the priests—these were the subjects insisted upon by these leaders of the Reformation; but on Predestination, and the topics connected with it, they were wholly silent. These heads of agreement were drawn up at Marpurg, in October, A. D. 1529.(k)

(i) See Art. XIII. Church of England.

(k) *Capita Recessus Marpurgensis, &c.* 3d Oct. an. 1529.

IV.

Quarto.—Credimus, quod peccatum originis ab Adamo in nos propagatum sit, quodque sit peccatum damnans omnes homines, & quod, si Christus *nobis* opem non tulisset, morte & vita sua, in æternum propter illud mori nos oportuisset, neque participes regni Dei, & salutis fieri potuissemus.

V.

Quinto.—Credimus, quod ita liberemur ab hoc et ab omnibus aliis Peccatis, & morte æterna, si nostram fiduciam collocemus in filium Dei Jesum Christum, pro nobis mortuum: Et quod extra hanc fidem per nullum opus, aut certæ vitæ Genus liberari possimus ab ullo peccato.

VI.

Sexto.—Quod fides sit donum Dei ejusmodi, quod nullo præcedente opere ac merito nostro obtinere, neque ex propriis viribus consequi possumus; sed spiritus sanctus dat et efficit fidem, prout vult in cordibus nostris, quando Evangelium sive verbum Christi audimus.

VII.

Septimo.—Quod hæc fides sit justitia nostra coram Deo, utpote, per quam Deus nos justificat imputata nobis justitia sine ullo opere, aut merito nostro. Hac de Causa igitur sentimus omnia vota, totum ordinem monasticum, quatenus ad salutem promerendam necessarius, putatur, jure ac merito damnari.

IX.

Nono.—Quod Baptismus non sit nudum signum, aut tessera tantum inter Christianos, sed signum et opus Dei, in cujus usu fides nostra excitatur, perquam *regeneramur*.

The celebrated Augustan Confession of Faith was penned by Melancthon, and was presented to the Diet of Augsburg, from the Latin name of which it derives its title, by the advice, and with the approbation of Luther, A. D. 1530. So far is this Confession from supplying the omission of the Marpurg Articles in this matter, that it states expressly, "That there was no occasion here for disputations concerning Predestination, or similar topics—for, that the promise of God is universal—the promise of grace universal—all were ordered to believe, and to *accept* the benefit of Christ, as Christ says, *Come unto me all ye who are laden, &c.*" (*k*)

In the Confession of the Saxon Churches, presented to the Synod of Trent, 1551, a similar reserve, after a lapse of twenty-one years, is observed: "We do not add here," say they, "questions concerning Predestination and Election; but we hand all readers over to the Word of God, and we desire them to learn the will of God from his own word, as the eternal Father expressly commanded, saying, *Hear him*; let them not inquire after speculations elsewhere. Most certain it is, that as the preaching of repentance appertains to all men, and accuses all, so the promise is universal, and offers to all men remission of sins, according to those universal words, "*Come unto me all ye that labour,*" &c. and John iii. "*That every man who believeth,*" &c. (*l*)

(*k*) XX.—"Non est hic opus disputationibus de prædestinatione aut similibus. Nam promissio est universalis—et sicut universalis est pœnitentiæ prædicatio, ita promissio Gratiæ universalis est, et omnes credere jubet et accipere beneficium Christi, sicut Christus inquit: Venite ad me omnes qui onerati estis."—Confessio Fidei, in Comiciis Augustæ, A. D. 1530.—Edit. Fran. 1551, a Petro Brubac.

(*l*) "Non addimus hic quæstiones de prædestinatione, seu de Electione; sed deducimus omnes lectores ad verbum Dei, et

From these quotations most evident it is, that, "The doctrines concerning the ruin and recovery of mankind," as taught in the Reformed Churches, do not admit those concerning Predestination to a place among their number. So far from being enrolled as constituent and inseparable parts of the system, as the Author of the Inquiry would make us believe, they are cautiously and expressly excluded—excluded in those general confessions of faith, and omitted in those more private heads of agreement entered into between those great divines, Zuinglius and Luther. But as it may occur to some of our Readers, that they are virtually comprehended in the sixth of the Marpurg Articles, which admits "no precedent work, or merit of ours, or the exercise of our natural powers, to the obtaining of faith, which is the gift of God alone," it will not be inexpedient to shew, that it has no respect to these doctrines.—Persons versed in the disputations of that day know, that "deserving grace of congruity" is the error which is here designed to be corrected. To them no quotations will be necessary to prove, that the freedom of the will was not compromised by this Article. But, for the satisfaction of others, we shall set down one or two passages, from a work which, it will not be denied, maintains the freedom of the will. It is the "Pious and Catholic institution of a Christian man." On the Apostles' Creed, speaking of the Holy Spirit, this is its

jubemus ut voluntatem Dei ex verbo ipsius discant, sicut æternus Pater expressâ voce præcepit, Hunc audite. Non querant alias speculationes. Certissimum est, prædicationem pœnitentiæ ad omnes homines pertinere, et accusare omnes homines. Ita et promissio universalis est, et omnibus offert remissionem peccatorum, juxta illa dicta universalia; venite ad me omnes qui laboratis, et onerati estis, ego reficiam vos—item Joan. 3. Ut omnis qui credit in eum non pereat."—Saxonicarum Confessio Eccles. Synodo Trid. Oblata, A. D. 1551. Edited at Basil by John Oporinus, 1552.

language:—"This Spirit is, moreover, by nature good; yea, goodness itself, from whom all good things and every spiritual gift proceed, namely, Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, Fortitude, &c. and briefly, whatever is comprehended under the name of genuine Virtue. All these gifts of the Spirit are conferred on men according to his own good pleasure *freely*, and of his *mere* goodness. Nor is there any one who *can either obtain* these gifts for himself, or rightly use them when obtained, except of his gift."^(m) This language is, at least, as strong as that of the Marpurg Article; and now, are we not warranted in saying, that the support which the Author of the Inquiry hoped to procure to these doctrines, by incorporating them with the universally acknowledged tenets of the Churches of the Reformed Æra, must be abandoned? To their capability of independent existence must they be resigned:—and who can doubt that these tenets form no essential part of the peculiar doctrines of the Protestant Churches, when we know that they are held by a large portion of the most bigoted adherents to the Roman See.

Should the Author of the Inquiry still contend for the natural association of these doctrines, and the consequences which he has deduced from their assumed separation, we shall consider ourselves at liberty, notwithstanding, to lay aside every part of his work, as wholly irrelevant to the question in debate, with the exception of such quotations only as relate to the Predestinarian doctrines; for the construction of the Article in this matter

(m) In Symbolum Apostolorum—in Spiritum Sanctum. Est præterea hic spiritus natura bonus, et hæc omnia spiritus dona, juxta ipsius voluntatem, *gratis* et ex sola ejus bonitate hominibus conferuntur. Nec quisquam est qui vel hæc dona *sibi comparare*, vel comparatis recte uti, nisi ipso donante possit.

is the only disputed point; and though the Inquiry will then be susceptible of a compression, within the compass of a few of its pages, we shall have the boldness to demur against the first part altogether, as containing testimony quite inadmissible on the subject matter in dispute. Nay, we shall advance a step farther, and exclude from any influence, in the decision of the question, the writings of those divines in the reign of Edward VI. who were *not consulted* in the framing of the Liturgy, for reasons too obvious to be stated; (n) nor shall we defer to the *private* authority, no, not of those who, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, were engaged in that high concern, much less of those also whose services were not required, unless there be granted to us the benefit of the private opinion of those who, after the Restoration, were called to the revision of the Liturgy, A. D. 1661. With these deductions, a small space, indeed, will contain the fruits of the learned compiler's labours; and as so unsparing a retrenchment might be deemed an unwarrantable liberty, we shall submit our reasons for making the demand.

The proposition upon which judgment is to be pronounced, is not, what was the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, but what is the doctrine of the United Church of England and Ireland; what tenets does she bind upon all her members, with so unerring an authority, that, not satisfied with simple assent to any, how speculative soever, she demands, we are told, an "un-

(n) The evidence being manifestly inadmissible, neither confirming by its concurrence, nor rescinding by its contradiction, the import of decisions in which it had no share, it has been thought unnecessary to spend time on the refutation of its authority. But if the learned reader would see how lightly the credit of some of the witnesses of that period, whose names appear in the Inquiry, was esteemed by the Reformers, let him consult Heylin's *Quinquant. Hist.* Part ii. pp. 9 & 17.

feigned belief of them, as necessary to salvation;"(o) and so peremptorily "requires this belief from all her members, that by none can this belief be safely withheld." "The layman," we are told, "who withholds it, in his attendance upon public worship, exposes himself to the guilt of avowing, before God, what he does not believe; and if the Church, to which he professes to belong, be not in a most dangerous error, he is; for he rejects, as false, what she teaches as the truth of God, and the *only way of salvation*."

"The candidate for orders cannot withhold this belief, and be innocent of the aggravated crime of entering upon the sacred office, by subterfuge, equivocation, or falsehood, and that in subjects of the utmost importance, in connexion with the most sacred rites of religion, and the most solemn appeals to Heaven."

"The Clergy cannot withhold this belief, and be free from the weighty charges of violating promises, which they most solemnly made; of denouncing as error, what the Church commissioned them to preach as truth; of going back to those doctrines of the See of Rome, on account of which, among other errors, their Church separated from that communion, and thus virtually acknowledging that separation to be so far schismatical; and, finally, of instructing their flocks in principles which the Church has renounced, as corruptions of Christianity, and incompatible with salvation."(p)

Now, what Minister of this Established Church, who understands his liberty, would submit to have her doctrines tried at the bar of the doctrines of any other Church? Who would endure to be included in so highly penal, yea, fearful consequences, by deductions from authorities whose

(o) Inquiry, Part ii. last page.

(p) Ibid. pp. 249, 250.

binding power we utterly refuse? No; we shall say of her ecclesiastical, as her Barons did of her municipal law, "Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari." We will have no foreign interference, either in the one or in the other; and, in point of fact, there was none; neither were her doctrines, nor was her discipline, constituted upon the model of any foreign Church. No; in the Councils of her domestic divines, both were canvassed; in them they were moulded into their present exquisite forms by the hand of patient investigation, profound research, deliberate judgments, and mutual sacrifice of contending opinions, as the valuable document given to the world by Burnet abundantly proves. (g) Indeed, so temperately were the Institutions of the Church of England arranged, that an observer, unacquainted with the history of the times, might imagine they were the fruits of laborious investigations, entered upon at a period of entire tranquillity, and conducted in the bosom of calm retreat, by men whose breasts were unruffled by the breath of one disturbing passion; whose sole object was, the adjusting of them to apostolic purity, and the only motive, the love of truth. That they did approach this standard, both in discipline and doctrine, the Indo-Syrian Churches, discovered by Buchanan, concisely, but satisfactorily, testify; an approximation, for which she is, no doubt, indebted to a more wise and temperate course of proceeding, than unhappily was adopted by the Continental Churches; she is an independent Church, and beyond herself we will not look for her doctrines.

Had the design of the profound researches of the Inquiry simply been to exhibit a harmony of faith, acquiesced in by all the Reformed Churches, without deducing from the collection so formida-

(g) Burnet's History of the Reformation, Part i. p. 289.—
Collection of Records, Book iii, p. 201. et seq. No. xxi.

ble results, the temerity of the impracticable attempt would excite no other emotion than surprise; but when we reflect on the object of the publication, and see the names of Zuinglius and Melancthon compelled to give their suffrage to the doctrine of absolute decrees, we cannot reject the testimony of this part, without, at the same time, entering a protest against the bias with which the collection was compiled.

Again, we refuse the private sentiments of the revisers of the Articles and Liturgy in 1562, as any authoritative commentary on the Article, except an equal authority be given to the private opinions of the revisers of the Liturgy in 1661. Indeed, if either be allowed to have influence, the latter, as the more recent, must, according to acknowledged maxims, if contrary to the former, annul the opinions of their predecessors;—and this is a test to which we know the Author of the Inquiry would not choose to bring the tenet of unconditional decrees. Would he, for instance, submit to the judgment of the reputed author of the General Thanksgiving, and the acknowledged author of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, who declares in that Preface, in the name of the whole Convocation of both Provinces, “We are fully persuaded in our judgments, (and we here profess it to the world,) that the Book, as it stood before established by law, doth not contain in it any thing contrary to the Word of God, or to sound doctrine, or which a godly man may not, with a good conscience, use and submit unto; if it shall be allowed such just and favourable construction, as in common equity ought to be allowed to all human writings, especially such as are set forth by authority, and even the very best translations of the Scripture itself?” He need not to be told that the author is Bishop Sanderson, and that he is the well-known opponent

of absolute decrees; and yet, by what possible mode of argumentation he could, or indeed can, avoid the justice of the conclusion, when he very accurately characterises our excellent Liturgy, by saying, "that it furnishes the most satisfactory evidence concerning the doctrines of the Church," it is not easy to foresee. The Preface is an authentic document issued from the Convocation, by whose labours the Liturgy was revised. This revision comprehended omissions, alterations, and additions: that Preface announces the full persuasion of the whole Convocation, that the Book, as it stood before established by law, doth not contain in it any thing contrary to the Word of God or sound doctrine. The Author of the Inquiry not only entirely coincides with them in the justice of this assertion, but he goes beyond them in a still more important declaration, that "if any where we might hope to find the real doctrines of the Church, it must be here," in the Liturgy so revised, containing the additions made in that Convocation. It is here, "in the Liturgy, that these principles of divine truth are brought before us, again and again, in every page, in every prayer, and under such varied forms of expression as can leave no uncertainty respecting the sense in which they are to be understood."^(r) The Liturgy, comprehending these additions, is, then, the genuine unambiguous interpreter of the real doctrines of the Church. Now, how can he, upon his own principles, evade the conclusion—of necessarily subscribing to the sentiments contained in Bishop Sanderson's writings concerning these doctrines? And, should he appeal from a single name to the whole Convocation, he is, no doubt, well assured, that the sentence would be confirmed by a large majority. Thus,

(r) Inquiry, Part ii. pp. 186, 187.

upon his own shewing, the premisses, and, consequently, the inferences, of the Inquiry are annulled. So far as the overthrow of the argumentation adopted by the Inquiry is concerned, here we might rest; but lest we seem to shun a trial of the question on its merits, we shall proceed in the consideration of the subject; and we entertain the hope that, in the sequel, it will be seen, that the 17th Article was, in its original constitution, erected as a *barrier* against the *mischief*s attendant on the doctrine of absolute decrees; and, if its language was afterwards adopted in defence of opposite sentiments, the perversion was owing to an indulgent latitude of expression, which rendered it susceptible of such an appropriation. We cherish the expectation, too, that our truly moderate Church will be vindicated from the heinous charge of demanding, with an air of infallibility, from her children, the "unfeigned belief of all her doctrines as the only way of salvation," much less of those imputed to her by construction:—a charge which the Author of the Inquiry has unconsciously united with the advocates of the See of Rome in infixing on her.

The establishment of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, which constitute that specific code of opinions, both in doctrine and discipline, by which this Church is distinguished, naturally attracts our attention, in the first instance, to the early part of the reign of Elizabeth, the period of their enactment. The difficulties, both political and religious, which that remarkable epoch of our history presented, need not be detailed;—they are notorious. In a state, in which the strongest passions of the human breast were committed to the conflict, in the most infuriating of all contests, the contest of religion—in a state, in

which Papists were divided against Protestants, and Protestants were as eagerly divided amongst themselves about the non-essential ceremonies of religion, it required no common endowments in the Monarch, who sat at the helm, to guide the vessel, charged with the interests of true religion, through so tempestuous an ocean. Consummate prudence united to unshaken firmness, as the ministers of Providence, could alone provide for its safety in so perilous a situation. With these qualifications Elizabeth was so eminently gifted, that the glories of her reign are become proverbial. The affections of her subjects were the powerful instruments through which she procured their happiness. Their affections she won by her moderation and justice, and secured by the temperate vigour of her administration.^(s) These were the principles by which her conduct was actuated in the settlement of religion. Amid the distraction of parties she adopted that ritual, which, if it were not agreeable to all, could not fail of being pleasing to numbers, and, at all events, did not leave to any, solid grounds of impeachment. Such was the plan of the Reformation of her brother Edward VI. prepared to her hand, with the additional recommendations, of its having been received by the nation before, and consecrated by the martyrdom of its authors.

This form of religion, which her predilection for its constitution, in all probability, conspired with political wisdom in selecting, as the best adapted to the circumstances of her people, was contemplated by judicious foreigners, who were no friends to our Liturgy, as the only practicable approximation to their entire wishes;

(s) See Rapin's England.

and its eventual establishment was hailed as a work which would give satisfaction to the pious.

Such were the sentiments of the learned Bullinger, chief pastor of the Church of Zurich, to whose judgment great deference was paid by our divines. In fact, these who returned from exile imbued with the strongest attachment to the Genevan discipline and doctrine, as well as those who favoured that doctrine, without its discipline, found Edward's Reformation the only asylum which afforded refuge from the threatened reception of the Augustan Confession: they were, therefore, under the necessity of adding the force of their influence to the momentum of Cox and his party, who persisted in their faithful adherence to Edward's Reformation, that they might avert the admission of the dreaded Lutheran scheme. The sacrifice of these partialities they felt to be necessary, because the danger with which they were menaced was imminent.^(t) The Lutheran party, in themselves sufficiently considerable to have weight and domestic influence, enjoyed the peculiar and alluring advantage of fortifying a Government, beset with enemies and destitute of allies, by a closely cemented league with the German Protestants, who were of the Lutheran Church.^(u) A short extract from a letter of Bullinger will preclude the necessity of supporting this interesting fact by numerous quotations. "I perceive (says he) that in

(t) Strype's Annals,

(u) "Verum quantum video obstabit desiderio nostro, inauspicata illa ex Saxis ac Saxonibus damnata *καταβία* Nostra (Elizabeth) enim nunc cogitat Fœdus Smalcaldicum." —Jewel to Martyr. Burnet's Reform. Part iii. Collect. of Records, B, vi, No. 50.

England no small troubles are about to break out, should the demands of some be complied with, (an event for many reasons to be deprecated,) in introducing the Augustan Confession. This form gives uneasiness to all the *purser* Churches, and would fain ferment all with its own leaven. May God restrain these men, in other respects truly pious, but vexatious, to a purer godliness; you yourself know what happened in Poland; beware, and lend your efforts, that it be not admitted, Edward's Reformation *satisfies* the pious." (v) What Bullinger so earnestly desired, he had the gratification to know was effected. Edward's Reformation, as such, was established; but it was established in all its parts, without reference to the private opinions of those who were commissioned to carry it into execution: for we have seen that it was embraced, as an alternative, by many who would have preferred another scheme, because it saved them from the Lutheran form. The utmost however which they could effect in departing from Edward's Reformation was so immaterial, that Cox, one of the most eminent of the commissioners appointed for revising the Liturgy and Articles, in a letter to Wolfgang Weidner, chief pastor at Worms, writes, "wherefore the pure religion of Christ is established amongst us throughout every part of the kingdom, precisely in the same form in

(v) "Video et in Anglia non modicas obituras Turbas, si quod quidam (rem indignissimam multis modis) postulant recipiatur Augustana Confessio.—Vexat hæc omnes Ecclesias sinceriores & cupit suo fermento inficere omnes. Deus coherceat homines satis alioquin pios, at pietati puriori molestos.—Et tu scis quod factum sit in Polonia—Cave, & adjuva ne recipiatur—*Satisfacit* piis Edwardi Reformatio."—Ex Epist. M.S. in Biblioth. Eccles. London, and Strype's Annals.

which it had been promulged under our late Edward of blessed memory." (*w*)

Indeed so scrupulously was the plan traced under that King's protection, followed by his wise sister, that the observance of it descended to minutiae—not to instance in other matters.—The Injunction issued in his reign, for the diffusion of a knowledge of the Scriptures, as the grand preparative for the emancipation of minds, bowed down by the corrupt innovations of the Latin Church, was not merely adopted in spirit, but copied verbatim by Elizabeth. In 1547, it was ordered, and the order was repeated in 1559, "that the Bible should be provided within three moneths, of the largest volume in English; and Erasmus's Paraphrases in English, within twelve moneths, to be set up in the churches for the use of the people, to the reading of which they were to be encouraged." (*x*)

Neither a departure, then, from the discipline of that Reformation, nor an imposition of doctrines in more rigid terms, was indulged to the admirers of the Helvetic Churches. Edward's Reformation was not simply conformed to; it was re-instated;—it was not adopted as the best organ of the sentiments of the Revisers, it was revived: the few alterations which it underwent did not in the least affect its substance. The more material were, either, such concessions as, in a spirit of conciliation, were designed to sooth the feelings of the Roman Catholics, and leave room for their use of the revised

(*w*) Itaque stabilitur apud nos, per omnia Regni loca, sincera Christi religio, eadem prorsus ratione quâ sub Edwardo olim nostro, beatissimæ memoriæ promulgata erat."—E. Bibli. Tigur. Strype's Appendix to Annals, Vol. i, No. xxi.

(*x*) Sparrow's Collection of Articles, &c.

Liturgy, without insulting their scruples; or, the relaxation of an unnecessary strictness of decision in some unimportant points. They liberated in some instances; they bound more rigorously in none. A form of religion which should enfold in its embraces all her subjects, was the Queen's policy, which, in the words of the Lord Keeper to her first Parliament, she endeavoured to effect, "by proceeding between the extremes of superstition and irreligion, so that she hoped to reunite the adherents of both religions in the same public worship."^(y) She accordingly instructed the Committee of Divines appointed to review King Edward's Liturgy, "to strike out all offensive passages against the Pope, and to make people easy about the belief of the corporal presence of Christ, in the Sacrament."^(z)

While to the Roman Catholics, these concessions were granted, no restrictions were imposed upon others: had they been imposed in any instance, absolute decrees would, in all probability, have obtained the distinction. The Articles concerning Predestination, Free-will, and persevering Grace, to borrow the expression of one of the famous admonitions of the Puritans to the Parliament, were either "too sparely or too darkly set down" for the satisfaction of the abettors of unconditional election; and accordingly, during the revision of the Articles, while the hopes of that party were high, and they expected a suitable alteration, they, both with becoming mildness and their usual charity, reviled those who differed from them, "as Free-willers, Pelagians, Papists, Anabaptists, and the like, and threatened them with the impending enactment of punishment for their

(y) Rapin's Hist. England, Eliz.

(z) Neale's Hist. of the Puritans, c. iv. p. 138. Lond. 1732.

opinions." (a) Their eager hopes and insolent threats were equally disappointed; the Articles remained unaltered, though "darkly and sparsely set down." The liberty of those Free-willers, contemptible as they were in the eyes of these more enlightened Calvinists and absolute-decrees men, was not compromised; "their numbers were considerable; they also had suffered persecution for the Gospel in Queen Mary's reign; they saw no reason why, on the return of better days, they should not enjoy liberty of conscience without restraint or punishment, as others of the Queen's Protestant subjects did; and therefore they exhibited a petition by the hands of Thomas Talbot, Parson of St. Mary Magdalen, Milk-street, London, who was one of them, praying the Bishops against the enactment of Absolute Reprobation, as one of the Articles of the Church." (b)

Whether it was this petition that had the desired effect of preventing the enactment, as Strype conjectures, or not, is of little consequence: the existence of it proves beyond a doubt, that the doctrinal Puritans were as little flattered by the revision of 1562, as the disciplinarian Puritans, whom Neale calls "the stricter Protestants," (c) were in the previous review of the Liturgy.

It has, we think, now been shewn, beyond possibility of contradiction, that the public doctrines of our Church, in the age of Elizabeth, were, ipso facto, those of the age of Edward; and that they were not fashioned to meet the alteration of opinions, which the visit to the

(a) Strype's Annals, 1552, page 331, &c.

(b) Strype ut supra.

(c) "But not a word (in the Queen's Commission to the Reviewers) of the stricter Protestants." Ut supra.

Helvetic Churches had produced in many of our divines; (d) that, on the contrary, the private opinions of some, even the most respectable of these, were barely admissible within the precincts of our Church; and, therefore, that it is to the Divines of the age of Edward, the compilers of the Liturgy and the framers of the Articles, and to them alone, we can safely recur, as the only witnesses, who are entitled to corroborate the testimony of the public monuments of our Church, by their private suffrage.

If competency to affix to the Articles of our Religion a signification, not explicitly conveyed by their own language, belong to any men in their individual capacity, we presume that it has been ascertained by irrefragable argument, that that competency belongs exclusively to the compilers of the Liturgy and the framers of the Articles in the reign of Edward VI. We shall, therefore, hasten to bring the sentiments of the most distinguished of these venerable men, into contact with the opinions ascribed, by the Author of the Inquiry, to our Church.

These his opinions are categorically detailed from the 152d to the 154th pages of the second part of the Inquiry; they are selected from this part of the work, because they present, at one view, the sum and substance of the predestinarian doctrines. They are quoted by the Author of the Inquiry with great apparent triumph,

(d) Take the following instance, "*Recipimus quidem, seu potius toleranter ferimus, donec meliora Dominus dederit, interrogationes infantium, & crucis characterem in Baptismo, in Coenæ perceptione Genuflexionem. Nosque operam dabimus, quantum fieri possit, quemadmodum in proximis Comitibus fecimus, et si nihil obtinere potuimus,*" &c.—Letter of Bishop Grindal and Bishop Horn to Bullinger and Gualter, 1567. Burnet's Ref. Part iii. B. vi. Records, No. 83.

being extracted from a Confession of Faith at *one period* received by the Irish Church, and deriving additional claim to celebrity from their having been adopted into that code by the learned Usher, from the Lambeth Articles, which had been drawn up by Archbishop Whitgift, and a few others, A. D. 1595. They are presented to us in the pages of the Inquiry, in pursuance of the object of that publication, which the Preface announces to be, "to shew that they are the opinions of all the reformed divines," and they will, therefore, we conceive, be deemed the most unexceptionable summary we could present to the Reader, of those doctrines, of which the Author of the Inquiry says, "he is ready to avow his belief." A few quotations from other parts of the Inquiry will be interspersed, as useful illustrations of the positions of the Predestinarian School.

"The cause moving God to predestinate unto life, is not the foreseeing of faith, or perseverance, or good works, or of any thing which is in the person predestinated, but onely the good pleasure of God himselfe. For all things being ordained for the manifestation of his glory, and his glory being to appeare both in the works of his mercy and of his justice; it seemed good to his heavenly wisdom to choose out a certain number to whom he would extend his undeserved mercy, leaving the rest to be spectacles of his justice."^(e)
 "And this we are sure of, that whomsoever he chooseth, them he saveth of his mercy; and whom he repelleth, them of his secret and unsearchable judgment he condemneth."^(f)—
 "God by his immovcable counsels ordained some

(e) Inquiry, &c. Part ii. page 152.

(f) Ibid. Part ii. p. 19.

of his creatures to praise him, and live blessedly from him, and in him, and by him, namely, by his eternal predestination, his free-calling, and his grace, which was due to none. That he hath mercy with great goodness, and hardeneth without iniquity, so as neither he that is delivered can glory of his own merits, nor he that is condemned complain of but his own merits; for as much as grace only maketh the distinction betwixt the redeemed and the lost; who by a cause drawn from their common original were framed together into one mass of perdition.”(g)

“Such as are not predestinated to salvation, shall finally be condemned for their sinnes.”(h)

“None can come unto Christ, unlesse it be given unto him, and unlesse the Father draw him. And all men are not so drawne by the Father, that they may come unto the Sonne. Neither is there such a sufficient measure of grace vouchsafed unto every man, whereby he is enabled to come unto everlasting life.”(i)

“All the gifts both small and great, as well spiritual as temporal, which God purposed to give unto me, and all the good things which at any time in all my life I should do, God himself had before appointed, when I was yet in my mother’s womb, where I could neither wish, think, nor do any good thing. Therefore this gift also came to me by the mere predestination and free mercy of God, before I was yet born.”(k)

“Whatsoever we do, think, or imagine, is abominable in the sight of God; neither is his

(g) Inquiry, Part ii. pp. 141, 142.

(h) Ibid. p. 153.

(i) Ibid. p. 154.

(k) Ibid. Part i. page 18.

law or his will written in our members, or in our hearts; neither is there any more power in us to follow the will of God, than in a stone to ascend upward of his own self.”(l)

“A true lively justifying faith, and the sanctifying spirit of God, is not extinguished, nor vanisheth away in the regenerate, either finally or totally.”(m)

These are the doctrines of which, we repeat, the Author of the Inquiry declares himself “ready to avow his belief;”—these are the doctrines to which he has set the seal of his approbation, by quoting them in selections which he had the option of either admitting or rejecting;—these are the doctrines which he tells us form constituent parts of those essential verities, which “the Church pronounces it a wicked error, and deserving of excommunication for any of her members to deny;(n) these are doctrines of which,” he assures us, “our Church requires the unfeigned belief from all her members, as necessary to salvation, and as exclusively productive of true holiness.”—!!! (o)

Will it be credited that these doctrines, which we may univindiously call frightful, when Calvin himself, shrinking from the revolting nature of the absolute decree, calls it frightful,(p)—will it be credited, that these frightful doctrines, to which the Inquiry has ventured to knit the fearful consequences just recited, cannot possibly be attributed to the Articles of our Church, except

(l) Inquiry, Part ii. page 5.

(m) Ibid. pp. 154, 155.

(n) Ibid. p. 240.

(o) Ibid. page 252.

(p) Instit. Lib. iii. c. 23. § 7. “horribile decretum.”

by arbitrary construction and momentous additions? Still more, will it be credited, that these additions, which in the preceding extracts we have presented to our Readers, and which are re-published by the Author of the Inquiry, interwoven into the text of our Articles, were at two periods refused admittance among the Articles of the Church of England—and at a third period, after having been enacted among those of Ireland, A. D. 1615, were rescinded in 1634? And yet, in the face of these rejections and of this annulling, these are the additions which we are informed can alone elucidate the doctrines “too darkly or too sparsely” set down in the Thirty-nine Articles. Such, however, are the facts—so strong, as to make it questionable, whether the temerity of adducing such a commentary, or the confidence of annexing to its non-acceptance so tremendous penalties, surpass in boldness—so fatal to the interpretation advocated by the Inquiry, as to leave in the mind almost a doubt of the records of their existence. The particulars of these facts are too interesting, and the inferences which they support too important, not to detain us from the immediate production of the direct authorities which we promised to lay before our Readers.

The Lambeth Articles first saw the light, A. D. 1595, full thirty-three years after the revision of the Articles, and eleven after Harsnet had denounced from the Pulpit of St. Paul's Cross, the Goliath stature of the Calvinistic doctrines. They were transmitted ready penned from Cambridge, by the hands of Doctor Whitacres, accompanied with an earnest supplication from the heads of that University to Archbishop Whitgift, that he would give them the sanction of his authority; they were recommended to his favor as the most efficacious remedy for terminating the violent dispu-

tations on these points, which then agitated the University; and a gracious reception had been prepared for them, by prepossessing the Archbishop with complaints of the turbulent conduct of Professors and Fellows, &c. who opposed these tenets—and of the affronts to which the champion of them, Dr. Whitacres, whom the Archbishop highly esteemed for his writings against Bellarmine, had been exposed. The Archbishop complied, “and calling unto him Dr. Fletcher, Bishop of Bristol, then newly elected unto London,^(q) and Dr. Richard Vaughan, Lord elect of Bangor, together with Dr. Tyndal, Dean of Ely, to meet Dr. Whitacres, the primum mobile of the Conference, and his colleagues from Cambridge, he submitted to them nine propositions, which have been since known under the title of the Lambeth Articles.” Burleigh, the Lord Treasurer, informed the Queen of these Articles when they were ready to be published—the Archbishop was called to account, but he softened her Majesty’s displeasure by the assurance “that he and his associates had not made any Articles or Decrees with an intent that they should serve hereafter for a standing rule to the Church, but only had resolved on some propositions for the appeasing of some unhappy differences in the University...with which answer her Majesty being somewhat pacified, commanded notwithstanding, that he should speedily recal and suppress the Articles; which was performed with such care and diligence, that a copy of them was not to be found a long time after.”^(r)

But the accession of James I. filled the Puritans with the pleasing expectation, that the public autho-

(q) Not Bancroft, as Fuller erroneously states.

(r) Heylin’s *Quinq. History*, Part iii. p. 78.

rity would be interposed, not to suppress, but to confirm the decisions of Lambeth; that they should no longer be regarded as the unauthorised and disallowed judgments of a few private divines, nor be compelled to seek shelter in universities, but that their unequivocal language would be incorporated into the Articles of Religion, and effectually restrain the pernicious excursions, heretofore permitted to the judgments of the clergy, by a greater latitude of interpretation.

The Hampton Court Conference, in 1604, dissipated the illusion; the doctrinal and disciplinarian Puritans were equally disappointed in a Prince, who had from his infancy breathed the very atmosphere of Puritanism.

At that Conference, Doctor Reynolds, the spokesman of the Puritans, proposed to introduce into the Sixteenth Article, after "we may depart from grace given," the peremptory clause, "yet neither totally nor finally," and into the Seventeenth, the other Lambeth clauses; but both propositions were rejected. The Articles remained unaltered, under the declared conviction of the impolicy of expressing these doctrines in more precise terms. (s) They did, indeed, find admission in a few years after, among the Articles of the Irish Church; but what was their fate? They were introduced by Usher, who lived to alter his opinion, and they were replaced by the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, in 1634, with Usher's suffrage,—in all probability, because he had then already experienced that change of sentiments, which he had felt for many years before he published it to the world. (t)

(s) Fuller's Ch. History, Book x.

(t) See Chapter III.

From this sketch of the history of the Lambeth Articles, we are furnished at once with the most satisfactory evidence of the total inadequacy of the language of the Articles of the Church of England, to represent, with any degree of precision, the dogmas of the absolute predestination scheme, (*u*) and with a solemn protest against affixing to her public doctrines an interpretation dictated by the fancies of individuals. The Lambeth Articles originated at a period, when the Calvinistic doctrines had nearly attained the maturity of their progressive growth in England, and, exhibiting a faithful summary of that system of tenets, enable us to perceive at a glance, the urgent necessity which impelled the university of Cambridge to have recourse to the "nine orthodoxal assertions," (so Doctor Reynolds calls them,) and the same Doctor Reynolds to suggest the incorporation of those assertions with the Articles of the Church. But in their constitution, confessedly drawn up without an intent "that they should serve hereafter for a rule to the Church," and in the subsequent effort at their incorporation, intentionally rejected, with the design of preserving the Anti-Calvinistic sense to the Articles, they attest the position to be incontrovertible, that the *public* monuments of the Church are the *sole* interpreters of her opinions.

(*u*) Doctor Reynolds—"May your Majesty be pleased, that the Book of Articles of Religion, concluded on 1562, may be explained where obscure, enlarged where defective; viz. whereas, it is said, Article Sixteen, *After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace.* These words may be explained with this, or the like addition, *yet neither totally nor finally*; To which end it would do very well, if the nine orthodoxal assertions, concluded on at Lambeth, might be inserted into the Book of Articles."—Fuller's Ch. Hist. Book x.

It is much to be regretted, that the Author of the Inquiry did not admit the equitable spirit, which the obvious truth of so plain a proposition, one might imagine, would inspire. No—he argues (pp. 155, 156,) from private opinions to public doctrines, from the sentiments of a few to the sentiments of all; and, fortified with so hopeful and conclusive modes of argument, he fulminates anathemas, and would fain bind on the consciences of his brethren, under pain of excommunication, speculative doctrines, which the Synod of Trent itself, in its unmitigated rage for definitive judgments, left undetermined.—Nowel's Catechism, which the Author of the Inquiry takes care to inform us, “was submitted to the same Convocation which agreed to the Thirty-nine Articles, and by it approved as a proper summary of the doctrine professed in the Church of England,”^(x) might have shewn him the importance of distinguishing between the text of an Article and any man's commentary on it.

“In the Convocation now sitting, (says Fuller) wherein Alexander Nowel, Dean of St. Paul's, was Prolocutor, the Nine and Thirty Articles were composed. For the main they agree with those set forth in the reign of King Edward VI. though in some particulars, allowing *more liberty* to dissenting judgments. For instance, in this King's Articles it is said, that it is to be believed, “that Christ went down into Hell, [to preach to the Spirits there],” which last clause is left out in these Articles, and men *left to a latitude* concerning the cause, time and manner of his descent.”^(y)

(x) Inquiry, Part ii. p. 202.

(y) Fuller's Ch. Hist. Book ix, Sect. i. § 51.

The Prolocutor was not equally tenacious of this latitude in his Catechism. In it he teaches, "that, as Christ in his body descended into the bowels of the earth; so his soul, severed from the body, descended into hell; and that therewith also the virtue and efficacy of his death so pierced through to the dead, and to very hell itself, that both the souls of the unbelieving felt their most painful and just damnation for infidelity, and Satan himself, the Prince of hell, felt that all the power of his tyranny and darkness was weakened," &c. &c. (z)

Will the Author of the Inquiry maintain, that the Catechism of the Dean of St. Paul's has virtually reinstated the abrogated clause of the Third Article, and fixed the sense in which it must be construed? Is he of opinion, that his own liberty and that of his brethren are compromised by this commentary, in a matter, in which it would fain "be wise above that which is written?" We presume not—the text, not the commentary, we take to be the rule of his conformity in this instance; and why not transfer the principle from the Third Article, to those which Doctor Reynolds was commissioned to request, "might be explained where

(z) Nowel's Catechism translated into English by T. Norton, re-published among the Fathers of the English Church.—The original is subjoined for the use of the learned Reader.—*M. Ejus ad Inferos desensus quam habet sententiam? A. Quod Christus ut Corpore in terræ viscera, ita anima a corpore separata ad Inferos descendit, pariterque mortis ejus vis ad mortuos, inferosque, adeo ipsos usque eo permanavit, ut et animæ incredulorum tristissimæ, ipsorumque incredulitati, maxime debitæ condemnationis sensum perciperent, ipseque Satanas Inferorum princeps, tyrannidis suæ, et tenebrarum potentiam omnem afflictam profigatam, &c.—Christianæ Pietatis prima Institutio. London, 1608.*

obscure, enlarged where defective?"—For, supposing the original composers, and subsequent revisers of the Articles, to be as deeply inoculated with the predestinarian virus as Calvin himself, and both to be as rigorous in prescribing enslaving terms of Church Communion, as men who had never been emancipated from a spiritual tyranny; supposing those who had been called to the revision after exile, to be as insensible to the indulgences due to tender consciences, as men who had never suffered themselves for conscience' sake; (a) as unrestricted in the powers granted by the Queen's commission, as persons who were not appointed to alter and amend a former code, but to fashion a new one at their own discretion; supposing them as unembarrassed by conflicting opinions, as if but one heart, one understanding, one soul had animated all the members, both of the Commission and the Convocation; still, since the terms in which the public doctrines are couched, were deliberately chosen—since the connecting links of the Lambeth "assertions," with which a chain might have been fabricated, that would indeed bind up the refractory spirit of Free-will, and conditional election, were (we will for the concession sake say) *omitted*, omitted not ignorantly, but designedly; surely a candid and judicious person would see in the omissions, intentional relaxations; and, so far from having recourse to the writings of private divines, "for the explanation of what was left obscure, or the enlarging of what was

(a) "Indeed most of them had formerly been sufferers themselves,...which (in compiling these Articles) made them the more merciful and tender in stating those points, seeing such who themselves have been most patient in bearing, will be most pitiful in burdening the consciences of others,"
—Fuller's Ch. Hist. B. ix. Sect. i. § 53.

defective," would give effect to their intentions, by construing the terms in all that comprehensive liberality, which the form of their structure admitted. (b)

To us, at least, the justice of this comprehension appears so reasonable, and the charity of the stipulation so just, that in the event of realizing that impression, which we confidently entertain, of conveying to our readers matter sufficient to produce a moral certainty that the *conditional*, not the *irrespective* decree, and its adjuncts, were contemplated in the original compilation of our Articles, we shall not, under this reversed aspect, in which our opponents will seek shelter under its latitude of interpretation—we shall not imitate the Author of the Inquiry, and the abettors of his doctrine, by denying that admissibility of their opinions to the construction of the Article, which they sternly refuse to any others but their own.

Whether we anticipate too much from the character of the materials in our hands, the production of them will decide.

The industry of the celebrated historian of our Reformation has redeemed from oblivion

(b) "Some have unjustly taxed the composers, for too much favour extended in their large expressions, clean through the contexture of these Articles, which should have tied mens' consciences up closer in more strict and particularizing propositions; which indeed proceeded from their commendable moderation. The Articles of this English Protestant Church, in the infancy thereof, they thought good to draw up in general terms, foreseeing that differences in judgments would unavoidably happen in the Church, and they were loath to unchurch any, and drive them off from an ecclesiastical communion, for such petty differences; which made them pen the Articles in comprehensive words, to take in all, who differing in the branches, meet in the root of the same religion."—Fuller's Ch. Hist. B. ix. Sect. i. § 52.

valuable specimens of the discussions by which the pretensions of a doctrine to be recognized as pure, or rejected as spurious, were investigated by our Reformers.^(c) These discussions, while they spread before us the criteria to which the disputed doctrine was brought, and stand imperishable monuments of a labour of research, proportioned to the arduous duty, supply us, at the same time, with an interesting view of the method by which the Reformers were directed in this examination. The question was submitted in writing to each of the divines in the Commission, and ample time was afforded for its due consideration. The test to which it was then subjected was, first, the Word of God; secondly, the testimony of the Fathers. The answers were returned in writing, together with the observations and opinions of the divines who had been consulted, and, where the Scriptures were not express, the consonance of the doctrine to a standard of truth was inferred, from its conformity to the tenor of the inspired Word, and to primitive antiquity, as shewn in these answers. It was a rule laid down for the regulation of their judgments, that "the four General Councils were to be received, but that all Councils were to be examined by the Scripture; as were also the writings of the Fathers, who were to be much revered; but, according to what themselves have written, they were only to be submitted to, when they agreed with the Scriptures."^(d)

In these embryo materials of our Reformation, it is consolatory to discover the independence of our national Church, upon the opinions of foreign divines, and to trace in the very elements of its

(c) Records, B. iii. page 201, and seq.

(d) History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Part ii. Book i. p. 197.

constitution the foundation of the declaration formally made (*e*) and reiterated (*f*) in public instruments, that the doctrines of our Church were derived solely from the Scriptures, and the consent of the Fathers, as their best interpreters. The principle of our Reformation was to make "no so dayne, no unnecessary changes;" and Hume admits that, true to the principle, the Reformers "indulged nothing to a spirit of contradiction." They regarded the zeal and the talents of the continental Reformers with sentiments of the most lively affection and esteem; but, conscious of the dignity of the duties they were themselves called upon to perform to their national Church, they refused the proffered assistance of Calvin, and dispensed with the services of the rest. (*g*) Melancthon, indeed, was invited to England, and Bucer and Martyr were called to the divinity chairs of Cambridge and Oxford. But what should we thence infer? This indiscriminate invitation of persons who belonged to Churches, which by no means agreed in some important matters, while it shews the just value which was set upon the

(*e*) "The three Creeds, the Canonical Scriptures, interpreted by the holy and approved (*sancti et probati*) Doctors of the Church with unanimous consent, and the Nicene, Constantinopolitan, Ephesian, and Chalcedon Councils, are the rules of faith."—*Pia et Catholica Christiani hominis Institutio Londini*, A. D. 1544.

(*f*) "England embraced not new or strange doctrine, but the same which Christ commanded, and what the primitive and Catholic Church had received, and was approved by the ancient Fathers, as might be testified by their writings."—*Q. Eliz. Answer to the Emperor*. *Strype's Annals*, xvi. p. 148, An. 1559.

(*g*) "It is confessed by Mr. Collier himself, in his *Church History*, (p. 253, v. 2.) that when Calvin offered his assistance to Archbishop Cranmer, about the time of compiling the Liturgy, it was rejected."—*Appendix to Sparrow's Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. clxxxvii. London, 2d Ed. 1772.

general usefulness of these distinguished men, also shews, that our Reformers did not intend to yield the modelling of the forms, or the adjustment of the tenets of our Church, to the peculiar opinions of either.

It is true that the Liturgy, which had been compiled *before* Bucer's arrival, was submitted to his inspection, (*h*) after having been translated for the purpose—this was wise; it was a just tribute to his skill, their own prudence, and the immense importance of the work; and they had the satisfaction to know that it received his approbation, though it was so much excepted against afterwards by Calvin, and the English Puritans of his school. But though the Liturgy, and with great propriety, was submitted to Bucer's review, yet nothing could be farther from the mind of Cranmer than to be directed by the foreign divines, as we learn incidentally from a letter addressed by Martyr to Bucer; in it he writes, "that the Archbishop had acquainted him that some alterations were agreed on, but that he durst not presume to ask him what they were." (*i*) It was therefore with good reason that Whitgift affirmed, "As for our Faith and Church, they depended neither upon Mr. Beza, nor any other man." [*Foreigner.*] (*k*)

The adepts of no foreign system—the disciples of no master—the Patriarchs of our Reformation had no other ambition, than that of ascending to

(*h*) The Liturgy was first compiled, A. D. 1548. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Part ii. Book i. Bucer and Fagius left Germany, April, 1549. Appendix, Vol. iii. p. 313.—The Liturgy was translated by Aleffe for Bucer's use, and Bucer having given his opinion, the Review was made 1550, 1551.—Refor. *ibid.* p. 155.

(*i*) Appendix to Sparrow's Rationale, p. cxci. London, 2d Ed. 1722. Collier's Church History, Vlo. ii. p. 310.

(*k*) Strype's Whitgift, c. vi. p. 38.

the genuine faith of the primitive ages, and of rendering our national Church contemporaneous in effect with those purer times, by rolling aside the corruptions of the intervening periods. The standard which they sought was not a speculative perfectibility; their object was practical, it was attainable, and they succeeded.

On that object they steadily fixed an undeviating eye. From the commencement of their labours under the protection of Henry VIII. till their consummation under Edward VI. the same reverence for antiquity runs, in uniform tenor, through the discussion which preceded the reception of a doctrine, and the private writings of those, to whose sentiments the received doctrine was most conformable. (1) If their approximation towards the purity of the ancient Churches was gradual, it was a natural phenomenon. It is an indication of ingenuous candour, which invites us to repose on the just grounds of their settled renunciation of the errors they abandoned; it is an internal evidence of a progress independent of foreign aid, keeping pace with a strength of conviction, at length surmounting the deep-rooted prejudices of early education. The merit of monks, together with all the trumpery of that order, papal indulgences, pilgrimages, processions to shrines, &c. were, after the supremacy of the Pope, the first objects which they assailed, because these overthrew the very pillars of Christianity, which rests upon the undivided merits of the Redeemer's atoning sacrifice.

(1) The same method of discussion was continued under Edward VI. Burnet. Collection of Records, Part ii. Book i. No. 25.

Justification by Faith alone was therefore stated from the beginning, and with so great clearness, that no improvement was made afterward in the perspicuity or precision with which it was expressed. (*m*) But other errors, which were not so obviously opposed to the word of God, nor to the sentiments of antiquity, were but slowly recognized. Latimer, and he was not singular, considered images to be the books of the people, and hence, while he denounced the worship of them, he did not object to their being retained, as helps to memory, in the Churches. (*n*) Ridley was not the only advocate for the benefit of auricular confession. (*o*) Redmayn, an able promoter of the Reformation, was once of opinion, that the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments should be taught, and, so far from diminishing the number, that the *Lotio Pedum* should be added, as an eighth. (*p*) Cranmer, with christian frankness, confesses of himself, "that not long before I wrot the sayd Catechisme, I was in that error of the Real Presence, as I was in many years past in divers other errors, as of Transubstantiation, of the Sacrifice, &c. But after it had pleased God to shew unto me, by his holy word, a more perfect knowledge of his Sonne Jesus Christ, from tyme to

(*m*) History of the Reformation, Part i. Book iii. p. 288.

(*n*) Bishop Latimer's Life, Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog. Vol. iii. p. 44.

(*o*) "Sodayne changes wythout substantial and necessary cause, and the heady setting forth of extremities, I did never love. Confession unto the Minister, which is able to instruct, &c. indede I ever thought might do much good in Christ's congregation."—Letters of Martyrs, Ridley to West. London, Day, 1564.

(*p*) Burnet's Hist. Refor. Part i. Book iii. Records, p. 209.

tyme, as I grew in knowledge of him, by little and little, I put away my former ignorance; and as God of his mercy gave me light, so through his grace I opened myne eyes to receive it, and did not wilfully repugne unto God, and remayne in darknesse.”(q)

These preliminary remarks, to which it has been thought expedient to call the reader’s observation, before we submit to him the following testimonies, lead us to suggest; First, that the general consent of the ancient Fathers, in an ambiguous case, is a good expositor of the sentiments of our Reformers; and, Secondly, that the admission of some erroneous opinions into their earlier productions, which were afterwards detected and renounced, affords no argument against their continuing to hold the truth of those contained in the same production which they never disclaimed.

The promised testimonies we shall now no longer withhold.

The first that we shall cite is that of Dr. John Redmayn.

Redmayn is characterized by Burnet, as being “esteemed the most learned and judicious divine of that time;”(r) a reputation to which Cranmer must have considered him fully entitled, when he commanded him to write a Treatise on Justification, which should vindicate the Reformers from the charge of maintaining Faith without Works; because they insisted, that Faith, separate from Works, is solely respected in our Justification.—His execution of the work committed to him is said to be such as “will sufficiently justify any

(q) Answer to Smith’s Preface, subjoined to his Answer to Gardiner, p. 402. Edit. 1580. Wordsworth’s Eccles. Biog. &c. Fathers of the English Church.

(r) History of the Reformation, Part i. B. iii. p. 287.

advantageous character that can be given of the Author.”(s) Afterwards we find his name in the list of “the Committee of selected Bishops and Divines, who, in the reign of Edward VI. A. D. 1548, were appointed to examine all the Offices of the Church, and to consider how far any of them needed amendment.”(t) He was subsequently nominated to the Mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge, and in that situation continued to act a conspicuous part among the most eminent characters of the Reformed Party.(u)—In that Treatise of Justification, mentioned above, he thus speaks of Predestination :

“God, of his sole goodness and ineffable mercy, freely predestinates, calls, justifies, glorifies all those who shall come to eternal salvation and happiness. For all things are to be ascribed to grace, and to the Holy Spirit, and to the love and mercy of our heavenly Father, who hath reconciled us to himself in Christ, and hath adopted us into sonship.”(v)

Here we see that it was not in the reign of Edward VI. for the first time, nor in the seventeenth Article, that Predestination was recognized by our Reformers.—In the reign of Henry VIII. and at the very dawning of the Reformation, we have essentially the prototype of the first and second members of the seventeenth Article, pub-

(s) History of the Reformation, Part i. B. iii. p. 287.

(t) Ibid. Part ii. B. i p. 61.

(u) Ibid. p. 164.

(v) “Deus ex sola bonitate et misericordia ineffabili omnes qui ad æternam Salutem et beatitudinem perventuri sint, gratis prædestinat, vocat, justificat, glorificat.—Sunt enim Gratia omnia et Spiritui sancto ascribenda, et Charitati ac misericordiae Patris cœlestis qui nos sibi in Christo reconcilavit atque in filios adoptavit.” Redmayn de Justificatione opus. Antwerp, 1555.

lished under their authority—indeed Redmayn is still more restricting than the Article; for, while Redmayn affirms both the Predestination and the call of all those who shall come to eternal salvation to be gratuitous, the Article only states their Predestination to be the everlasting purpose of God, without any term of limitation; and their call, with equal latitude, to be consequent upon this Predestination. Redmayn prefixes *freely* to the Predestination, the call, the justification, and the glorification. The Article places *freely* in connexion with justification alone—studiously omitting it in the construction of those members, in which its import might be liable to misinterpretation—and affixing it to that one, concerning which there was no difference of sentiment. Had the Article been as explicit as Redmayn, we may judge of the triumphant tone with which it would have been quoted by the absolute Predestinarians, from the pretensions which they so strenuously and unblushingly urge for its exclusive appropriation under its present form. But with what truth, even with *freely* affixed to the predestinating and the calling, they would lay claim to that appropriation, we may estimate from what follows, in Redmayn's Treatise.

“Nor truly is it our present intention to investigate nicely how it happens, that our salvation must be attributed to *grace alone*, and yet that the *freedom of the will* should remain. But this we believe, according to the Catholic dogmas, which the writings of the Saints evince to have been received in the Church from the beginning, both, that the grace of God is to be so extolled, that Free-will do not glory of any thing as effected by its own strength, to the exclusion of grace—and yet, that the power of grace is so to be insisted upon, that Free-will is not indeed

nothing, but that we confess that *without grace* it is inefficacious, but that with grace it can perform every thing, according to that scripture, "I can do all things through him who strengthens me," Phil. 4. That sentence of Augustine to Valentine is to be kept in memory, "The sound Catholic Faith neither denies Free-will, whether for a bad or a good life, nor does it attribute to it so much, that without the grace of God it can perform any good thing."(w)

Freely, then, in his apprehension, respected God, not man;—it denies the claims of any of his creatures by right of merit to redemption, but it excludes not their acceptance, or refusal of his unmerited vocation in the freedom of their will.—The doctrine of the Article, and the exposition of its phraseology, are thus presented to us, both conjoined at the birth of the Reformation, and not separated when it had attained to its maturity.—Had it not been the intention of the Reformers to maintain this connexion between undeserved grace and Free-will, there was a phrase that would have ascertained the sense of the Article, to the entire satisfaction of the absolute Predestinarians. The

(w) "Nec vero quomodo id fiat ut soli Gratiae salus nostra accepta referatur, et libertas tamen Arbitrii maneat, est hujus temporis aut Instituti subtiliter persequi.—Hoc autem secundum Catholica dogmata, quae ab initio Sanctorum Scriptis confirmata in Ecclesia recepta sunt credimus, et Gratiam Dei sic extollendam ne liberum Arbitrium de suis viribus, semotim Gratia, quicquam gloriatur, et tamen sic praedicandam Gratiae vim, ut liberum Arbitrium non quidem nihil esse, sed absque Gratia inefficax esse, cum Gratia autem nihil non posse confiteamur, juxta illud, *omnia possum in eo qui me confortat*. Phil. 4.—Memoria tenendum illud Augustini ad Valentinum, Fides sana Catholica neque liberum Arbitrium negat, sive in vitam malam sive in bonam, neque ei tantum tribuit ut absque Gratia Dei valeat aliquid boni operari." Ut supra.

precedent was to be found in the Helvetic Confession of Faith; in it there is no ambiguity, no latitude: "God," says that Confession, "from eternity hath predestinated, or chosen freely and of his mere grace, *without any respect of men*, those saints whom it is his pleasure to save in Christ."^(x)—Here is the irrelative decree issued from the mint of absolute Predestination, and stamped with the characters that insure it currency—yet these are the characters which Redmayn and his colleagues, the framers of our Articles, wilfully omit—and why? The answer is obvious.

Happily, the Helvetic Confession had not for them the charms, that, not long after, captivated Jewel and his fellow exiles. Had the influence of Calvin and his disciples been as powerful over the Reformers, as it was over many of the Revisers of 1562, they would have anticipated the efforts of their successors, and Jewel and his associates would have been spared the mortification of a rejection, when they presented to Elizabeth "all their Articles of Religion, and of Doctrines, without deviating from that pattern to the extent of the least accent."^(y)

If we have been successful in finding in the Treatise on Justification the prototype of the two first members of the seventeenth Article, we are still more confident of finding in a book of still greater authority, the archetype of the Article in full dimensions. This book is "The pious and

(x) *De Prædestinatione Dei et Electione Sanctorum*, 1536, postea 1566.—"Deus ab æterno prædestinavit vel elegit libere et mera suâ Gratiâ, *nullo hominum respectu*, quos vult salvos facere in Christo."

(y) "Nos Articulos omnes Religionis, et Doctrinæ nostræ exhibuimus Reginæ, et ne minimo quidem apice discessimus a Confessione Tigurinâ."—Jewel's Letter to Martyr. Ex. M.S.S. Tigur. Burnet's Hist. Refor. Part iii. B. vi. Records, No. 50.

Catholic Institution of a Christian Man."—A work, which the Author of the Inquiry has dismissed, as unworthy his consideration, with a summary catalogue of the errors of the first edition, and an unfair insinuation of the sense in which Penance is understood in that compendium, (z)

(z) "It states that Penance is a Sacrament; that such men which after baptism do fall again into sin, if they do not penance in this life, shall undoubtedly be damned."—Inquiry, ut infra.—Penance, from the Latin *Pœnitentia*, was, in that treatise, and in all the works of the Reformers of the same period, used where we would now employ Repentance.* In the paragraphs immediately subjoined to that which the Author of the Inquiry has quoted, we find it thus described:—"That like as such men, which after baptism doe fall again into sin, if they doe not penance in this life, shall undoubtedly be damned; even so, whensoever the same shall convert themselves, and do such penance for the same as Christ requireth of them, they shall without doubt attain remission of their sins, and shall be saved.—That the sacrament of perfect penance, which Christ requireth of such manner of persons, consisteth of three parts;—Contrition, Confession, and the amendment of the former life, and a new obediencial reconciliation unto the laws and will of God. Contrition consisteth of two special parts; that is to say, the penitent and contrite man must first knowledge the filthiness and abomination of his own sin, unto which knowledge he is brought by hearing and considering of the will of God, declared in his laws, and feeling and perceiving in his own conscience, that God is angry and displeasèd with him for the same. He must also conceive not onely great sorrow and inward shame, that he hath so grievously offended God, but also great fear of God's displeasure towards him, considering he hath no works or merits of his own, which he may worthily lay before God as sufficient satisfaction for his sins.—And for Auricular Confession;—(which is also one of the charges made by the Inquiry,)—it is not insisted upon as of divine institution, (that King Henry denied, [letter to Tonstal, Addenda Burnet's Reform. v. i. p. 366.]) but that they ought to repute the same as a very expedient and necessary mean, whereby they may require and ask this absolution at the priest's hand."—We leave to our Readers to form a judgment of the Author's accuracy and fairness from these instances.

* *Penance* is still retained in the Commination, in its ancient signification,

without any admission of the truths (*a*) which, as the harbinger of the Reformation, it promulgated. The futility of objections derived from the mixture of errors with truth, has been already exposed in the preliminary remarks—they are equally applicable to the gradual knowledge of every one of the Reformers, and would, in their principle, strike at the root of the Reformation.

Lest we seem, however, to be maintaining a questionable proposition, concerning this book, by putting our own opinion in competition with that of the Author of the Inquiry, and lest we thereby leave room for a suspicion of our setting an undue value on its fair representation of the most important doctrines of our Reformation, we shall quote Neale upon the subject. The learned historian of the Puritans, himself a Puritan, will be deemed an impartial witness:—"This book (says he) was recommended and subscribed by the two Archbishops, nineteen Bishops, and by the lower house of Convocation—among whom were Gardiner, Bonner, and others, who put their brethren to death for these doctrines in the reign of Queen Mary." (*b*)—It is of the earliest edition of the Institution Neale here speaks; that only edition which the Author of the Inquiry chooses to notice, and "to which he is surprised that any Members of our Church could have appealed." (*c*) There were, however, subsequent and improved editions of this book, which, one would have supposed, might have had attractions for an Author,

(*a*) Inquiry, Part ii. pp. 237, 238, 239.

(*b*) Neale's History of the Puritans, Vol. i. ch. i. p. 23, Lond. 1732.

(*c*) We know not of any members of our Church, who have appealed to this *first* edition. As far as our information goes, it is to "The Necessary Erudition, &c." they have appealed.

who recoils from the papistical errors of the first edition with so great horror, that he can shew it no clemency—no, not for doctrines which were maintained at the price of martyrdom. How far the spirit of advocacy influenced his choice, and stimulated his sensibility, our Readers, we think, will have little difficulty in deciding, when they will have been furnished with extracts from the Book. A second edition of this book appeared in 1540—these two editions were called the Bishops' Book;—a third edition was published A. D. 1543, under the title of "A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man, set forth by the King's Majesty of England." It was then called the King's Book—"It, admit the Editors of the Fathers of the English Church, contained additional alterations and enlargements, and some retrenchments from the former editions. Some progress of the reformed principles appeared in different parts of the work." Yes, such progress, that, not the members of our Church, but Neale affirms; "the Reader therefore will judge, by the following abstract (of this edition) of the sentiments of our first Reformers in sundry points of doctrine and discipline." After furnishing the abstract, he observes,—“By this abstract of the Erudition of a Christian Man it appears further, that our *Reformers* built *pretty much* upon the plan of St. Austin with relation to the doctrines of Justification and Grace.” (d)

If Neale, then, be not egregiously mistaken, the Institution is not a tissue of papistical errors; it is not a gloomy picture of corruptions so little relieved by any truth, as to make it incumbent on the Inquiry to refuse it a place in its collection.

(d) Neale's History of the Puritans, Vol. i, ch. i. pp. 33—
Lond. 1732.

On the contrary, there were some of the doctrines sufficiently anti-papistical to merit the fatal vengeance of Bonner: and the Doctrines of "The Necessary Erudition, &c." are such, as to enable us to judge of the sentiments of the Reformers in sundry points of doctrine—sentiments which approximated to, but did not coincide with, St. Austin's doctrine, concerning grace.—The last edition of this book was printed in Latin, 1544, by Bartelet, London. It is from this improved edition our extracts will be taken, and we shall venture to appeal to the internal evidence they supply for the justness of Neale's opinion, and the grounds of our esteeming them archetypes of the Seventeenth Article, and of the other Articles connected with it in doctrine. In this book, under the heads entitled "of Justification," "of Good Works," and "of Free-will," after stating the general scriptural signification of the term Justification to be, "the rendering of the unjust, just before God," it adds, "This is effected, when, *being called through his grace*, we are converted to himself, and are reconciled to him; and we, who were sons of wrath and death, are rendered Sons of God," and heirs of eternal life, so that by the *free gift of God* we are enabled both to walk in the way of the Lord, *and at length*, in the last judgment of God, to be esteemed and reputed justified, and to obtain everlasting life." (e) All things are conferred *freely* on us, and not on account of our dignity, nor could any merit of

(e) "Id quod tum fit, cum per ipsius Gratiam vocati, ad ipsum convertimur et illi reconciliamur, efficiamurque ex filiis iræ et mortis, Filii Dei et vitæ æternæ hæredes, adeo ut, gratuito Dei munere, et in viis Domini ambulare, et in extremo tandem Dei judicio pro justis haberi ac reputari, vitamque æternam adipisci queamus."

ours *precede* the grace of God, since grace is the parent of merit—and our merits and all good things proceed from God, the author and father of lights.”(f) “And here, let all curious and idle imaginations concerning Predestination be dismissed, and entirely rejected, and let us hear and follow that which the Scripture plainly and simply teacheth. But it, in innumerable passages, truly charges us, “to be always diffident of ourselves, to be always alarmed for the weakness of our flesh, and our inborn proneness to sin, and, that we do not entertain any other assurance of our election, than by spiritual motions, and signs of grace in our hearts, which do not only kindle the love of heavenly things in our souls, but do also shine forth in our good works,” in which, moreover, we must persevere to the remotest period of our lives, that we may be truly reckoned in the number of the elect.”(g) “But when we name good works, it is to be understood that we speak, not only of external deeds, and the actions of the body, but also and especially of those, which are carried on internally

(f) “Itaque omnia gratis nobis, et non propter nostram dignitatem collata sunt, nec ullum meritum nostrum potuit gratiam Dei *precedere*, cum gratia sit meriti parens; suntque merita nostra et bona omnia, adeo auctore et patre luminum profecta.”

(g) “Jam hic facessant omnino ac penitus abjiciantur curiosæ omnes et inanes de prædestinatione imaginationes, et quod Scriptura plane et simpliciter docet, illud audiamus atque sequamur. —Hæc autem innumeris sanè locis admonet; ut semper nobis ipsi diffidamus, ut a carnis nostra infirmitate ac insita ad peccandum pronitate nobis semper metuamus, Nec de nostra nos *electione aliter certos esse statuamus*, quam per spirituales in Corde motus et signa gratiæ, quæ non modo rerum cælestium amorem in animis nostris excitant, sed in bonis etiam operibus nostris elucet, in quibus porro ad *extremum vitæ* nostræ finem (ut vere in electorum numero habeamur) perseverandum est.”

in the mind, and in the secret motions and affections of the heart, and especially of those which are denominated the fruits of the Spirit; such are love, joy, patience, humility, the fear of God, and, in short, all holy and pious cogitations.—For these we understand here to be good works which flow from faith and love, and are not works of the human understanding and prudence only, but rather are the works of grace and of the spirit, namely those for which Paul to the Ephesians writes, *we have been created in Christ, and which are prepared by God, that we should walk in them.*"(h) "God's goodness is inexhaustible, and he wills that we all should be saved, and he orders and provides those things which are for our salvation, except we will, by our own wickedness, withdraw ourselves from him, and go to ruin through our own fault. For we certainly are the authors of our own destruction; God is not. But we shall be condemned by his just judgment, if we will defile and pollute a nature, at first created upright, and afterwards redeemed from the fall, by serving the lusts of the flesh and the world, in preference to the observance of his will. Wherefore men are to be warned that they do not ascribe their damnation to God, but that they cast it on themselves, and their own

(h) "Cum autem bona opera nominamus, sciendum est, non de externis tantum factis et corporum actionibus nos loqui, sed etiam ac potius de his, quæ intrinsecus in animo geruntur, secretisque cordium motionibus et affectibus, ac presertim de fructibus qui Spiritus esse dicuntur, quales sunt Charitas, Gaudium, Patientia, Humilitatis, Timor Dei, ac denique omnes sanctæ et piæ cogitationes. Ea enim nos opera bona hic intelligimus, quæ ex fide prodeunt et dilectione, et non humani tantum sensus aut prudentiæ, sed gratiæ potius ac spiritus opera sunt, ea videlicet, ad quæ conditos nos in Christo scribit Paulus ad Ephesios et quæ a Deo præparata sunt, ut in illis ambulemus."

pravity, who, in the perverseness and wantonness of their own will, ungratefully abuse so many benefits and favours of God.—Finally, all those, and especially public preachers, are to be admonished, that in this high subject they decline neither to the right hand nor to the left, that is, that they do not so preach Free-will as to derogate from the grace of God, nor so extol grace as to leave no room for Free-will.” (i)

In this book, which received the approving signatures of the same persons who, in eight years after the publication of this last edition, compiled the Articles of Edward VI. we find the same doctrines, drawn up in the same order, and expressed, almost verbatim, in the same terms that they are in the Seventeenth Article. The call through grace—the reconciliation to God—the Free Justification—the adoption into Sonship—the receiving of ability to walk in the ways of the Lord—and, *at length*, to be esteemed and reputed justified, and to obtain everlasting life—are they not merely restated and confirmed in the Article which declares, “They through

(i) “Est enim illius inexhausta bonitas, vultque omnes nos salvos fieri, et curat ea ac ea providet, quæ in salutem nostram sunt, nisi nostra velimus malitia nos ab illo avertere atque nostra culpa perditum ire. Nam ipsi certe nobis peccati et exitii auctores sumus, non Deus; damnabimur autem justo ipsius iudicio, si naturam primò recte conditam, et deinde a lapsu restitutam, contaminare, et vitio conspurcare voluerimus carnisque et mundi cupiditatibus, posthabita ipsius voluntate obsequi.

“Monendi itaque homines sunt, ne damnationem suam Deo ascribant, sed sibi suoque vitio acceptam referant, qui tot Dei beneficiis ac donis pro suæ voluntatis malitia et libidine, ingrati abuntur.

“Postremo admonendi sunt hi omnes, et præsertim illi qui sacras apud populum conciones habent ne in hoc tam sublimi argumento, vel ad dextram vel ad sinistram declinent, id est, ut gratiam Dei afficiant contumelia, nec gratia sic efferant, ut libero arbitrio locum non relinquunt.”

grace obey the calling—they be justified freely—they be made sons of God by adoption—they be made like the image of his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ—they walk religiously in good works, and *at length*, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity."—Nay, more, in the Book and in the Article, the same dangers, resulting from a misapplication of the doctrine of Predestination, are contemplated, and the same cautions are resorted to, as guards against its abuse. Both the dangers and the cautions are briefly referred to by Bancroft, Bishop of London, in the Hampton Court Conference, as the Spokesman of the Clergy, and the expounder of the faith of the Church to King James:—"Upon the first motion concerning falling from grace, (says he,) may your Majesty bee pleased to consider how many in these dayes neglect holinesse of life, presuming on persisting in grace upon Predestination, *if I shall be saved, I shall be saved*. A desperate doctrine, contrary to good divinity, wherein we should reason, rather ascendendo than descendendo, from our obedience to God, and love to our neighbour, to our Election and Predestination. As for the doctrine of the Church of England, touching Predestination, it is in the very next paragraph, viz. we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture, and in our doings the will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God." (*k*)

The assurance of our election, derived only from the spiritual motions and signs of grace in our hearts, kindling the love of heavenly things in our souls, and shining forth in good works, together with an admonition to hear and

(*k*) Fuller's Ch. History, Book x.

follow that which the Scripture plainly and simply teacheth—as expressed in the Book—and the same proof of our election, joined to a similar admonition in the Article, are the guards which, in both, are interposed between God's holiness and man's presumption, on the one hand, and God's mercy and man's despair, on the other; guards and declarations which we are authorised, by Bancroft, to say, contain the doctrine of the Church of England, touching Predestination.

And as they agree in the tenor of the doctrine, they agree, also, in tracing its abuses to the same unhappy sources.—If the Book advises that curious and idle imaginations concerning Predestination be dismissed—and that men are to be warned, 'that they do not ascribe their damnation to God, but that they charge it upon themselves, and their own pravity, perversity, and wickedness,' the Article marks out "curious and carnal persons," as the subjects for the machinations "of the Devil," that father of lies, who compasses their perdition, by tempting them "to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination;" in other words, 'to ascribe their damnation to God,' "thereby thrusting them either into desperation," while 'God wills their salvation,' "or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perillous than desperation;" because they, by 'their own wickedness, withdraw themselves from God, and go to ruin by their own fault.'

So exact a correspondence between these two public documents will, we think, justify the position that the one was the archetype of the other. Had not the lineaments and the colouring of both been the work of the same hands, this inference, we admit, could not be supported. A

similar combination of circumstances will, at the most remote periods, and in distant regions, give a similar direction to the human mind, and produce a striking conformity of sentiment. But the proof of this combination, which would operate, in such a case, in vindicating originality to the more modern, will, in the present instance, indicate the Article to be the copy of its predecessor. We have seen that the erecting of barriers against the abuse of Predestination, was the object of the Article, and of the mention of the subject in the Book. The Gospellers who reviled, in terms bequeathed to Predestinarians, as Free-willers, Pelagians, Papists, &c. all those who would not allow "that Cain was predestinated to slay his brother,"^(l) and who continued, in the reign of Edward, to propagate their pernicious doctrine with success,^(m) were the adversaries against whom they sought security; and the formal enactment of the Seventeenth Article, at the latter period, testified the unaltered sentiments of horror with which our Reformers continued to regard the detestable monster.

We are, therefore, we believe, entitled to regard this portion of the King's Book, and the Article, in the relative connexion which we have assigned to them, and to affirm to the Reformers an uninterrupted uniformity of opinion upon this subject, from the first expression of it, in Redmayn's authorised Treatise on Justification, to its enactment in the forty-two Articles of Edward VI.

The certainty of this connexion will be more evident, on bringing together extracts from the King's Book, and those Articles which decide the

(l) Heylin's Quinquar. Hist. Part iii. p. 4. London, 1660.

(m) Latimer and Hooper make them the frequent subjects of their Sermons, and of their reproofs.

character of that species of Predestination which they maintain.—A glance will suffice.

The Articles we allude to are, the Second and Thirty-first, which treat of the extent of the Redemption; the Ninth, the subject of which is Original Sin; the Tenth, which treats of the inability of the natural man to please God, and the consequent necessity of preventing grace; and the Sixteenth, which relates to falling from grace.

Now the King's Book asserts of the Redemption, "that our Saviour, Jesus Christ, offered himself a victim to the Father for the salvation of the world; since he wills all men to be saved, without respect of persons, inviting all to salvation; and to a participation of his own glory and happiness."⁽ⁿ⁾ The second Article, "that the Son was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men." The thirty-first, that, "the offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of *the whole world*, both original and actual." The King's Book affirms, "that this concupiscence is the inclination and proneness of our depraved and vitiated nature to sin, into which wretchedness we are plunged by Original Sin; which sin, though abolished and forgiven in Baptism, yet the rebellion of the flesh against the spirit remains, and will be terminated only with our bodily death."^(o) The Ninth Article states,

(n) "—— quod quamvis servator noster Jesus Christus se victimam Patri pro salute mundi obtulit,—ut omnes homines absque personarum respectu velit salvos fieri, omnes ad salutem, &c." De Justific.

(o) "Hæc concupiscentia inclinatio est et pronitas depravatæ ac vitiosæ naturæ nostræ in peccatum, in quam miseriam ex peccato originali incidimus, quod peccatum etsi baptismo deletum et condonatum est, manet tamen carnis adversus spiritum rebellio quæ non nisi morte corporali terminabitur." In Precat. Dominicam. "Et ne nos inducas in tentationem."

“that Original Sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated.”

The Book affirms, “that this truly is the gift of grace alone, that, at first, the inclinations are moved and excited to good.”—“For though the light of reason is not entirely extinguished in man, it is, however, enveloped and invested with such excessive darkness, that it is only scarcely, and not without great difficulty, that it can see its way through even those inferior pursuits, the business and the offices of this world, but it is of itself weak, and incapable of understanding and extricating those things which relate to a future and immortal existence.” “And as the understanding, so also the will, is subject to this fault of imbecility, which, though it can exercise itself in matters relating to this life according to its own discretion, still it is weak and impotent in engaging in spiritual and heavenly things.” “That the grace of God is so required that except it *prevent*, and accompany, and wait upon Free-will, no good or holy work can be performed by us, or so much as be resolved upon in the mind and inclination.”(p)

(p) “Hoc sane solius est Gratiae beneficium quod primo voluntates ad bonum moventur et excitantur.”

“Quanquam enim rationis lumen—ad ea autem quae ad futuram et immortalem vitam spectant, intelligenda et eruenda ex se invalidum et insufficiens existat—Jam quemadmodum intellectus ita etiam voluntas huic imbecillitatis vitio subjecta est quae—ad spiritualia tamen et caelestia capessenda invalida atque inefficax est.” “Sic requiri Gratiam Dei, ut nisi ea liberum arbitrium et praevēniat, et comitetur et deducat, nihil boni aut sancti operis a nobis confici, aut animo saltem ac voluntate constitui possit.”—De Liber. Arbitrio.

The Tenth Article declares, "that the condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn and prepare *himself*, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God; wherefore, we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, *without* the grace of God, by Christ, *preventing* us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will."

The Book avows, "that we may be sure that God (as far as it relates to him) will abundantly supply every thing, and that he will never desert us, if we will adhere to him and abide in him, in which state if we persevere to the end, we are certain of our salvation, and that from the infallible promise of Christ." (q) The Sixteenth Article, "that after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives."

In this mere juxtaposition of the language of the Book, and that of the Articles, the coincidence of sentiments is too obvious to require comment; and what shall we infer? That in the Articles there was a departure from the adjuncts which accompanied the doctrine of Predestination, in the Book—not a syllable appears in the Articles to countenance such an assumption. They accord with the Book not only in the specific views of Predestination, but in all its ramifications, and differ from it only in being less diffuse.

Where, then, is the evidence of the Reformers having *renounced* the positions, with which they accompany the expounding of these doctrines in the

(q) Adeo ut certi esse possimus, Deum (quod ad ipsum spectat) abunde omnia præstiturum, &c."—De Certitudine Prædestinationis.

Book?—and yet had they favored such a renunciation, it must have been specifically declared, for they were under a strict necessity of drawing a well-defined line of demarcation between such of the doctrines of that Book as they rejected, and those which they retained, because they had all been circulated with the sanction of their names among the people; and all those would necessarily continue to be regarded as the doctrine of the Reformers, which were not explicitly abandoned.

This negative evidence it is plainly incumbent on our opponents to adduce; but none such exists; and we shall, therefore, take leave to affirm, that no change, no alteration was contemplated; that the doctrines in the Articles on this subject, are the result of the same undeviating sentiments which were before promulgated by the same men, in the King's Book; and that if, where the Articles are "darkly and sparsely set down," we should take any commentary beyond themselves, and books of concurrent authority for their illustration, it is not to the Helvetic Confession, or to writings formed on its system, we should have recourse; but to that work, out of whose materials the doctrines of the Articles appear to have been constructed.

We do, therefore, assert to the Articles, in their primary intention, the declaration of the Book, *viz.* "that whether there is any special knowledge through faith, by which any man could assure himself that he was of the number of the predestinate, and of those who would persevere to the end in their Christian vocation, we have no knowledge or certainty of this kind handed down or commended, either in the testimony of the scriptures, or the writings of the

holy Fathers." (r)—“ That the frequent precepts, prohibitions, and threatenings with which, in almost every sentence of scripture, God accosts us, most clearly prove that man, even since the fall of Adam, is endued with the freedom of the will; for otherwise, to what purpose were these phrases, “ be not overcome of evil,—do not neglect grace,—love not the world,—if you would enter into life, keep the commandments, &c.” All these precepts would be uttered to no purpose, if there were not in man any capacity or power, through which he might be able, God’s grace assisting him, (provided that he chose to embrace it when offered,) to attend to, and to perform things which relate to his salvation, and not only to understand the commands of God, but also to apply his will to keeping them. And this is that which, by those ancient and Catholic Fathers of the Church, is called Free-will—and which may be aptly described to be, “a power of the will joined with reason, by which, in matters that can be discerned and decided upon by reason, any one turns himself, without compulsion, either to good or evil”—yet, in the mean time, we should keep in mind, that this ability is too weak to be able to incite itself either to think or to do those things which are pleasing and acceptable to God, except it be sustained by the support of God, but that it can both choose and accomplish evil of itself, and of its own strength; and,

(r) “ *Cæterum an singularis aliqua sit per fidem notitia, qua quisquam certo apud se statuere et sibi confirmare possit, esse se de numero prædestinatorum et eorum qui in Christiana vocatione ad finem usque perseveraturi sint, non est ut in præsentia dicamus, cum nullam hujusmodi notitiam aut certitudinem vel divinarum literarum testimonio, vel sanctorum patrum scriptis traditum commendatumve habeamus, &c.*”—*Pia et Cathol. Christ. Hom. Inst. p. 12. London, 1544.*

therefore, it is defined by others to be, "a faculty of the reason and the will, by which good is chosen, with the assistance of grace, but evil when that grace is lacking." Which energy of the Holy Spirit, or grace, though in the immense goodness of God it is offered to all; they alone, however, derive benefit from, who accommodate their will to the receiving and retaining of grace." "This truly is the gift of grace alone, that at first, our wills are moved and stirred up to God. But in temptation, to resist, and to overcome, to persevere in these good actions, and to advance in the progress of piety; that truly is the property of grace, and of our Free-will, and efforts united to it, &c." (s)

To these extracts, many more might be added, which we refrain from quoting, to avoid prolixity. We shall, for the same reason, withhold the application of those that have been now offered to the attention of our Readers, and shall take leave of the Book, with a few observations that will arise from presenting the Articles to it, and to the summary of the Absolute-Predestination doctrines, in parallel columns; a form which we adopt, that it may be the more readily seen, which of the two mirrors more faithfully reflects their features.

(s) "Crebra illa præcepta, prohibitiones, et comminationes, quibus per singulas pene Scripturæ Sententias, Deus nos compellat, clarissime ostendunt hominem arbitrii libertate præditum esse, &c." De libero Arbitrio.

INSTITUTION, &c.
OR
KING'S BOOK.

Whether there is any
special knowledge
through Faith, by which
any man could assure
himself that *he* was of the
number of the Predestinate,
and of those who would
persevere to the end in
their Christian vocation,
we have no knowledge or
certainty of this kind ;

but,

This Justification is ef-
fected when,

being called
through his Grace,
we are converted to him-
self, and are reconciled.

All things are confer-
red .

freely on us, and not
on account of our *dignity*,
nor could any merit of
ours

ARTICLES.

ARTICLE XVII.

Predestination to Life
is the everlasting purpose
of God, whereby (before
the foundations of the
world were laid) he hath
constantly decreed, by
his counsel,

secret unto us,

to deliver from curse and
damnation, those whom
he hath chosen, in Christ,
out of mankind, and to
bring them by Christ, to
everlasting salvation, as
vessels made to honour:—
wherefore they which be
endued with so excellent
a benefit of God,

be called

according to God's pur-
pose,

by his Spirit

working in due season,
(because)

ARTICLE XIII.

Works done

before

the Grace of Christ, and
the inspiration of his spirit,
are not pleasant to God,
neither do they make men
meet to receive Grace,
or, (as the school authors
say)

ARTICLES.

ARTICLE XVII.

Predestination to Life, is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed, by his counsel,

secret unto us,

to deliver from curse and damnation, those whom he hath chosen, in Christ, out of mankind, and to bring them, by Christ, to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour:— wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God,

be called,

according to God's purpose,

by his Spirit

working in due season, (because)

ARTICLE XIII.

Works done

before

the Grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his spirit, are not pleasant to God, neither do they make men meet to receive Grace, or, (as the school authors say)

INQUIRY, &c.

“ All the gifts, both small and great, as well spiritual as temporal, which God purposed
to give unto me,

God himself had before appointed, *when I was yet in my mother's womb,* where I could neither wish, think, nor do, any good thing. Therefore, this gift also

came unto me

by the mere Predestination

and free mercy of God, before I was yet born.

Whatsoever we do, think, or imagine, is abominable in the sight of God; neither is his law or his will written in our members, or in our hearts:

INSTITUTION, &c.

precede
the Grace of God, since
Grace is the parent of
merit, &c.

(because,)
As the Understanding, so
also the Will, is subject
to the disease of imbecility,
which renders it

weak and impotent in
engaging in spiritual and
heavenly things :

(hence it is that)
Through his Grace we
are converted

to himself and reconciled
to him ;

(for,)

The Grace of God is
so required, that

except it prevent

and accompany, and es-
cort Free-will,
no good or holy work can
be performed by us, or be
so much as resolved upon
in the mind and inclina-
tion.

“ Justification is the
free gift
of God, and is

ARTICLES.

deserve
Grace of *congruity* :

(for,)

ARTICLE X.

The condition of man
after the fall of Adam is
such, that

He cannot turn and
prepare himself ;
(and therefore,)

ARTICLE XVII.

They through Grace,
obey

the calling:—

(since)

ARTICLE X.

We have no power to
do good works pleasant
and acceptable to God,

without

the Grace of God by
Christ,

preventing
us, that we may have a
good will,
and working with us,
when we have that good
will.

ARTICLE XVII.

They be justified
freely :
(for,)

ARTICLE XI.

We are accounted righ-
teous before God, only

ARTICLES.

deserve
Grace of congruity:

(for,)

ARTICLE X.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that

He cannot turn and prepare himself;
(and therefore,)

ARTICLE XVII.

They through Grace, *obey* the calling:—
(since)

ARTICLE X.

We have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God,

without the Grace of God by Christ,

preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

ARTICLE XVII.

They be justified *freely*:
(for,)

ARTICLE XI.

We are accounted righteous before God, only

INQUIRY, &c.

Neither is there any more power in us to follow the will of God, than in a stone to ascend upwards.

None can come unto Christ, unless it be given unto him, and unless the Father draw him:

Neither is there such a sufficient measure of Grace vouchsafed unto every man, whereby he is enabled to come unto everlasting life.

And this we are sure of, that whomsoever he chooseth, them he saveth of his mercy. Grace only maketh the distinction between the redeemed and the lost; who by a cause drawn from their

INSTITUTION, &c.

gratuitously
conferred on us, in like
manner as all our good
works and good desires
proceed from Grace ;
and we who were sons of
wrath and death, are rendered

Sons of God

and heirs of eternal life ;
so that by the free gift of
God we are enabled

*to walk in the ways
of the Lord.*

Yet we must remember, that though Original Sin is abolished and forgiven in baptism, yet *the rebellion of the flesh against the spirit remains*, and will be terminated only with our death.

And at length,
in the last Judgment of
God, they are esteemed
and reputed justified, and
obtain *everlasting life.*

Penitence, in general,
is an internal anguish of
mind for sins, and a detestation of them ; toge-

ARTICLES.

for the merit of our
Lord and Saviour Jesus
Christ by faith, and
*not for our own
works or deservings.*

ARTICLE XVII.

They be made

Sons of God

by adoption ; they be
made like the image of
his only-begotten Son Je-
sus Christ ;

*they walk religiously
in good works :*

(yet,)

ARTICLE IX.

*this original infection of
nature doth remain, yea,*
in them that are regenerated :

ARTICLE XVII.

And (notwithstanding)
at length,

by God's mercy, they attain to *everlasting felicity :*

(for)

ARTICLES.

for the merit of our
Lord and Saviour Jesus
Christ by faith, and
*not for our own
works or deservings.*

ARTICLE XVII.

They be made
Sons of God
by adoption; they be
made like the image of
his only-begotten Son Je-
sus Christ;
*they walk religiously
in good works:*

(yet,)

ARTICLE IX.

*this original infection of
nature doth remain, yea,
in them that are regene-
rated:*

ARTICLE XVII.

And (notwithstanding)
at length,
by God's mercy, they at-
tain to *everlasting felicity:*

(for)

INQUIRY, &c.

common original, were
framed together into

one mass of perdition.

God, by his immove-
able counsels, ordained
some of his creatures to
praise him, and
live blessedly
from him, and in him,
and by him; namely, by
his eternal Predestination,
his free calling, and his
grace, which was due to
none.

INSTITUTION, &c.

therwith a vehement longing to be pardoned, and a determined resolution of amending our lives, joined *with earnest efforts and desires to recover lost grace, and to persist in the same grace in time to come.*(t)

And that we do not entertain any other assurance of our election, than by

spiritual motions and signs of grace in our hearts, which do not only kindle the love of heavenly things in our souls, but do also shine forth in our Good Works,

in which, moreover, we must *persevere* to the remotest period of our lives, that we may be truly reckoned in the number of the Elect.

Let all curious and idle imaginations concerning Predestination be dismissed and entirely rejected. Men are to be warned that they do not

ARTICLES.

ARTICLE XVI.

After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may *depart from grace given,* and fall into sin, and by the Grace of God *we may arise again, and amend our lives.*

ARTICLE XVII.

As the godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and to such as

feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things,

as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently *kindle* their love towards God: So for curious and carnal persons lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination is a most dan-

(t) De Pœnitentia, p. 4.

ARTICLES.

ARTICLE XVI.

After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the Grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives.

ARTICLE XVII.

As the godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and to such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: So for curious and carnal persons lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination is a most dan-

INQUIRY, &c.

A true lively, justifying faith, and the sanctifying Spirit of God is not extinguished nor vanisheth away, in the regenerate, either finally or totally.

The cause moving God to predestinate unto life is not the foreseeing of faith or perseverance, or good works, or of any thing which is in the person predestinated, but only the good pleasure of God himself.

For all things being ordained for the manifestation of his glory, and his glory being to appeare both in the works of his mercy and his justice, it seemed good to his heavenly wisdom, to choose out a certain number to whom he would extend his undeserved mercy.

INSTITUTION, &c.

*ascribe their damnation
to God,*

but that they cast it on
their own pravity, who,
in the perverseness and
wantonness of their own
will, ungratefully abuse
so many benefits and fa-
vours of God.

For

God's goodness is inex-
haustible, and provides
those things which are for
our salvation, except
*we will by our wickedness
withdraw ourselves from
him,*
and go to ruin through
our own fault;

inasmuch as,

our Saviour Jesus Christ
offered himself a victim
to the Father for the
*salvation of the world, since
he wills all men to be saved*
without respect of per-
sons.

Let all curions and idle
imaginations concerning

Predestination

ARTICLES.

gerous downfall, whreby
the Devil doth thrust them
either

into desperation,
or into wretchlessness of
most unclean living, no
less perilous than despe-
ration.

ARTICLE XII.

And therefore they are
to be condemned which
*deny the place of forgive-
ness to such as truly re-
pent,*

(since)

ARTICLE XXX.

The offering of Christ
once made, is that per-
fect redemption, propitia-
tion and satisfaction
*for all the sins of the whole
world,*
both Original and actual.

ARTICLE XVII.

Furthermore we must
receive God's
promises

ARTICLES.

gerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either

into desperation,
or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

ARTICLE XII.

And therefore they are to be condemned which *deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent,*

(since)

ARTICLE XXX.

The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction *for all the sins of the whole world,* both Original and actual.

INQUIRY, &c.

leaving the rest to be spectacles of his justice ;

whom he repelleth them of his secret and unsearchable judgment, he condemneth.

Such as are not predestinated to salvation shall finally be condemned for their sins.

INSTITUTION, &c.

be dismissed and entirely rejected; and let us hear and follow that which the *Scripture plainly and simply teacheth.*

ARTICLES.

in such wise as they be *generally* set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and in our doings,

That Will of God is to be followed, which we have

expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

In which of these, the extracts from the King's Book, or those from the Inquiry, shall we more certainly trace a resemblance to the first paragraph of the Seventeenth Article, which states the Elect to be chosen according to the tenor of a decree secret unto us, and, therefore, not discoverable—in the Book, which disavows any warrant, either from Scripture or the Fathers, for a special assurance of being one of the predestinated—or in the Inquiry, which describes an individual interest in a special decree, viz. “the gifts which God purposed to give unto me;” and that decree as taking effect upon that individual, “came unto me;” and therefore discovered—which admits a mortal into the secrets of the Incomprehensible—limits a period for the application of the decree, “when I was yet in my mother's womb,” and assumes the Election to be the result of mere Predestination?

Again—In which shall we find the doctrine of grace represented with more exact conformity to the Articles—which couple the inability of man with the consequent necessity of spiritual

aid—which pronounce the redemption to be universal—and thereby divest the application of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, necessary to every Son of Adam, of any individual partiality? In the Book, which esteems preventing grace offered to all, but accepted in the freedom of moral agency, by those only who turn to God—or in the Inquiry, which derives the operations of the Spirit, with physical necessity upon passive beings, irresistibly changing the wills of those who have no more power, not to go before, but to follow the will of a God, than a stone to ascend upwards?

Again—In which shall we discover the proofs of Election pourtrayed with more precise correspondence to the Article that combines the effect of our Election only. “with walking religiously in good works,” and consequently recognizes the connexion no longer than while we thus walk?—In the Book, which charges us to entertain no other assurance of our Election than that which is thus evidenced—or in the Inquiry, which extends this assurance to a state of actual guilt; holding that the sanctifying Spirit of God “is not extinguished nor vanisheth away in the regenerate, either finally or totally, because their Predestination is wholly independent of perseverance, or good works, or any thing in the person predestinated?—Finally—but here subject for comparison ceases; there is nothing in the Article to which the reprobation of the Inquiry can be compared; it exhibits no trace of this inseparable adjunct of absolute Predestination; it leaves none to be spectacles of his justice; it consigns none to a condemnation originating, not in their sins, but in an inevitable repulsion; it refuses to none a sufficient measure of grace, whereby he is enabled to come unto

everlasting life. The Inquiry alone attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable justice of a Being, who is love in the abstract, with the irremediable destruction of his creatures, whom yet it can aver he does not hate.

In marking some of the stronger traits which occur on turning the Article alternately towards the Book, and towards the Inquiry, we feel conscious that we may be spared the necessity of a more minute recapitulation. Enough, we believe, has been produced to establish, to the satisfaction of the unprejudiced, that the sentiments delivered in the extracts from the Inquiry, and those contained in the Articles, could have scarcely emanated from the same mind; there is a virtual, even when there is not an expressed, opposition in their tenor and spirit; in them, as in the King's Book, their archetype, Election and Special Grace, being united to Universal Redemption, the two former must be so interpreted, as not to admit of any additions which would militate with the latter; and Free-will is then necessarily recognized by the Articles, under the same restrictions as it is in the "Pious and Catholic Institution."

We cannot, we think, conclude this investigation of the earliest expressions of the sentiments of our Reformers, more suitably than by confirming the claims of Redmayn's Treatise, and the King's Book, to the concurrent suffrage of the Fathers; and, as submission to the unanimous consent of antiquity was a standard regulation among the Reformers of Edward's days, we shall have thence the strongest grounds of assurance, that if the "Treatise on Justification," and the "Pious Institution," have not been incorrect in asserting to themselves this approbation, the doctrine which was once received upon that sanction was not afterward relinquished.

It is not our intention to exhibit, for this purpose, the long lines of those venerable ancients, furnished by both the Greek and Latin Churches. The Reader, who would desire to satisfy a laudable curiosity, for an exact knowledge of the opinion of each, will find the labour of research into the original writings abridged by the learned selections of Vossius, in his "Historia Pelagiana," those of "Whitby on Election, &c." together with others, and those of Bishop Tomline, of our own day, in his "Refutation of Calvinism."—Our object will be fully answered, we conceive, by the following quotations from Vossius, viz.—"That the Greek Fathers invariably, and the Latin Fathers down to the time of Augustine, are wont to say, that they are predestinated to life who God *foresaw* would live piously and righteously."(s)—He adds, from Beza's Notes on Rom. ix. v. 39. "This passage is to be carefully observed against those who make the foreseeing of Faith or Works the cause of Election. Into which error, a most scandalous one truly, Origen drew most of the ancients, as well Greek as Latin, until, at length, the Lord raised up Augustine, through means of the Pelagians, to discover and correct this error."(t)—He quotes Calvin, also, to the same effect, acknowledging, in his Institutes, "Thus, by interposing the veil of Foreknowledge, they not

(s) "Græci Patres semper, Patrum Latinorum vero illi, qui ante Augustinum vixerunt, dicere solent, eos esse prædestinatos ad Vitam, quos Deus pie recteque victuros *prævidit*, &c."—Hist. Pelag. Lib. ii. Thes. 8va.

(t) "Est etiam hic locus diligenter observandus adversus eos, qui fidei vel operum prævisionem faciunt Electionis causam. In quem Errorem sane turpissimum Origines, veteres plerosque, tum Græcos, tum Latinos adegit: donec tandem Dominus Augustinum per Pelagianos, ad hunc agnoscendum et corrigendum Errorem, excitaret."—Ibid.

only obscure Election; but they pretend that it derives its origin from another source.—Nor truly is this vulgar opinion received by the mere vulgar only, for it has been supported by names of great note in all ages:—a fact that I frankly own, lest any person should persuade himself that our cause would be greatly impeded, if the authority of these were urged in opposition to it.”(u)

Calvin’s apparent frankness is manifestly enough the reluctant confession of a strong mind, which, in the consciousness of its own powers, admits the truth of a position which cannot be refuted, that it may the more boldly repel its influence from the merits of the cause; while his colleague Beza’s recognition of a special providence, in raising up St. Austin to stem the torrent of what he calls error, is, as plainly, the mortifying consolation of an indignant spirit.—But their unsuspecting testimony, at all events, fully verifies the statement of the Books in whose behalf it has been cited; and it, with Vossius’s summary, fully establishes the identity of the judgment of concurring antiquity, on the subjects of Election and Grace, and the opinions of the Reformers expressed in these publications.

This identity descended, in their uninterrupted deference for the judgment of antiquity, upon the Articles, and warrants us to affirm, that the Election of the Seventeenth Article is no other than that which devolved from the apostolic age upon Clemens Alexandrinus, one of the earliest

(u) “ Sic interposito præscientiæ velo electionem non modo obscurant, sed originem aliunde habere fingunt. Neque vero hæc vulgo recepta opinio solius vulgi est. Habuit enim sæculis omnibus magnos authores. Quod ingenue fateor nequis causæ nostræ magnopere obfuturum confidat, si eorum Nomina contra opponantur.”—Ibid. Instit. Lib. iii. Cap. xxiii.

and ablest writers of the Church, and who, so far from deriving his opinions from Origen, flourished before that celebrated author.—Two or three sentences taken from his *Stromata*, as they occurred, will shew of what elements the sentiments of the Reformers on this doctrine were composed.—This Father, using the term *Elect* in its ordinary acceptation in his day, because he uses it incidentally, says, “For by *Church* I do not now mean *place*, but the assembly of the *Elect*.”(v)—But whom does he understand by *Elect*? Judge from what follows:—“We have,” says he, “been born to be obedient to the commandments, if we adopt the determination to be saved.”(x)—“Nor, truly, shall he that is saved be saved against his will, for he is not irrational; but altogether he will rather voluntarily and heartily speed to salvation.”(y)—“All things lie without respect of persons before God, and he is blameless: he that is in a capacity of receiving mercy is pitied, and he that wills it has the strength.”(z)

The private writings of Cranmer, the standard-bearer of the Reformation, to whom the Articles are solely attributed by Burnet, though upon evidence somewhat equivocal; (a) of the venerable

(v) ἡ γὰρ οὖν τὸν τόπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν, ἐκκλησίαν καλεῖ.” *Strom.* 7. p. 514.

(x) “γινόμεθα δι’ εἶναι πιθηνοὶ ταῖς ἐπιταγαῖς, καὶ τὸ βύλισθαι σώζεσθαι ἰλοιμῶμεθα.” *Strom.* 7. p. 511.

(y) ἤτις μὲν ἄκων σωθήσονται ὁ σωζόμενος· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἄψυχος· ἀλλὰ παρὶς μᾶλλον ἰκυσίως καὶ προαιεσίτικῶς σπύσσει πρὸς σωτηρίαν. *Ibid.* 7. p. 520. A.

(z) πᾶσι γὰρ πάντα ἴσα κτῆσαι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. καὶ ἐστὶν αὐτὸς ἀμεμῆτος· ἰλασθεὶς δὲ ὁ δυναμένος· καὶ ὀβεληθῆς ἰσχυρῶς. *Ibid.* 7. p. 511: *Lugduni Batav. Dan. Heinsius.*

(a) The evidence to which he refers, is to be found in the report of the interrogatories objected to the Archbishop, with his answers annexed to the same. He is charged

Latimer, the Father of the reformed Clergy; and Hooper, the most distinguished preacher of his day, will be next resorted to. Ridley we do not quote, because he was unusually reserved on the subject of Predestination. He avows, indeed, to Hooper, (b) his entire agreement with him in doctrine; but as we know that he was extremely diffident of meddling with the subject, we shall ground nothing upon this accordance. He committed himself by no decisive expressions on either side.—“Sir,” says he to Bradford, “in these matters I am so fearful, that I dare not speak farther, yea almost none otherwise than the very texte dothe, as it were, lead me by the hand.” (c)—These whom we shall quote were men whose private sentiments, if those of any had that preponderating influence, gave tone to the enacted doctrines of the Church which they were chosen to propound;—and to them, while we renew our protest against the validity of the tribunal, we are not afraid to refer.—Here we are ready to meet the Inquiry on terms of its own prescribing, and to put the merits of the cause to issue on this appeal. Cranmer, Latimer,

with compiling and causing to be set abroad divers books; and the names of the books having been recited to him in order, he is reported to have answered—“As for the Catechisme, the booke of Articles, with the other booke against Winchester, hee granted the same to be his doings.” But in the official dispatch of Bishop Brookes to the Cardinal de Puteo, the answer is stated somewhat differently. “As to the Catechism and Articles, he owns, (not that he edited, as he says of other books,) but that he took a part about the editing of the same.” “Se adhibuisse ejus consilium circa editionem ejusdem.” Of other books, “se edidisse.”—Wordsworth’s Eccles. Biog. Cranmer, Vol. iii. p. 555. Editor’s note, quoted from Lambeth MSS.

(b) Letters of Martyrs.

(c) Ibid.

and Hooper, we claim from the Inquiry;— they have been compelled to lend their countenance to a cause which they do not support; they have been injuriously exhibited as the advocates of tenets which they utterly disclaim. The palpable repugnance of their sentiments to the system of the Inquiry was before its Author;— the very writings in which Latimer's and Hooper's dissent is recorded are noticed; but the extracts, which were deemed sufficient in the opinions of those who produced them to support this dissent, are never presented to the Reader of the Inquiry: its existence is as slightly marked as if it had been the 'baseless fabric of a vision:—the opportunity of comparing these apparently conflicting sentiments is refused to his Reader:—means of attempting either to reconcile opinions said to be at variance, or to adjudge them to one of the contending claimants, are withheld:—in a work, too, the very essence of whose constitution it should be to produce no ex-parte evidence, but to propound not barely the truth, but the whole truth.—Cranmer's Catechism, too, was in his hands;—a tract which, as might naturally be expected, treats of the doctrine of grace, and expatiates upon it, in condescension to weak capacities. But this work is postponed to some partial selections from his Annotations on the King's Book—a Commentary without a Text; and even in these selections, the fourth important Annotation of which the Commentator says, "In this part I have spoken the more largely, because I do refer unto the fourth note all other places, like to the same matter appertaining," (*d*) is wholly omitted; and all subsequent reference to it, expressly given in the Annotations, carefully

(*d*) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. p. 84.

suppressed in the extracts furnished by the Inquiry. Nay, more;—Annotations which lay in the natural order of the quotations are passed by, while those both above and below them, have the honour of being transplanted into the pages of the Inquiry.—If it will be seen that the omitted parts in the Annotations serve to throw a light round the extracts of the Inquiry, which will alter the apparent complexion they derive from the scanty portion administered to them in that work; and if, in these taken as a whole, and in the Catechism, there will be found a flow of thought running in even tenor with that which characterises the King's Book, what conclusions are we not authorised to draw of the weakness of a cause, which would endeavour to secure success by mutilated statements? We shall not trust ourselves to speak of this garbling in the terms of grave reprehension which a just indignation would inspire; we wish that facts should speak for themselves; we are desirous only to clear the justice of the cause, and we willingly restrain every expression which might seem to impart the soil of temper to the purity of truth.

To begin with Latimer.—We shall vindicate him from a suppositious support of the system of the Inquiry, partly by supplying the lacunæ left in that publication, and partly by extracts which could not arrest the attention of the Author of that work. It will be then seen whether absolute Predestination, in other words, "personal Election, (p. 156,) appears to have been the belief, even of Latimer himself, "who," yet it is allowed, "of all the English Reformers, speaks least like one who embraced this doctrine, and who has been cited by Heylin as a favourer of the opposite sentiment."(e)

(e) Inquiry, Part ii. p. 155, note.

We have no hesitation in saying, that the language of Cranmer's assessor will both be found to be in unison at once with the Articles and with the King's Book—and that his sentiments thus delivered as his own independently, unmodified by admixture with those of his colleagues in that Book, will affix that signification to the Articles, which we have already assigned to them.

“Many are [as in the Inquiry] called, and few are chosen.” These words of our Saviour are very hard to understand, and therefore it is not good to be too curious in them, as some vain fellows do, who, seeking carnal liberty, pervert, toss, and turn the Word of God after their own mind and purpose. Such (I say) when they read these words, make their reckoning thus, saying: “What need I to mortify my body with abstaining from all sin and wickedness? I perceive God hath chosen some, and some are rejected: now, if I be in the number of the chosen, I cannot be damned; but if I be accounted among the condemned number, then I cannot be saved, for God's judgments are immutable.” Such foolish and wicked reasons some have, which bring them either to desperation, or else to carnal liberty. (f) —Therefore it is as needful to beware of such reasons or expositions of the Scriptures, as it is to beware of the devil himself.

“But if thou art desirous to know whether thou art chosen to everlasting life, thou mayst not begin with God, for God is too high; thou canst not comprehend him. The judgments of God are unknown to man, therefore thou mayst not begin there; but begin with Christ, and wherefore he came, namely, that he came to save sinners. Consider, I say, Christ and his coming,

(f) Compare with the reasons assigned for the constructing of the 17th Article, pp. 77, 78, 79, of this Apology.

and then begin to try thyself, whether thou art in the book of life, or not. If thou findest thyself in Christ, then thou art sure of everlasting life; if thou be without him, then thou art in an evil case. For it is written, "No man cometh unto the Father, but through me." Therefore if thou knowest Christ, then thou mayst know further of thy Election." (g) Here the Inquiry stops.

It then follows in the Original:—"But when we are about this matter, and are troubled within ourselves, whether we be elect or no, we must ever have this maxim or principal rule before our eyes, namely, that God loveth us, God beareth a fatherly heart towards us.

"But you will say, how shall I know that, or how shall I believe that? We may know God's will towards us, through Christ. God hath opened himself unto us by his Son Christ. For saith John the Evangelist, "The Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed:" therefore, we may perceive his good will and love towards us: he hath sent the same, his Son, into this world, which hath suffered most painful death for us. Shall I now think that God hateth me? Or shall I doubt of his love towards me?

"Here you see how you shall avoid the scrupulous and most dangerous question of the Predestination of God; for if thou wilt inquire his councils, and enter into his consistory, thy wit will deceive thee, for thou shalt not be able to search the councils of God. But if thou begin with Christ, and consider his coming into the world, and dost believe that God hath sent him for *thy* sake, to suffer for *thee*, and to deliver *thee* from sin, death, the devil, and hell; then when thou art so armed with the knowledge of Christ, then I

(g) Inquiry, Part ii. pp. 48, 49.

say, this simple question cannot hurt thee; for thou art in the Book of Life, which is Christ himself.

“Also we learn by this last sentence, that “many are called;” that the preaching of the Gospel is *universal*; that it pertaineth to all mankind; that it is written, “Through the whole earth their sound is heard.” Now seeing that the Gospel is universal, it appeareth *that he would have all mankind saved, and that the fault is not in him, if we be damned.*(*h*) For it is written thus, “God would have all men to be saved.” His salvation is sufficient to save all mankind, *but we are so wicked ourselves, that we refuse the same, and will not take it, when it is offered unto us, and therefore he saith, “few are chosen,”* that is, few have pleasure and delight in it, for the most part are weary of it, they cannot abide it. And there are some that hear it, but they will abide no danger for it; they love more their riches and possessions, than the word of God. And therefore, “few are chosen,” there are but a few that stick heartily unto it, and can find in their hearts to forego this world, for God’s sake and his holy word. There are some now-a-days, that will not be reprehended by the gospel, they think themselves better than it.

Some again are so stubborn, that they will rather forswear themselves, than confess their sins and wickedness. *Such men are cause of their own damnation, for God would have them saved, but they refuse it, like as did Judas the traitor, whom Christ would have had to be saved, but he refused his salvation. He refused to follow the doctrine*

(*h*) See the extract from the Confession of the Saxonie Churches, cited, p. 33, of this Apology.

of his master Christ.(i) And so whosoever heareth the Word of God and followeth it, the same is *elect* by him; and again, whosoever *refuseth* to hear the Word of God, and to follow the same, is damned; so that our *Election is sure*, if we follow the Word of God. Here is now taught you, how to try out your Election, namely, in Christ; for Christ is the accounting book and register of God:—even in the same book, that is, *Christ*, are written all the *names of the Elect*. Therefore we cannot find our Election in ourselves, neither yet in the high council of God, for “unsearchable are the judgments of the Most High.”(k) Where shall I then find my Election? In the accounting book of God, which is Christ; for thus it is written, “God hath so entirely loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son to that end, that all that believe in him should not perish, but have life everlasting.” Whereby appeareth most plainly, that Christ is the book of life, and that all that believe in him are in the same book, and so *are chosen* to everlasting life, for only those are *ordained* which believe. Therefore, when thou hast faith in Christ, then thou art in the book of life, and so art thou sure of thy Election....And thus you may see who are in the book of life, and who are not; for all those that are obstinate sinners are without Christ, and so not elect to everlasting life, *if they remain in their wickedness*. There are none of us all, but we may be saved by Christ, and therefore let us stick hard to it.”(l)

It is important to observe, that the Sermon, from which the extract has been made, was preached

(i) Compare with the Extracts from the King's Book, as given pp. 75, 76, (k) and with p. 74, in this Apology.

(l) Sermon on Septuagesima Sunday, on St. Matt. xx. i. Fathers of the English Church, Vol. ii. pp. 474—479.

in 1552, the very year in which the Articles of King Edward were published—an argument that the same spirit was transfused into both, and actuated both—a spirit which was the offspring of the sad necessity of the times. What that necessity was, and what the consequent design of our Reformers in inserting an Article on the subject of Predestination, are already before our Readers, collected both from the structure of the Article, and from other materials. If any doubt of the accuracy with which the delineation of their views has been sketched could have rested on the mind, we have, we think, a right to believe, that it will give way before Latimer's full and corroborating disclosure of the ideas which the brief language of the Article was intended to convey. This plain and sincere Christian, rejecting all the subtilty of intricate disputation, and searching for Election neither in personal appropriation, nor in the counsels of the Most High, which are 'secret unto us,' recognized with the King's Book and with the Article, every man's Election only in his obedience.—The terms were convertible;—the Elect were obedient, and the obedient were Elect; and again,—a departure from the one, was a departure from the other also.

His Sermon for the third Sunday after Epiphany, and that for the twenty-third Sunday after Trinity, convey so ample satisfaction on this point, that we cannot refuse portions of them a place here, even at the risk of making extracts which will probably be deemed superfluous. "We read in the Apostles, that when St. Paul had made a long Sermon at Antioch, there believed (saith the Evangelist) as many as were ordained to life everlasting. With the which saying a great number of people have been offended, and have said, "We perceive, that only those shall come to believe, and so to everlasting life, which are

chosen of God unto it; therefore it is no matter whatsoever we do, for if we be chosen to everlasting life, we shall have it." And so they have opened a door unto themselves of all wickedness and carnal liberty, against the true meaning of the Scripture; for if the most part be damned, the fault is not in God but in themselves; for it is written, "God would that all men should be saved;" but they themselves procure their own damnation, and despise the Passion of Christ by their own wicked and inordinate living.

"Here we may learn to keep us from all curious and dangerous questions. When we hear that some be chosen, and some be damned, let us have good hope that we shall be amongst the chosen, and live after this hope, that is, uprightly and godly; then thou shalt not be deceived. Think that God hath chosen those that believe in Christ, and that Christ is the book of life; if thou believest in him, then thou art written in the book of life, and shalt be saved. So we need not go about to trouble ourselves with curious questions of the Predestination of God, but let us rather *endeavour ourselves*, that we may be in Christ; for when we be in him, then are we well, and then we may be sure that we are ordained to everlasting life.

"But you will say, "How shall I know that I am in the book of life? How shall I try myself to be Elect of God to everlasting life?" I answer, first, we may know, *that we may one time be in the book, and another time come out again*; as it appeareth by David who was written in the book of life, but when he sinned, he at the same time was out of the book of the favour of God, *until he had repented*, and was sorry for his faults.(m) So we

(m) Compare with the Extract from the King's Book, de Pœnitentia, p. 92, where it is brought in contact with the xvi. Article, and with the inextinguishable grace of the Inquiry.

may be in the book one time, and afterward, when we forget God and his Word, and do wickedly, we come out of the book, that is, out of Christ, which is the book, and in that book are written all believers.”(n)

Again—“Christ only, and no man else, merited remission, justification, and eternal felicity, for as many as will believe the same. They that will not believe it shall not have it, for it is no more, but believe and have. *For Christ shed as much blood for Judas as he did for Peter*; Peter believed it, and therefore he was saved. Judas would not believe, and *therefore* he was condemned, the fault being in him only, in nobody else.”(o) Is this the language of the Advocate of Personal Election and Special Redemption, as the Author of the Inquiry avers, taking good care, however, to keep these obstinate passages out of sight?—Latimer! who affirms that we may one time be in the book, and another come out again—that there was as much blood shed by Christ for Judas as for Peter, and, that *Judas was condemned only because he would not believe*.—We defy the wit of man to devise a more unqualified refutation of the doctrine—a more earnest opposition to its pernicious effects in practice, than this plain ingenuous preacher’s candid exposition of his sentiments.

We had many other passages marked in this Prelate’s writings, for the purpose of confirming, with abundant testimony, the hostility of his honest views of religion, to the intricate subtilty of the Absolute Predestinarian hypothesis; but the full persuasion of the sufficiency of those which have been recited above, admonishes us to forego the indulgence of our own wishes, for the attention due to the ease of our Readers.

(n) Fathers of the English Church, vol. ii. pp. 689, 690, 691.

(o) Ibid. pp. 658, 659.

We shall therefore consult Cranmer next—and, if we are not greatly mistaken, it will be seen that the same chart which was spread before Latimer, was that by which Cranmer's course was directed. It will, we believe, appear, that the Archbishop of Canterbury was not less decisive than the Bishop of Worcester, in holding the Redemption of mankind to be universal; Election to subsist only with obedience, so that the Election was null when the obedience was lost; in maintaining, that grace might be refused, and actually is refused by those who continue in wickedness; and, that continuance in well-doing to the end of life, is the only criterion of our Election.

In preparing to confirm these positions by extracts, we have been struck perhaps as forcibly with the inconsistency, we had almost said imprudence, of the Author of the Inquiry, in selecting the Annotations on the King's Book, as the standard of this Reformer's sentiments, as by his hardihood in risking his cause on a mutilated production of them: he rejects the Book, but he adopts the Commentary. Because the Commentary disproves the Text! No such thing. The Commentary approves the Book; aye, with most, if not all, its errors on its head. The Annotations, it will be seen, upon inspection, were drawn up, not to put on record a protest against the doctrines of this celebrated Book; but to satisfy critical acumen, and to open the sentiments of the Annotator, upon the comprehensive nature of the Christian dispensation in a form more pleasing to his own judgment. This view of the Annotations is not conjectural; it is expressly furnished in the Work. That Cranmer approved the Book, is incidentally, but very expressly, stated in the Twenty-third Note, and the latter part of the Eighty-second. In the former he writes, "This particle, (any number of Christ's

mystical Body, &c.) I confess I never well understood, *neither as it was by us made*, nor as it is now corrected, but *I consented thereto*, only because there is no evil doctrine therein contained, as far as I perceive and discern.”(k)—In the latter: “In this matter I have written much more than needeth, and *nothing disallowing* the three leaves to the *printed Book*; for I like them very well, saving that the first side is not *perfect English*, &c.”(l)—And farther, that it was a friendly criticism he exercised, will be attested, both by the whole tenor of the Annotations, a specimen of which has just now presented itself, in his objection to its grammatical construction, and more particularly, by the explanation he has given of his design, in drawing up some general observations on an operative Faith, as distinguished from an inert assent of the mind to the truth of Christianity. This explanation occurs in the latter part of his fourth note. “This being declared, (the obediential influence of a true Faith) in my judgment, it shall not be *necessary to interline or insert* in many places, where we protest our pure Christian Faith, (viz. in the Book) those words or sentences that be newly added, viz. ‘I being in will to follow God’s precepts’—‘I rejecting in my will and heart the devil and his works’—‘I willing to return to God,’—‘If I continue not in sin’—‘If I continue a Christian’s life’—‘If I follow Christ’s precepts’—‘We living well’—‘If we order and conform our wills in this world to his precepts’—‘If we join our wills to his godly motions,’—and such other like sentences or clauses conditional, which to the right

(k) *Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. iii. page 87.

(l) *Ibid.* page 108.

Faith *need* not to be added: *for without these conditions* is no right Faith. And these sentences, methink, come not in aptly in some places, as they be brought in, but rather interrupt and let the right course and phrase of the Paraphrases, and obscure the same, rather than make it clear. In this part I have spoken the more largely, because I do refer unto the fourth note all other places, like to the same matter appertaining.”(m)—The retrenchment of the conditional clauses which he here proposes, is accordingly the subject of many of his subsequent observations:(n) he does not disapprove of them doctrinally; he only discards them as unnecessary, because they are virtually included in his conception of a pure Christian Faith: he goes so far as to tell us, that “*without these conditions* there is no right Faith,” and therefore, that they “need not be added.” A decided proof of his approbation of those doctrines of the Book in which the disputed tenets are involved, as the Reader must have observed that they turn upon some of the conditions which he has quoted, and which the Book maintains, against personal Election:—As “*if I continue* a Christian life, *if we join our wills* to his godly motions.”—It is really somewhat singular that intimations so obvious, of Cranmer’s assent to the doctrine of the Book, which he assisted in framing, could have escaped the sagacity of the Author of the Inquiry. It is still more singular, as there is in no one passage of the Annotations, a negative to any part of the Book maintained: and it is above all extraordinary, as a moment’s reflection must have suggested to him that any direct oppo-

(m) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. page 84.

(n) The 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 19th, 20th, 24th, 25th, 27th, 28th, 29th, &c.

sition between the Annotations and the Book, to which the Commentator had subscribed, would have justly exposed this great leader of our Reformation to the heavy charges of equivocation, &c. which are so liberally urged against the Clergy of this day, without the apology, which in their case would be fairly admitted, of a latitude of interpretation. The truth is, that Cranmer had not, at that time, disallowed even the errors which he so firmly renounced afterward—and hence his approbation of the Book was nearly unlimited, as will be evident on consulting the 33d, 46th, 47th, and 48th Annotations. The fact of the Annotations and the Book being identified in sentiment once established, the production of them is fatal to the object of the Inquiry; it is convicted out of its own mouth.

This species of refutation, however, is too general to answer the purposes which we have in view, or to meet the expectations of the discerning Reader; we shall therefore, in the first instance, fill up some of the chasms left by the Inquiry, and then submit such selections from this Reformer's works, as will leave, we trust, little doubt of his support of the opinions which we have ascribed to him. The Fifteenth note opens the Extracts of the Inquiry; it runs thus: [*“By his grace first called, and then by the Faith.”*] Calling for God's grace precedeth not Faith, but contrary, Faith must needs precede our invocation of God, as St. Paul saith, “How shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed?” This note is quoted by the Inquiry; but that which immediately follows is omitted,—Sixteenth. [*“Which I am void of, if I continue in sin.”*] “*These words may stand, but they were sufficiently expressed before, by these words, “while he is my Lord and governor,*

and I under his protection." Again, the Seventeenth is partially quoted, [*"I doing my duty."*] We may not say that we do our duty; nevertheless, he hath not a right Faith in his heart, that hath not a good heart, and will to do his duty." Add—(See the Fourth Annotation.) But no man doth do *all his duty*, for then he needeth not to have any faith, for the remission of his sins.—The Inquiry quotes the Nineteenth, [*"If we so die."*] This condition taketh away the right belief of a faithful man, for the faithful man *trusteth* surely in God's goodness, that he will give him grace so to die, so that it pertaineth as well to our Faith, that we should so die, as that we should be saved." Add—("See the Fourth Annotation above.") But he omits the three next following, the 20th, 21st, & 22d. The 20th. [*"Continuing a Christian life."*] These words be *superfluous*, for *continuance of a Christian's* life pertaineth unto a pure Faith. See the Fourth Annotation.—The 21st. [*"May adhibiting his will thereto."*] This interrupteth the phrase of speech; and *man's will is most amply and fully* contained in the words next immediately following, "contrition and penance, the gift of calling by many ways the sinner."—The 22d. [*"From sin and such others."*] "Calling is no gift of God in us, as all the others following be, but the operation of God *towards us.*"^(o)

This, we presume, will be deemed a sufficient specimen of the fidelity with which a transcript

(o) The value and import of this Annotation will be judged of from the opposition which it intimates between Cranmer's sentiments, and those of the Contra-Remonstrants in the Synod of Dort. It is their assertion; "Illam (Regenerationem) Deus in nobis, sine nobis, operatur." Synod of Dort. De Regeneratione. Quoted by Fletcher, Equal Check. P. 85. Dublin Edit.

of Cranmer's sentiments is given in the pages of the Inquiry. The interruption of a pure Faith, by the interruption of a Christian life; the deprivation of grace by a continuance in sin; the adhibiting of man's will to the grace of God; and the calling of God, not being an internal operation "*in us, but*" an external "*operation towards us,*" were doctrines that had no charms for the system espoused by the Author of the Inquiry; and the Annotations in which they appear, are, therefore, very discreetly kept out of view.

It only remains, that we collect such extracts, as will support the justice of attributing to him a perfect agreement with Latimer.

In the Fourth Annotation, so often alluded to, as fully comprehending his sentiments on the nature of true Faith, he thus speaks: "They 'that follow the works of the flesh shall not inherit the kingdom of God.'—'These be very notable and fearful sentences unto all such as be not repentant, but live after their own wills, and not after God's will, neither have they right faith nor love unto God, nor shall be inheritors of his kingdom. And *though* Christ hath paid a sufficient ransom *for all the sins of the world,* and is a sufficient Redeemer and Saviour of *all the world,* yet shall they have no part thereof, for they belong not unto Christ, and Christ utterly refuseth them for his, which have faith and love only in their mouth, and have not the same engraven in their hearts, and expressed in their acts and deeds."(*p*)

The particle 'though,' we need scarcely observe, co-extends the ransom of the Redeemer to the sins of *all*, even of those who shall not partake of its benefits, while 'yet' reserves its applica-

(*p*) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. p. 81.

tion only by the wilful defeating of its designed extent.

And as he held the Redemption to be universal, he held all its necessary consequences also.

Thus, he represents the intercession of Christ to be as universal as his satisfaction. "For Christ offered not the blood of calves, sheep, and goats, (as the priests of the old law used to do,) but he offered his own blood upon the Cross. And he went not into a holy place made by man's hands (as Aaron did,) but he ascended up into Heaven, where his eternal Father dwelleth, and before him he maketh continual *supplication for the sins of the whole world*, presenting his own body, which was torn for us, and his precious blood, which, of his most gracious and liberal charity, he shed for us upon the Cross."(g)

He affirms the loss of righteousness or obedience to be the loss of justification, a falling from Christ, and a consequent liability to damnation.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, good children, in the Fifteenth Chapter of John, speaketh these words: "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch which, &c. For without me ye can do nothing." By these words, our Lord Jesus Christ doth teach us, very plainly, how we be justified and sanctified before God. For as the branch of a vine bringeth forth no fruit, except it abide in the vine; so we cannot be righteous, except we abide in Christ; and as the branch of a vine doth not flourish, nor keep long its sap, but withereth away, and is cast into the fire when it is cut from the vine, *even so be we damned, and cannot be saved,*

(g) Book on the Sacrament, Book v. c. 2.—Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. pp. 501, 502.

when we forsake our master Christ. Now ye have heard, good children, how by baptism we are so planted in Christ, that by him we have forgiveness of our sins, and are grafted in him as the branch is in the vine. And as the branches have sap and life of the vine, that they may bring forth fruit, so we also (which believe in Christ, and are baptized,) have received of him the Holy Ghost, that we may be justified. *And if it chance us to fall from Christ,* through sin or unbelief, or to be put out of the Christian congregation for our open and manifest sins, yet ye have heard how we are received again into the bosom of the Church, and joined to Christ's Body, by the Authority of the Keys and Absolution.^(r)

While he gives the glory of sanctification to the Holy Ghost, he states it to be the duty of man to *give place* to his working, and not to withstand the same. "Learn, therefore, good children, that all we must be made holy, and new men, by the virtue of the Holy Ghost; and that we cannot attain this holiness by our own strength or works, and therefore we must believe in the Holy Ghost, that he will sanctify us, at such time or place, and after that sort and manner, as it shall please him. And it is our part to *give place* to his working, and not to withstand the same. And therefore, we say in this Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." But it is necessary, some things here to speak of the manner of sanctification, how and after what manner the Holy Ghost doth hallow us, that we may so *prepare ourselves,* or rather *give place to the Holy Ghost, which provoketh us,* that he, with his light, and Almighty strength and power, may work his will in us".^(s)

(r) Cranmer's Catechism, 1548. Ibid. Vol. iii. p. 315.

(s) Ibid. p. 231.

So far was he from conceiving that the operation of our will was precluded by the gift of preventing grace, that he describes the duty of improving the benefit of the favour, enhanced by the unmerited vouchsafing of the gracious boon to all men. "Before I told you, good children, that we go not *before* God; we pray not first, that God *will* be our God and Father, but God of his inestimable mercy doth *prevent* us, doth call us by his word, doth call us unto Faith, doth give us his Spirit, to know him for our Father and Lord, before we could think thereof, and seek for God. But now seeing that by his word and faith he hath called us, and by baptism grafted us in Christ, and made us members of his Church, we ought not to be slothful nor idle, but study to go forward, and increase in godliness."(*t*)

In his conception, Election, and a vital Faith, were terms of the same import.—The assured hope;—the confidence in Christ's mercy;—the undoubted trust in God, in his words and promises;—the perseverance unto the end;—which are the marks of exclusive Election in the absolute Predestination scheme,—are, in Cranmer's practical analysis of Christianity, the inseparable attendants of a faith which exists no longer than while it worketh through love.

"These three be all one; 'perfect faith'—'assured hope and confidence in Christ's mercy,'—and 'undoubted trust in God, in his words and promises.'^(*u*) "And he that hath this pure Christian Faith,...hath also the very Christian hope, that after this life he shall reign ever with

(*t*) Catechism, Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. pp. 247, 248.

(*u*) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. p. 109, An. 87.

Christ in his kingdom.”(v) “Continuance of a Christian’s life pertaineth unto a pure faith.”(x) “Continuance is comprehended in faith.”(y)—Hence, we find his notion of Elect, which was but a different title for faithful Christian, embracing precisely the same topics: for, as he describes a pure faith to be that which “enters within us, into the deepness of our hearts;—kindles a warm fire of love in our hearts towards God, and towards all others for the love of God;—and in summa, a firm intent and purpose to do all that is good, and leave all that is evil; a right, pure, perfect, lively Christian, hearty and justifying faith, which worketh by love, as St. Paul saith, and suffereth no venom or poison of sin to remain within the heart:”(z) so he affirms, on the one hand, that “without obstinacy and lack of repentance, no man is *out of the Catholic Church*,”—“into which he was ingrafted by baptism;”(a) and on the other, that “the Elect will follow Christ’s precepts, and repent and rise again when they fall; and the right faith cannot be without following of Christ’s precepts, and repentance after falling.”(b) Election and a lively faith are co-ordinate; the one fails with the failure of the other, ‘with falling from Christ through sin or unbelief;’ and when final triumph is associated with both, it is not because certainty, as of the mere act of Predestination, belongs to either; but because a Faith that will be crowned, and an Election which will be ac-

(v) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. p. 78.

(x) Ibid. p. 87.

(y) Ibid. p. 88.

(z) Ibid. p. 88.

(a) Ibid. p. 88, and Catechism, p. 248.

(b) Ibid. p. 88.

cepted in the beloved is recognized, only in the condition, that there be a continuance in well-doing. "And take this for a sure conclusion, and doubt nothing thereof, that the Holy Ghost, as he hath begun these things in us, so he will finish the same in us, *if we obey him, and continue in faith unto the end of our lives*: for he that continueth unto the end shall be saved."(c)

Brief as this sketch is, we trust it is sufficiently comprehensive to satisfy even the sceptical, of the unlimited extent which this principal framer of the Articles gave to the Redemption, applying its embracing virtue even to those who incapacitate themselves from participating in its efficacy; and of his recognition of such doctrines on the subjects of Grace, Free-will, and Election, as harmonize with the universality of that unmerited gift of God, to a fallen race.—Nor are these the only proofs which his writings furnish: there are more of the same order; but there are some, if possible, more decisive, derived from the Regeneration and Election of all baptized infants, which are reserved for that part of this Apology which will treat expressly of the subject in the chapter assigned to the Liturgy.

Till then, we shall take leave of this venerable godly Bishop, and shall next examine whether Hooper be the advocate of the opinions which he is said by the Inquiry to have espoused. The sheets devoted in that work to the extracts from his writings, are closed by observing: "Such were the sentiments of this venerable Bishop and Martyr, which we have detailed the more at large, because he had been represented as the advocate of opposite opinions, on account of *some expressions* in the Preface to his "Decla-

(c) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. p. 239.

ration 'on the Ten Commandments.'"(d) These 'some expressions'—these slight, obscure and casual hints, which so unconcerned a notice would insinuate, had fallen from his pen in an unguarded moment, but were redeemed by the vigilance of a more thoughtful hour:—These expressions, the tottering prop of such injurious representations, might surely have been transplanted into the Inquiry. One or two pages would have sufficed to exhibit the mere apparent opposition of these careless sentiments to the more sober language of this Prelate;—would have displayed the weakness of a cause that rested on such feeble supporters;—and, in the contrast, would have shewn these 'expressions' to be the vehicles of their own correction. What the Inquiry has declined, we are sure, for prudential reasons, we shall take leave to perform; and though we have had the satisfaction to consult Heylin, and the original work of Hooper, from which he quotes, we shall preferably refer our Readers to the copy of it in that very volume of the Fathers of the English Church, from which the Extracts of the Inquiry have been borrowed: nay more, we shall assemble passages, not from the portion of his writings alluded to alone, but from almost every part of that volume, that our Readers may feel nothing short of a full persuasion of mind, that while Hooper, in common with Redmayn, Latimer, Cranmer, &c. &c. held Election, he was decidedly hostile to *personal* Election and *absolute* Predestination. This is not the first time that the Bishop of Gloucester's writings have been diverted from their intended meaning. Were he now alive, he would have reason (to use his own words, with some omissions, which we gladly

(d) Inquiry, Part ii. p. 93.

make) to appeal—"unto the charitable Reader and loving heart of all them that be endued with God's Holy Spirit,—for they will—judge and search for judgment in the processes and circumstances of the writer, and content themselves with the writer's mind, rather than to bring their affection to make their own imagination and fancies another man's doctrine."(e) To such a Reader, as in his name, we appeal, by requesting his attention to the following clear and vigorous exposition of this nervous writer's mind.

"As the sins of Adam, without privilege or exception, extended and appertained unto all Adam's, and every of Adam's posterity; so did this promise of grace generally appertain as well to *every and singular* of Adam's posterity, as to Adam."...."If all then shall be saved, what is to be said of those that St. Peter speaketh of (1 Pet. ii.) that shall perish for their false doctrine? And likewise, Christ saith, that the gate is straight that leadeth to life, and few enter?"

"Thus the Scripture answereth, that the promise of grace appertaineth to every sort of men in the world, and comprehendeth them all; howbeit within certain limits and bounds, the which if men neglect or pass over, they *exclude themselves* from the promise in Christ. As Cain was no more excluded, till he excluded himself, than Abel; Saul than David; Judas than Peter; Esau than Jacob." (Matt. i. 13. Rom. ix.)

"By the Scripture it seemeth that the sentence of God was given to save the one, and to damn the other, before the one loved God,

(e) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. v. p. 204.—Hooper's Confession of Faith.

or the other hated God. Howbeit these threatenings of God against Esau, if he had not of his wilful malice excluded himself from the promise of grace, should no more have hindered his salvation, than God's threatenings against Nineveh; which, notwithstanding that God said it should be destroyed within forty days, (*Jonah* i.) stood a great time after, and did penance.

“Esau was circumcised, and presented unto the Church of God by his Father Isaac, in all external ceremonies, as well as Jacob, and that his life and conversation were not as agreeable unto justice and equity as Jacob's, the sentence of God unto Rebecca (*Gen.* xxv. 23.) was not in the fault, but his own malice. For there is mentioned nothing at all in that place that Esau was disinherited of eternal life, but that he should be inferior to his brother Jacob in this world; which prophecy was fulfilled in their posterity, and not in the persons themselves.

“Of this acceptation of one, and reprobation of the other, concerning the promise of the earth, speaketh Malachi the prophet, as the beginning of his book declareth, speaking in this wise. (*Mal.* i. 23.) I have loved you, (saith the Lord,) and ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? God answereth, “Was not Esau Jacob's brother? (saith the Lord,) notwithstanding I loved Jacob, and hated Esau.” Wherein hated God Esau? the prophet sheweth:—“I have made his possession, that was mount Seir, desolated as a desert, or wilderness of dragons.” The which happened in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Wherein he loved Jacob, the text declareth:—God transferred the right and title that appertained unto Esau the elder brother, to Jacob the younger; likewise the land that was promised unto Abraham and Isaac was by legacy and testament given unto Jacob and his posterity. (*Gen.* xxxv. 23, &c.)

“ St. Paul (*Rom. ix. 11, &c.*) useth this example of Jacob and Esau for none other purpose, but to take away from the Jews the thing that they most put their trust in ; that is to say, the vain hope they had in the carnal lineage and natural descent from the family and household of Abraham ; and likewise the false confidence they had in the keeping of the law of Moses. Paul’s whole purpose is, in the Epistle, to bring man unto a knowledge of his sin, and to shew him how it may be remitted : and with many testimonies and examples of the Scripture he proveth man to be saved only by mercy for the merits of Christ, which are apprehended and received by faith, as he at large sheweth in the third, fourth, and fifth chapters of the same Epistle.”(f)

“ And this imperfection or natural sickness, taken of Adam, excludeth not the person from the promise of God in Christ, except we transgress the limits and bounds of this original sin by our own folly and malice, and either of a contempt or hate of God’s word we fall into sin, and transform ourselves into the image of the Devil. Then we exclude, by this means, ourselves from the promises and merits of Christ, who only receives our infirmities and original disease, and not the contempt of him and his law.

“ Further, the promises appertain to such as repent. Therefore Isaiah said, without exception, that the infirmities of all men were cast upon his blessed shoulder. It is our office, therefore, to see we exclude not ourselves from the general grace promised to all men. It is not a Christian man’s part to attribute his salvation to his own Free-will, with the Pelagian, and extenuate original sin ; nor to make God the author of ill, and our damnation, with the Manichee: nor yet to say,

(f) *Fathers of the English Church, Vol. v. pp. 255, 256, 257.*

God hath written fatal laws, as the Stoic, and with necessity of destiny, violently pulleth one by the hair into heaven, and thrusteth the other headlong into hell. But ascertain thyself, by the Scripture, what be the causes of reprobation, and what of Election.

“The cause of rejection or damnation is, sin in man, which will not hear, neither receive the promise of the Gospel: or else, *after he hath received it*, by accustomed doing of ill, falleth either into a contempt of the Gospel, and will not study to live thereafter, or else hateth the Gospel, because it condemneth his ungodly life, and would there were neither God nor Gospel to punish him for doing ill. This sentence is true, howsoever men judge of Predestination; God is not the cause of sin, nor would have man to sin. Thou art not a God that willeth sin. (*Ps. v.*) And it is said, (*Hos. xiii. 9.*) “Thy perdition, oh Israel! is of thyself, and thy succour only of me.”

“The cause of our Election is the mercy of God in Christ. Howbeit, *he that will be partaker* of this Election must receive the promise in Christ, by faith. For therefore we be elected, because afterward we are made the members of Christ. (*Eph. 1. Rom. viii.*) (g)

“Christ saith, “No man cometh to me, except my Father draw him.” Many men understand these words in a wrong sense, as though God required in a reasonable man no more than in a dead post, and mark not the words that follow: “Every man that heareth and learneth of my Father, cometh unto me.” God draweth with his word and the Holy Ghost, but man’s duty is to hear and learn, that is to say, receive the grace offered, *consent* to the promise, and not to repugn the God that calleth. God doth promise the Holy Ghost unto

(g) *Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. v. pp. 259, 260.

them that ask him, and not to them that contemn him.”(h)—Such are the expressions which have induced some to ‘represent Hooper as the advocate of opinions opposite’ to those infixed on him by the Inquiry; and such are the expressions which we are disposed to believe will induce every candid Reader to agree with them, in recognizing in his sentiments a studied refutation of irresistible Grace and personal Election, and a deprecation of their pernicious consequences. They are sentiments, too, which were not the crude conceptions of his early years—No, they carry in their enunciation the conviction, that they were the settled result of profound deliberation, and that they were accordingly retained to the latest period of his life.—For instance, in his exposition of the seventy-seventh Psalm, written during his imprisonment for martyrdom, we find him illustrating the universal offer of grace, and the obstinate refusal of the unconverted to profit by the consolation of the redemption promised in Christ’s blood, by some of the same examples that he had employed before in the Preface from which the passages above have been extracted. In the exposition he observes—“There was consolation and rest promised unto all them that came out of Egypt; but none *took the benefit* thereof but Joshua and Caleb. There was in the outward letter promised consolation unto all Abraham’s children; but none received the commodity thereof, but such as in spirit followed the faith of Abraham. The Scripture saith in letter, that God would all men to be saved; yet we see such as follow not the *Spirit offered* be damned.”(i).—In the Preface, “There was promised unto all those that departed out of the Land of Egypt with

(h) *Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. v. p. 261.

(i) *Ibid.* pp. 655, 656.

Moses, the Land of Canaan. Howbeit, for disobedience of God's Commandments, there were but two that entered.—In them seest thou (Christian Reader) the mercy of God, and the general promise of salvation performed in Christ, for whose sake only God and man were set at one.—They likewise promised obedience unto his Holy Laws and Commandments, as God give us all grace to do; that though we be infirm and weak to all virtues, we exclude not ourselves by *contempt* or *negligence* from the *grace promised to all men.*"(k) Here is a consent, both in illustration and doctrine, sufficiently striking to excuse, perhaps, the necessity of any more quotations. Yet, as we think the Reader's trouble will be well repaid for the perusal, we shall not withhold the following sentences:—"So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."... "Here is the justification of man lively expressed, and how many things concur as necessary unto the remission of sin; and yet man only justified by Faith. The Word of God, the preacher of the Word Christ himself, the contrition of Nicodemus, the Holy Ghost that moved Nicodemus to come by night unto Christ, the *consenting will* of Nicodemus unto the words of Christ; yet only was he delivered from sin by the faith that he had in the death of Christ."(l) As, in contradiction to the absolute Predestinarians, he teaches a consenting will; so does he consistently maintain the possibility and danger of a total falling from grace.— "He that hath obtained the remission of sin, must diligently pray for the preservation of God's favour, as David giveth example unto the Holy

(k) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. v. pp. 263, 264.

(l) Ibid. p. 147.

Church, saying, 'Create a clean heart and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation, and uphold me with thy free spirit.' (Ps. li.)"

"For a conclusion, justification is a free remission of sin, and acceptance into the favour of God, for Christ's merits; the which remission of sin must follow, necessarily, amendment of life, or *elsewe receive the grace of God in vain.*—(2 Cor. vi. Rom. viii. 2 Pet. i.)" (m)—Again, he shews our sanctification to be necessarily exposed to hazard, because our election is general and conditional. "Such as he sanctified by Christ, must live an honest and holy life, or else their *sanctification availeth not.* As God forsook the Children of Israel for sin, so will he do us. They were elected to be his people, with this condition, 'If ye will obey my voice, indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all people.'—(Exod. xix.) He that favoured not the Israelites, but took cruel vengeance upon them, because they walked not in their vocation, will do, and doth daily, the same unto us.—(Rom. xi.) Therefore one of these two we must needs do, that say we be justified and sanctified in Christ; either from the bottom of our hearts amend, or else be eternally lost with all our ghostly knowledge." (n) Once more—"God useth his gifts in us, not always after one sort, partly for our sins, and partly to prove us, and to bring us to a certain knowledge of our infirmity and wickedness. From Saul, Judas, and Cain, he took his *spirit clean*, to punish their iniquity and wickedness; and from Job, to attempt his patience, and to make him feel, that of himself he could bear

(m) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. v. pp. 150, 152.

(n) Ibid. pp. 171, 172.

nothing.”(o) “Such is our cursed nature and first-birth, to be ready to slip from God upon the lightest occasion of the world; yea, when God doth other men good, and us no harm. This doctrine, therefore, touching the brittleness and frailness of man’s nature, is to be marked; lest that, whereas the Prophet said, ‘my feet were almost gone,’ we slide and *fall altogether from God.*”(p)

It may now be justly asked, whence it happens that the Inquiry could challenge the support of any part of such writer’s productions to its favourite tenets. To this we answer, that there are sentiments equally claimed by different and even opposite principles, which, in the absence of their genuine Parent, may seem to have derived their existence from another source. Such are the condemnation of the wicked,—the assured preservation of God’s people,—the infallible glorification of his Saints,—or, in other words, the indefeasible salvation of his Elect. As the absolute Predestinarian scheme is resolvable into the Sovereign Will of the Creator, unmodified by the relations which he has been pleased to establish between himself and his rational creatures, so, in those instances, in which the *conditional* Predestinarian speaks of any circumstance, the result of the Divine attributes alone, the *absolute* Predestinarian and he will agree; and the language of the former may seem to flow from the pen of the latter. One example will suffice.—It will be that extract from Hooper, on which the Inquiry lays so great stress: “Another way it maybe taken: that a Christian hath testimony in his spirit, by the Spirit of God, that he is so elected, chosen, and ordained of God to eternal salvation; that whatsoever the world, the flesh, the Devil, or Sin shall do, yet

(o) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. v. p. 558.

(p) Ibid. p. 618.

standeth he assured of God's Election, Grace, Strength, and Fidelity, that he shall never fall to damnation, but arise again, and be called from his falls, whatsoever they be."(*q*) A continuation of the author's expositions of that Psalm, would have shewn that the Inquiry had no reason to plume itself on this apparent association of sentiment. It is the improved confidence of the faith of the advanced and experienced Christian which he is here describing; it is the strong persuasion, exchanged for the feebleness of his Noviciate, that all the banded powers of men and wicked angels, an ensnaring world, and a corrupt nature, could not defeat the Divine purpose, in sending his dear Son into the world:—it is the firm hope, that, in entire reliance on the Divine promises, he would accomplish the warfare, in spite of the forebodings of the infirmities of the flesh. But Hooper will himself best exhibit the distinction between "that one which toucheth God alone, and the other which toucheth God and the Prophet himself;" and will shew, that he was speaking, not of the certainty of unconditional Election, but of the triumph of Faith. "At *first* they seem unto the flesh things impossible, as we may see by Nicodemus, (*r*) who was as ignorant as could be at the beginning, when he came first to school to Christ.—(*John* iii.) But when a man hath been exercised awhile in it, he feeleth more sweetness in the promises of God, as we see by this Prophet; for after he had borne the cross of affliction a little while, and learned the nature of God, how *merciful* he is to sinners, he

(*q*) Inquiry, Part ii, p. 93.—Fathers of the English Church, Vol. v. p. 592.

(*r*) An example which illustrates of itself this subject.—"The consenting will of Nicodemus" (p. 129), will not be forgotten by the Reader.

said, ' Although I fall, yet it shall not be greatly.' But when he had *tarried* in the school of Christ, and learned indeed what he was, and how that *he* was *able* to perform his mercy, he said plainly, whatsoever Sin, the Devil, the World, the Flesh, Hell, Heaven, or the Earth, would say against him, he should not fall. These two interpretations are to be noted; (the former,—“that of God’s part, and by our acceptation into his favour through Christ, the faithful falleth not; that is to say, his sin, is not accounted damnable, nor laid to his charge, for Christ’s sake;” the latter,—this implicit assurance of faith); for whichsoever we use, we may find comfort and unspeakable consolation.

“ Now, when he hath declared, that he shall not fall into God’s eternal ire and displeasure, he sheweth *how* this *certainty* of eternal salvation came unto him; and why God so mercifully and strongly hath warded and fenced him against all temptations and perils of damnation.

“ It is (saith he) because *God* is his *health*; that is to say, one that hath not only taken him from the sickness and danger of Sin, the tyranny of the Devil, and damnation of the Law; but also *preserveth* him in the same state, that he fall not again into the sickness and peril that he was delivered from. Wherefore learn, that it is not man’s labours nor man’s works that help a sinner, and save a damnable soul; but it is the free work and undeserved mercy of Almighty God. Wherefore we be taught, that “ there is no health but in God alone.”

“ Then saith the Prophet also, that in God is his glory, of the which word he noteth two things, the one touching God alone, and the other touching God and himself:

“ The Glory that toucheth God *alone* is, that this troubled Prophet pondered, in the heaviness

and anguish of his mind, the number and strength of his enemies, the Devil, the Flesh, Sin, the World, and the bitter accusation of God's Laws, that truly accused and painfully grieved his conscience for sin: of the other side, *in faith*, he considered how the Scripture declared, that God was merciful unto the greatest sinners of the world; and he learned also, by the Word of God, that God had made promise unto sinners to be merciful. He considered further, that God had many times used and practised his mercy towards sinners; and he found likewise, by the Scripture, that God, to perform his mercy, would not spare his own dearly beloved Son, to redeem man from his sin with his own precious blood and painful death.

“ Thus weighing the strength of the Devil and Sin, on the one part, to damn, and the strength of God's Mercy, in Christ Jesus, on the other part, to save; and perceiving the riches, abundance, and strength of God's Mercy to be more available to save, than all the power and strength of the Devil and Sin to damn, (for the great victory that God taketh over such strong enemies,) the Prophet triumpheth in the Glory of God joyfully and thankfully; extolling him for his Mercy and Power, that hath broken the Serpent's head, and spoiled him of his prisoners. So we use to do; when any man by valiantness defendeth us from our enemies, we extol and magnify him for his victory and conquest.

“ This Glory gave the Prophet Asaph, in this Psalm to God, when by *faith* he saw God conquering of Hell, Sin, and the Devil, the accusation of the law, desperation, the Flesh, and the World; and the same Glory giveth every faithful creature unto God, at the end of the Lord's Prayer, when he saith, “ For thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory.”—(*Mat. vi.*) But now the Prophet, by the eye of Faith, seeing this glorious triumph,

strength, and power in God, saith, that in this Glorious, Almighty, and Triumphant God is *his Glory*; and desireth to have part of that victory, and of that marvellous Majesty; and, as the Psalm saith, he calleth and nameth the God of Glory his Glory.

“ Thus the Prophet, after he had espied the Almighty God in himself gloriously to be void of all troubles, dolours, and other adversities, and that he had also conquered gloriously the captains of all adversities, Hell, Death, Satan, and Sin; he challengeth by faith, and craved by *God's promise*, to be partaker of God's Glory in this point.”(s)

“ Such,” we also will repeat, “ were the sentiments of this venerable Bishop and Martyr;” sentiments perfectly in unison with his exhortations elsewhere:—“ Refuse not, therefore, the grace offered, nor, once received, banish it with ill conversation. If we fall, let us hear Almighty God, that calleth us to repentance with his Word, and return. Let us not continue in sin, nor heap one sin upon another, *lest at last* we come to a contempt of God and his Word.”(t) They are the echo of the Church, instructing the sponsors of an infant at the font of Baptism. “ Ye have heard also, that our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised in his Gospel to grant all things that ye have prayed for, viz. to release the infant of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, to give him the Kingdom of Heaven, and everlasting life,—which promise he, *for his part*, will most surely keep and perform.”(u) They are, in fine, parallel to those which we have

(s) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. v. pp. 592, 593, 594.

(t) Hooper on the Ten Commandments.—Fathers of the English Church, Vol. v. p. 423.

(u) Office of Baptism,

already exhibited from the King's Book ; (p. 82,) "that we may be sure that God, as far as it relates to him, will abundantly supply every thing, and that he will never desert us, if we will adhere to him, and abide in him ; in which state, if we persevere to the end, we are certain of our salvation, and that from the infallible promise of Christ."

Committing to our Readers' reflections this apposite solution of an apparent, not a real adoption of the language of Absolute Predestinarianism, here we shall pause, and, before we advance to the paramount testimonies supplied by the public documents of the Church, shall request of them to look back, and to consider with what success we have fulfilled the earnest expectations we conceived, of vindicating to the primitive Constitution of the Articles, a recognition of an Election, compatible only with Universal Redemption, and the universal offer of preventing, sanctifying, and persevering Grace.

They will recollect, that we ascended to the first brief notices of this doctrine in Redmayn's Treatise, and that we have seen, while the terms of the Absolute Predestinarian School are, with a small but an important difference, employed, the doctrine itself was refused admission. We pursued these brief notices through the more ample expositions of the King's Book ; and in it we found the same uniform reception of the language, united to the same explicit declaration of the freedom of the will, for a good as for a bad life, and associated with a deprecation of the pernicious effects of the scheme of irrelative decrees.

In addition to Redmayn's Treatise, we examined the writings of the three principal actors in the Reformation, assigned a sufficient reason for the omission of the fourth, and they maintain avowed hostility to the doctrine, in connexion with a simi-

lar use of the same language. We brought the Articles of the Church into contact with selections from the King's Book, to both of which the Reformers affixed their approving signatures, at different periods, and the result was an exact coincidence between them. We contrasted the Articles with some of the same selections from the Book, and with a summary of the irrespective scheme furnished by the Inquiry, and it was perceived to militate equally with both. We brought them to the test of the concurrent opinions of the Fathers of the Greek and Latin Churches, to which the Reformers paid an acknowledged deference, and we exhibited the extorted confessions of Calvin and Beza, admitting the unanimous consent of these ancients to the doctrine advocated by Redmayn's Treatise and the Book.

We discovered, in the declarations of Bishop Bancroft, at the Hampton Court Conference, and in the constitution of the 17th Article, the design for its enactment to be, its interposition between God's holiness and man's presumption on the one hand—the Creator's mercy and man's despair on the other. We were confirmed in the opinion by the sentiments of Latimer; and, in the discovery of the cause, we found a solution for the introduction of the subject of Election among the Articles of the Church, and a consistent motive for its issue from the pens of men who arraigned 'idle and curious' speculations on so dangerous a subject, and who continually inveighed against the abuse to which it was subjected by the Gospellers.

Farther—in the subsequent revision of the Articles in Queen Elizabeth's Reign, we demonstrated the necessity imposed upon the admirers of the Helvetic Churches, of sacrificing their wishes to the only practicable approximation to their accomplishment, the re-establishment of King Edward's Refor-

mation. We ascertained the acknowledged incompetency of the Articles to be the representatives of those tenets in the frequent but unsuccessful efforts, both at the time of the revision of the Articles, and at other subsequent periods, to procure the insertion of such clauses as would exclude every other but the Genevan interpretation. We produced proofs, that even when many of the Rulers of the Church accommodated the interpretation of the Articles to that hypothesis which they themselves embraced, they never substituted this interpretation for the judgment of the Church, nor ever attempted to enforce that signification on those who openly and publicly either disclaimed or opposed the doctrine. And, after all the dangers of innovation to which the Articles were exposed, and to which their slight deviation from the language of that scheme rendered them peculiarly liable, we see them still the unaltered organs of the sentiments of their first composers, cherishing practical holiness as the only true criterion of Election, and rebuking desperation and profligacy, the monstrous fruits of the teeming womb of Absolute Predestination.

We shall now introduce our Readers to the public monuments of the Church, in the perusal of which they will have a new opportunity of observing the consistent uniformity with which the Leaders of the Reformation inculcated the fundamental doctrines of Christianity on the People, from the Treatise on Justification, and the 'Pious and Catholic Institution,' to the publication of the Homilies.

These monuments are the Liturgy, the Catechism, the Homilies, and Erasmus's Paraphrases.

We have assigned to the Liturgy a separate chapter, and to that we refer; passages from the

rest will close the testimonies which we mean to lay before our Readers in this chapter.

The Paraphrases of Erasmus, or, to speak more accurately, the English version of them, became a public monument of our Church, by the Royal Injunctions which commanded them to be provided at the expense of the respective Parishes, and to be read together with the Bible. The diligent study of both was strictly enjoined on both Priests and People; and why?—was it not because these Paraphrases were deemed an unexceptionable exposition, which accorded with the sentiments of the Reformers? They were not the imprudent, we will add, the dishonest men, who would abuse the public authority, in inculcating doctrines upon the People, in connexion with the Bible, the standard of truth, which they designed, at a future period, to denounce as errors: they were not the careless observers of human nature, who would associate ideas in a first impression, which it was their intention afterwards to disunite.

But these are reproaches to which they would be justly exposed, if, while they were themselves the advocates of absolute decrees, and intended to enact these tenets among the doctrines of the Church, they conveyed to the people, in so solemn a combination, opinions of an opposite tendency: nay, in this instance, the conduct would be utterly inexcusable, because they had already given currency to the opponent doctrines, through the medium of the King's Book; and, if these Paraphrases agreed in the sentiments of that Book, on this subject, they would only be re-asserting what they were determined to annul. That the Reformers would be subjected to this heavy censure, had they contemplated the design of propounding in the Articles unconditional Election, a few extracts will satisfy the Reader. But, when he finds

how strictly these extracts agree with the sentiments to which his attention has been already solicited, he will discover, we apprehend, in the appointment of these Paraphrases to the distinguished purpose to which they were assigned, a weighty argument; that universal Redemption—the universal offer of Grace—the rejection of that Grace in the freedom of the will, on the one hand—and the acceptance of it in an assenting and co-operating will, on the other;—were the doctrines with which the Governors of the Church designed to imbue the minds of their people, and which they were resolved subsequently to establish among the Articles of the Church.

The Paraphrase on *John* iii. 16, runs thus:—
 “Who would have believed the charity of God to have been so great *towards the world*, being rebellious against him, and guilty of so many great faults, that he not only did not revenge the ungracious acts that had been committed therein, but also sent down his only Son from Heaven unto Earth, and delivered him to suffer death, yea, even the most shameful death by the Cross, to the intent, that *what man soever would believe in him*, were he Jew, Grecian, or never so barbarous, should not perish, but obtain eternal life through the Gospel; but whosoever, condemning so great charity of God towards him, and *putting from himself* the salvation that was freely offered, doth not believe the Gospel, he hath no need to be judged of any body; for, as much as he doth openly condemn himself, and *rejecting the thing whereby he might obtain everlasting life*, maketh himself guilty of eternal pain.”(x)

(x) Erasmus's Paraphrases, fol. p. 424, quoted by Heylin's Hist. Quinquar, pp. 109, 110.

On the 6th chapter of the same Evangelist, the Paraphrase contains these sentiments:—"That, of a truth, whosoever cometh unto Christ, shall obtain eternal life; that by faith men must come to him; that faith cometh not at all adventures, but is had by the inspiration of God the Father, who, like as he draweth to him men's minds by his Son, in such wise, that, through the operation of both, jointly together, men come to them both; the Father not giving this so great gift, but to them that be willing and desirous to have it; so that who, *with a ready will* and godly diligence, deserves to be drawn of the Father, he shall obtain everlasting life of the Son." (y) In the exposition of the Parable of the Sower, he enlarges thus upon part of the text:—"There is another sort of men, which greedily hear the word of the Gospel, and set it deep enough in their mind, and keep it long; but their minds being entangled and choaked with troublesome cares of this world, and especially of riches, (as it were with certain thick thorns,) they cannot freely follow that he loveth, because they will *not suffer* these thorns which cleave together, and be entangled one with another among themselves, to be cut away; *the fruit of the seed which is sown doth utterly perish.*" (z) Such are the sentiments of Paraphrases, which they were at the pains of rendering into the vernacular language, to make them accessible to the people. Such are the sentiments which they neither omit, nor modify, nor refute, nor enter a caution against, while they are presented to the King's Subjects, with the approving sanction of the public authority.

(y) Brasmus's Paraphrases, fol. p. 448.—Heylin's Hist. Quinquar, pp. 109, 110.

(z) Ibid. fol. p. 58.—Heylin's Hist. Quin. p. 112.

The Homilies, to which we shall next have recourse, are the organs of the same sentiments; and, though the second part of them was composed under the auspices of the Elizabethan Divines, still they also 'speak the same thing.'

It would be endless to be pointing out the delinquencies of the Inquiry, in the partiality of its selections on the present occasion. We shall, therefore, once for all, observe, that some doctrinal Homilies are wholly passed over; and, that as many passages, unfavourable to the narrow views of that publication, are omitted, in its excerpts from the rest, as would admit of separation without a breach of the sense. It is irksome to be continually exposing this conduct—it would be uncharitable, if the motive for these omissions could be mistaken; but what construction can be put, for instance, on its striding over the Homily of Falling from Grace, which has been so often appealed to by Members of our Church, against the absolute Predestinarians, but that of a tacit confession that the appeal was unanswerable? Dismissing the unpleasant duty of perpetually noticing the prejudiced compilation of that work, with this observation, we shall put our Readers in possession of so plain and perspicuous documents, drawn from these Homilies, as we make no doubt will satisfy them that these discourses must contradict themselves, if they sustain the positions of the Inquiry. When we took up the Homilies, for the purpose of making this examination, we did not expect to meet with the unequivocal testimonies which they afford. We expected to find universal Redemption, universal Grace, &c. couched under the customary form of *us*, in which the application of common benefits is usually represented in such compositions. We are agreeably disappointed to find, among abundant passages of that lax order,

not a few which employ the precise terms of formal Divinity. We have thus been relieved from the necessity of proving any thing by inference, which we know, how obvious soever, would be denied; and we are enabled to furnish direct and standard commentaries on the text of the Articles which we are referred to by the 35th Article itself, as containing 'a godly and wholesome doctrine.' This godly and wholesome doctrine will reflect back upon the Articles the recognition of universal Redemption—the universal offer of Grace to all—the resistibility of Grace—the falling from Grace, both intermediately and finally—the Triad of Election by the fruits of a good life—the loss and the recovery of Election—the devising of remedies against the dangers of presumption, on the one hand, and of despair on the other—and of the true and only cause of reprobation to be the sins of the individual.

In the first part of the Homily of Salvation, the universal efficacy of the Redemption is urged, from the application of Christ's sacrifice, to those on whom the Sacrament of Baptism is conferred.—“All the world being wrapped in sin, by the breaking of the law, God sent his only Son, our Saviour, Christ, into this world, to fulfil the law for us, and, by shedding of his most precious blood, to make a sacrifice and satisfaction, or, as it may be called, amends to his Father for our sins, to assuage his wrath and indignation, conceived against us for the same; insomuch, that infants, being baptized, and dying in their infancy, are, by this sacrifice, washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made his children, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven.” Elsewhere, the universality of the remedial benefits of the Redemption is co-extended to the universality of the disease contracted by the fall:—“O! what a miser-

able and woeful state was this, that the sin of one man should destroy and condemn all men!—that nothing in all the world might be looked for, but only pangs of death and pains of Hell! Had it been any marvel, if mankind had been utterly driven to desperation, being thus fallen from life to death, from salvation to destruction, from Heaven to Hell? But behold the great goodness and tender mercy of God in his behalf: he ordained a new Covenant, and made a sure promise thereof, namely, that he would send a Messias, or Mediator, into the world, which should make intercession, and put himself as a stay between both parties, to pacify the wrath and indignation conceived against sin, and to deliver man out of the miserable curse and cursed misery whereunto he was fallen headlong, by disobeying the Will and Commandment of his only Lord and Maker...and all this was done, that the Promise and Covenant of God, made unto Abraham and his posterity, concerning the redemption of the *world*, might be credited and fully believed." Again—"And because death, according to St. Paul, is the just stipend and reward of sin; therefore, to appease the wrath of God, and to satisfy his justice, it was expedient that our Mediator should be such a one as might take upon him the sins of *mankind*, and sustain the due punishment thereof, namely, death." Again—"In these, and such other places, is set before our eyes, as it were in a glass, the abundant grace of God, received in Christ Jesus, which is so much the more wonderful, because it came not of any desert of ours, but of his mere and tender mercy, even then when we were his extreme enemies. The end of his coming was to save and deliver his people—to fulfil the law for us...last of all, to become a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of

the whole world.”(a) Is not this language sufficiently express? Hear then the second Homily on the Passion: “Now he gave us not an angel, but his Son—was not this a singular token of great love? But to whom did he give him?—He gave him to the *whole world*; that is to say, to Adam, and *all that should come after him.*”

The universal offer of free Grace is necessarily consequent upon this ample explanation of the universality of the Redemption; accordingly, we learn, “We shall be able to overcome all our enemies that fight against us. Only let us apply ourselves to *accept* that Grace that is *offered* us.”(b) We are consistently addressed—“Good Christian Brethren and Sisters, advise yourselves, consider the dignity that ye be now set in; let no folly lose the thing that Grace hath so preciously offered and purchased; let not wilfulness and blindness put out so great light that is now shewed unto you.”(c)

And as it was freely offered to the acceptance of all, so might it be refused—“If ye *refuse* so great Grace, whereto *ye be called*, what other thing do ye, than heap to you damnation more and more, and so provoke God to cast his displeasure upon you; and, to revenge this *mockage* of his Holy Sacraments, in so great abusing of them? Apply yourselves, good friends, to live in Christ,” &c.(d) “And, specially, when thou art, either by the preaching of God’s Word, or by some inward motion of his Holy Spirit, or else by some other means, called unto repentance, neglect not the good occasion that is ministered unto thee, lest when thou wouldst repent, thou hast not the Grace

(a) Homily of the Nativity.

(b) Third part of the Sermon for Rogation Week.

(c) Sermon of the Resurrection.

(d) Ibid.

for to do it. For to repent is a good gift of God, which he will never grant unto them, who, living in carnal security, do make a mock of his threatenings, or seek to rule his Spirit as they list, as though his workings and gifts were tied unto their will.”(e). The Grace which these Homilies teach might, in the freedom of the will, in its first access, be either refused or accepted, they also instruct us, might, when accepted, be *lost at any subsequent period*. “By all these examples of Holy Scripture, we may know, that as we forsake God, so shall he *ever* forsake us....For whereas God hath shewed to all them that truly believe his Gospel, his face of Mercy in Jesus Christ, which doth so lighten their hearts, that they (if they behold it as they ought to do) be transformed to his image, be made partakers of the Heavenly Light, and of his Holy Spirit, and be fashioned to him in all goodness requisite to the children of God; so, if they, *after*, do neglect the same, if they be unthankful unto him, if they order not their lives according to his example and doctrine, and to the setting forth of his Glory, he will take away from them his Kingdom, his Holy Word, whereby he should reign in them, because they bring not forth the fruit thereof that he looketh for. Nevertheless, he is so merciful, and of so long sufferance, that he doth not shew upon us this great wrath suddenly. But, when we *begin* to shrink from his Word, not believing it, or not expressing it in our livings; first, he doth send his Messengers, the true Preachers of his Word, to admonish and warn us of our duty, that as he, for his part, for the great love he bare unto us, delivered his own Son to suffer death, that we, by his death, might be delivered from death, and be restored to the life

(e) Third part of the Sermon of Repentance.

everlasting, evermore to dwell with him, and to be partakers and inheritors with him of his everlasting Glory and Kingdom of Heaven; so, again, that we, for our parts, should walk a godly life, as becometh his children to do. And, if this will not serve, but still we remain disobedient to his word and will, then he threateneth us, by terrible comminations, swearing, in great anger, that "whosoever doth these works, shall never enter into his rest, which is the Kingdom of Heaven." (f)

The judicious Reader will not fail to perceive, that nearly all the points at issue are adverted to in this single extract, and all in direct opposition to those tenets, that compromise the co-operation of the Will with the Holy Spirit, and of the Holy Spirit with the Will.

This awful subject is resumed in the second part; and, if any hearer could have persuaded himself, that the danger of falling from Grace, so emphatically enforced, did not involve a final falling, he must, in this Sermon, have been undeceived—"He will take that (his Holy Word) away from them, so that they shall be no longer of his Kingdom, they shall be no longer governed by his Holy Spirit, they shall be put from the Grace that *they had*, and ever *might have* enjoyed through Christ; they shall be (as they were once) as men without God in this world, or rather in worse-taking. And, to be short, they shall be given into the power of the Devil, which beareth the rule in all them that be cast away from God, as he did in Saul and Judas, and generally in all such as work after their own wills, the children of mistrust and unbelief."

Indeed, so foreign was the decree of an irresistible Predestination from the mind of the Author

(f) First part of the Sermon of Falling from God.

of the 'Homily of Good Works,' that Chrysostom's Hypothesis, concerning the pardoned thief, is fully adopted.—“I can shew a man that by faith, without works, lived, and came to Heaven: but without faith never man had life. The thief, that was hanged when Christ suffered, did believe only, and the most merciful God justified him.—And because no man shall say again, that he lacked time to do good works, for else he would have done them; truth it is, and I will not contend therein; but this I will surely affirm, that Faith only saved him. If he had lived, and not regarded Faith, and the works thereof, he *should have lost his salvation again.*”

The full proof of any one of the foregoing propositions would, in its inseparable consequences, repel from our Church the spurious offspring which the Inquiry would fain suckle with her nutritious juices. We have, for the confirmation of our Readers' judgments, produced pregnant testimony to each separately; and now, for their greater satisfaction, we shall present them with the sentiments of those approved writers, on the topics more immediately the subject of the 17th Article: We affirmed (p. 97), that the Article, on the face of it, combines the effect of our Election only with good works, and that it consequently recognizes the connexion no longer than while we thus walk: do the third part of the Homily of Faith, and the second part of the Homily of the Passion, maintain any other connexion?—“He that feeleth his heart set to seek God's honour, and studieth to know the Will and Commandments of God, and to frame himself thereunto, and leadeth not his life after the desire of his own flesh, to serve the Devil by sin, but setteth his mind to serve God for his own sake, and for his sake also to love all his neighbours, whether they be friends or adver-

saries, doing good to every man, as opportunity serveth, and willingly hurting no man; such a man may well rejoice in God, perceiving, by the trade of his life, that he unfeignedly hath the right knowledge of God—a lively faith—a steadfast hope—a true and unfeigned love, and fear of God. But he that casteth away the yoke of God's Commandments from his neck, and giveth himself to live, without true repentance, after his own sensual mind and pleasure, not regarding to know God's Word, and much less to live according thereunto; such a man clearly deceiveth himself, and seeth not his own heart, if he thinketh that he either knoweth God, loveth him, feareth him, or trusteth in him. Therefore let us do good works, and thereby declare our Faith to be the lively Christian Faith. Let us, by such virtues as ought to spring out of Faith, shew our *Election* to be sure and stable; as St. Peter teacheth, "Endeavour yourselves, to make your Calling and Election certain by good works."

Such is the connexion in the representation of the Homily of Faith—let us now see the effects of the dissevering of that connexion in the Homily of the Passion. "The only mean and instrument required of our parts is Faith; that is to say, a sure trust and confidence in the Mercies of God; whereby we persuade ourselves, that God both hath and will forgive our sins, that he *hath accepted us again* into his favour, that he hath released us from the bonds of damnation, *and received us again into the number of his Elect People*, not for our merits and deserts," &c. The connexion is dissevered by relapsing into sin, it is restored through penitence, and the consequence is *a re-admission into the number of the Elect*: shall we not hence be convinced what species of Election was contemplated by the Article? We affirmed (p. 78) that the

Article was interposed between God's holiness and man's presumption, on the one hand—God's mercy and man's despair, on the other;—dangerous states of mind, which are encountered in the contemporaneous Homily of Falling from Grace, in the following manner: “Let us beware, therefore, good Christian People, lest that we, rejecting or casting away God's Word, (by the which we obtain and retain true faith in God,) be not at length cast off so far, that we become as the children of unbelief, which be of *two* sorts, far diverse, yea, at most, clean contrary, and yet both very far from returning to God; the one sort, only weighing their sinful and detestable living, with the right judgment and straightness of God's righteousness, be so without counsel, and be so comfortless, (as they all must needs be from whom the spirit of counsel and comfort is gone,) that they will not be persuaded in their hearts, but that either God *cannot*, or else that *he will not*, take them again to his favour and mercy.

“The other, hearing the loving and large promises of God's mercy, and so, not conceiving a right faith thereof, make those promises larger than ever God did, trusting, that *although they continue* in their sinful and detestable living never so long, yet that God, *at the end of their life*, will shew his mercy upon them, and that then they will return. And both these two sorts of men be in a damnable state”—irretrievably! as under the decree of Predestination? No.—“Yet, nevertheless, God (who willeth not the death of the wicked) hath shewed *means*, whereby both the same (*if they take heed in season*) *may escape*.” The first, as they dread God's rightful justice, in punishing sinners, (whereby they should be dismayed, and should despair, indeed, as touching any hope that may be in themselves,) so if they would con-

stantly or steadfastly believe, that God's *mercy* is the *remedy appointed against such despair* and distrust, not only for them, but generally for all that be sorry and truly repent, and will, therewithal, stick to God's mercy, they may be sure they shall obtain mercy, and enter into the Port or Haven of Safeguard; into the which whosoever doth come, be they beforetime never so wicked, they shall be out of danger of everlasting damnation; as God, by Ezekiel, saith, 'What time soever a sinner doth return, and take earnest and true repentance, I will forget all his wickedness.'—The other, as they be ready to believe God's promises, so they should be as ready to believe the threatenings of God; as well they should believe the Law as the Gospel; as well that there is an Hell and everlasting fire, as that there is an Heaven and everlasting joy: as well they should believe damnation to be threatened to the wicked and evil doers, as salvation to be promised to the faithful in word and works; as well they should believe God to be true in the one as in the other."(g) The characters of the desperation, in both the Article and the Homily, are the same, 'that God either *cannot, or will not*, take them again to his favour or mercy;' it is deprecated in both; and, while the Article refers to the general promises for a remedy, the Homily applies them. Again—As the Article cuts off the hopes of the presumptuous, by connecting security of God's favour only with obedience, so the Homily exposes them to the threatenings of the Law, unmitigated by the promises of the Gospel. Finally, The reprobation of the Homilies is not the inevitable repulsion of the Inquiry, is not the hideous display of a partial justice in the Holy One, but it is the reluctant chastisement of a Father inflicted

(g) Second part of the Sermon of Falling from God.

upon an unrepentant Child, who, through his own wilfulness and obstinacy, is irreclaimable. "In the 6th Chapter to the Corinthians, he saith thus: 'Be not deceived; for neither fornicators, neither worshippers of idols, neither thieves, nor drunkards, nor cursed speakers, shall dwell in the Kingdom of Heaven.' It must needs be a great fault, that doth move and cause the father to disinherit his natural son: and how can it otherwise be, but that this cursed speaking must needs be a most damnable sin, the which doth cause God, our most merciful and loving Father, to deprive us of his most blessed Kingdom of Heaven?"^(h) Elsewhere — "How much more, then, are we worthy of the endless torments of Hell, if, when we be so gently called again, after our rebellion, and commanded to return, we will in no wise hearken unto the voice of our Heavenly Father, but walk still after the stubbornness of our own hearts!"⁽ⁱ⁾

It only remains now, that the Catechism be called upon for its evidence; brief as it is, even here there is a lacuna of the utmost importance. The apologists of the Inquiry might endeavour to rebut the charge of the partiality of its selections from voluminous works, by pleading the necessity of setting limits to the extracts; but what excuse can be made for the discerption practised on the summary of the Creed? It was not want of space that prevented the member, relating to the Office of the Redecmer, ^(k) being inserted, as well as that relating to the Office of the Holy Ghost.—But Burnet, on the 17th Article, will intimate why that unmanageable sentence could not arrest the speed of the Inquiry—"The Remonstrant side (says

(h) First part of the Homily against Contention.

(i) Third part of the Homily of Repentance.

(k) Inquiry, part 2d. p. 180.

he) has this farther to add, that the universal extent of the death of Christ seems to be very plainly affirmed, in the most solemn part of all the Offices of the Church. And there are yet more express words in our Church Catechism to the purpose, which is to be considered as the most solemn declaration of the sense of the Church, since that is the doctrine in which she instructs all her children : and, in that part of it which seems to be *most important*, as being the short summary of the Apostles' Creed, it is said, 'God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind ;' where *all* must stand in the same extent and universality, as in the precedent and in the following words: 'The Father, who made me and all the world ;' 'the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the Elect People of God ;' which, being to be understood severely, and without exception, this must also be taken in the same strictness." This strong statement was before the eyes of the Author of the Inquiry, (for he quotes from this exposition of the same Article, in another place,) and what but the consciousness of its unanswerable force, could have suggested his suppression of, 'who hath redeemed me and all mankind.' Its admission, he was aware, would have given to the subsequent phrase 'Elect People, whom the Holy Ghost sanctifieth ;' and to the Instruction, in the explanation of the Lord's Prayer, for praying for special Grace, (without which the benefits of the Redemption cannot be applied), not in behalf of all the Elect, not in behalf of all *his*, but of *all People* ; a construction utterly fatal to the purposes of the Inquiry.

In exposing this inexcusably mutilated compilation from the Church Catechism, we have necessarily anticipated a formal production of the most important part of the pithy evidence, which that little document supplies ; and here, therefore, we

shall conclude our appeal to the public monuments of the Church.

The Reader has now before him a mass of evidence, on which we are not afraid to rest the merits of this momentous cause. Satisfied with this conviction, we shall not use the occasion to retort on the abettors of the opinions of the Inquiry its bitter invectives. We have exposed the inequitable spirit with which that compilation was asserted; we exposed it with regret; but we entertain the hope, that it is quite evident that the measure of self-defence, to which we were compelled to resort, rendered animadversion imperative, and censure unavoidable. As to the other advocates of those opinions, we are under no necessity of infixing upon them the odious charges which we have repelled from ourselves; and we rejoice in the exemption: we shall, therefore, merely request the attention of those, who have not yet imbibed the spirit of party zeal, to its dismal consequences. We have already subscribed to the general character of Mr. Matthias, as a zealous and pious Christian, and we are far from retracting our suffrage; but, were an opinion of the Author of the Inquiry to be formed from the concluding pages of that work, who would discover there the vestiges of the disciple of the Lord Jesus, who had given "a reason of the hope that is in him with meekness and fear?" (1) The example of such a man, whose judgment has been deposed by his pre-conceived opinions, and whose zeal has been heated even to Papal fervour by the presumption of their conformity to unerring truth, may hold out a useful admonition to those who have not yet contracted so bigoted an attachment to the tenets, as to deem them infallibly true; and so unqualified an assurance of their

(1) Peter, iii. 15.

fundamental importance, as to visit every deviation from them with the menace of everlasting damnation. It may not be unprofitable to them to trace the process by which the Inquiry invests the Prelates of the present day, in the *Auto de Fè* drapery with which it surrounds Clayton, and summoning them all before his tribunal, first pronounces the irrevocable sentence of everlasting damnation on the impugner of the Divinity of Christ, and then equalizes in criminality and in punishment, the impugner of the tenets of the Predestinarian School.

“ But (says the Inquiry) in none of the Clergy could the disbelief of these doctrines be so criminal, or so injurious to the Church, as in her Prelates, for none have laid themselves under so many obligations to believe and defend them, and none have such power of introducing error, as well as of maintaining truth. In illustration of this latter point, we shall put a case—we shall suppose, that what formerly happened should occur again,—that an Arian was placed on the Irish Bench, and that he determined to use his Episcopal influence and power, in introducing his errors into the Church. The weight of his rank and power would be considerable in his Diocese; his patronage would have great effect: some of his Clergy would be cautious of opposing opinions which their Bishop held; others would consider the avowal of them as the way to preferment. Should any of the beneficed Clergy be honest or pious enough to adhere to the doctrine of the Church, and instruct their people in it, though he could not deprive them of their livings, he could do much to annoy them, and render their continuance in his Diocese most unpleasant. Abusing the power with which the Church has most properly invested her Bishops for the maintenance of her doctrine, discipline, and pu-

rity, and for the right use of which she has taken every precaution, did any licensed Curate in his Diocese preach the doctrine of the Church, he could withdraw his license; did an unlicensed Curate preach it, he could notify that he would not license him. How much mischief, then, could an Arian Bishop do in his Diocese? And should his example be followed by others, the doctrine of Christ's Divinity might, in time, be banished from our Sermons and religious publications, and be found only in our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy; might, *in time*, be represented as a tenet, novel, sectarian, and opposed to the doctrines of the Establishment. Finally, as the Divinity of Christ is an essential doctrine of the *Word of God*, as well as of the Church, would not the *Judgment of God*, respecting his conduct, be the same *as that of man*; and should the people of his Diocese, deluded by the errors which he countenanced, perish in their sins; what numbers would rise up against him in the Day of Judgment, whose blood God would require at his hands? Now, why should any Bishop act, with respect to *these doctrines* of the Church which *we have been advocating*, in a manner similar to that which has been above described; how *much* of the criminality that would attach itself to the *Arian Prelate's* conduct might be fairly chargeable on him, or rather *how little of it might not?* is a question which well deserves to be seriously asked, and conscientiously answered."

The inaccuracy of this mournful illustration is a worthy compeer of its injustice. Clayton, who, by the way, if we are rightly informed, was not the author of the Essay on Spirit, as the note states, but of the Dedication prefixed to that work, (*m*) was so far from succeeding in the imaginary project imputed

(*m*) Biog. Britan.—Rees's Cyclopedia.

to him, of triumphantly spreading his opinions through his Diocese, by annoying his beneficed Clergy, and by either wantonly withdrawing the licenses of officiating Curates, or refusing to issue them to others, who preached the doctrine of the Church, that he fell himself a victim to his error, having died of a nervous fever, the consequence of a depression of spirits, produced by the King's mandate for his prosecution. Yet his Heterodoxy, which was impeached, and which terminated so fatally for himself, is chosen as an apt illustration of open, violent, fearless, unrestrained, unrestrainable, and successful exertions to overthrow the doctrines of our Establishment. Yet this solitary instance of Episcopal Heresy in the annals of the Irish Church, is tricked out in all the parade of extravagant amplification, and rendered still more terrific by affixing to it a multiplying property of propagating its portentous brood—for what purpose? Not to be the Historian of former evils for the benefit of the present generation, for they never existed; not, surely, to indulge the reveries of a sick brain, in conjuring up phantoms of remotely future assaults upon the form of sound doctrine, accredited by our Church. For what purpose, then? Is it carefully disguised? "*Now, should any Bishop act, with respect to these doctrines of the Church which we have been advocating, in a manner similar to that which has been above described, viz.—Annoying any of the beneficed Clergy, refusing to issue licenses, &c.* We leave it to our Reader's ingenuity to discover such one or more of our Prelates as, concurring with the great body of the Clergy, in combining in their sentiments the operations of Grace, with the "co-agency of man's free will;" and, in "considering man's Election and Perseverance as conditional,"⁽ⁿ⁾ dis-

⁽ⁿ⁾ Inquiry, Part 2d. p. 247.

countenance the progress of the pernicious doctrines advocated by the Inquiry, and he will find the man or men, who are said to denounce those doctrines as "novel, sectarian, and opposed to the principles of the Established Church;" (o) whose criminality falls little short of that of the Arian Bishop, who await a judgment of God, confirmatory of that of man, and who are to render a tremendous account, at the day of judgment, of the numbers of the people of their respective Dioceses, who, deluded by the errors which they countenanced, perished in their sins, and whose blood God will require at their hands. Let him who is not yet infected with the contagion of the leprosy of party zeal, as he reads the revolting preamble to an extract from a prayer, that "supplicates grace for all Bishops and Curates, that they may, both by their life and doctrine, set forth his true and lively word, and for all his people meekness of heart," (p)—shudder at the re-appearance of these doctrines, which, in their progress, threaten the revival of those inauspicious times, when zeal was turned into rage, and piety into profaneness.

(o) Inquiry, Preface, p. 4.

(p) Inquiry, last page.

CHAPTER II.



The doctrines of Redemption and Grace, witnessed by the Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland, are incompatible with the interpretations affixed to her tenets by the abettors of the absolute Predestination scheme.

IN the sweeping conclusions deduced from the laboriously collected premisses of the Inquiry, the Clergy and Laity of the Established Church are equally comprehended; for she “requires, from *all* her members, the unfeigned belief of these doctrines, as necessary to salvation;”(a) and “the Layman who withholds it, rejects as false what she teaches as the truth of God, and the only way to salvation.”(b) The belief of “gratuitous, unconditional Election,” we are thus taught, is essential to Church Membership—indeed, essential to salvation.

To justify so strict and rigorous an assertion, the Author of the Inquiry has made an appeal to our ‘admirable Liturgy;’ for, as she binds her Clergy by a formal subscription to Articles, she commands the assent of all her children who are not thus formally restricted by a set form of worship; it is

(a) Inquiry, Part ii. p. 252.

(b) Ibid, p. 249.

“that furnishes the most satisfactory evidence concerning the doctrines of our Church—here, if any where, we might hope to find the real doctrines of the Church.”^(c) “In the Liturgy these principles of Divine Truth are brought before us again and again, in every page, in every prayer, and under such varied forms of expression, as can leave no uncertainty respecting the sense in which they are to be understood.” In the Liturgy, then, we are assured that these tenets are unequivocally inculcated in the most explicit manner.

If they be, we are unquestionably bound to recognize them as the doctrines of our Church, but so far are we from assenting to this declaration, that, in this appeal to our admirable Liturgy, we once more join issue with the Inquiry, and shall be ready to admit the truth of the flagrant guilt of the Clergy, and the perilous situation of the Laity in the use of its offices, if the doctrine of absolute decrees, and their concomitants, can, by any fair and natural interpretation, be affixed to her services. To enable our Readers to compare the Liturgy of our Church with the disputed doctrines, we shall here transcribe the nine Articles agreed upon at Lambeth on the one hand, and the five Articles maintained by the Arminians on the other :

LAMBETH.

I. God from eternity hath predestinated certain men unto life; certain men he hath reprobated.^(d)

II. The moving or ef-

ARMINIAN.

I. God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those whom he foresaw would persevere unto the end in their faith in Christ Jesus,

(c) Inquiry, p. 187.

(d) Fuller's Church History, Cent. xvi. Book ix. p. 230.

LAMBETH.

icient cause of Predestination unto life, is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing that is in the person predestinated, but only the good will and pleasure of God.

III. There is predetermined a certain number of the predestinate, which can neither be augmented nor diminished.

IV. Those who are not predestinated to salvation, shall be necessarily damned for their sins.

V. A true living and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, falleth not away in the Elect, either finally or totally.

VI. A man truly faithful, that is, such an one who is endued with a justifying faith, is certain, with the full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ.

ARMINIAN.

and to inflict everlasting punishment on those who should continue in their unbelief, and resist unto the end his divine succours.

II. That Jesus Christ by his death and sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of all mankind in general, and of every individual in particular; that, however, none but those who believe in him, can be partakers of their divine benefit.

III. That they who are united to Christ by faith, are thereby furnished with abundant strength, and with succours sufficient to enable them to triumph over the seduction of Satan, and the allurements of sin and temptation, but that the Saints may fall from a state of grace.

IV. That true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of Free-will; since man, in consequence of

LAMBETH.

VII. Saving Grace is not given, is not granted, is not communicated to all men, by which they may be saved if they will.

VIII. No man can come unto Christ unless it shall be given unto him, and unless the Father shall draw him, and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come unto the Son.

IX. It is not in the will or the power of every one to be saved.(d)

ARMINIAN.

his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing; and that, therefore, it is necessary to his conversion and salvation that he be regenerated, and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ.

V. That this divine grace or energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the disorder of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection every thing that can be called good in man; and that, consequently, all good works, without exception, are to be attributed to God alone, and to the operation of his grace; that, nevertheless, this grace does not force the man to act against his inclination, but may be resisted, and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.(e)

(d) Fuller's Church History, Cent. xvi. Book ix. p. 230.

(e) Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, Cent. xvii. Sect. ii. Part 2. Chap. iii. § 4.

The first portion of the Liturgy to which the Reader's attention is requested, is the Exhortation which the Minister is directed to use 'when he giveth warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion, in case he shall see the people negligent to come' to that Ordinance. Let us hear in what terms the Church addresses her negligent members,—what sentiments she charges her Ministers in her name to utter,—with what arguments she arraigns the guilt of their negligence before God. "Dearly beloved Brethren, on — I intend, by God's grace, to celebrate the Lord's Supper; unto which, in God's behalf, I bid you all that are here present; and beseech you, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, that ye will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden by God himself. Ye know how grievous and unkind a thing it is, when a man hath prepared a rich feast, decked his table with all kind of provision, so that there lacketh nothing but the guest to sit down, and yet they who are called (without any cause) most unthankfully refuse to come.—Which of you in such a case, would not be moved? Who would not think great injury and wrong done unto him? Wherefore, most dearly beloved in Christ, take ye good heed, lest ye withdrawing yourselves from this Holy Supper, provoke God's indignation against you. It is an easy matter for a man to say, I will not communicate, because I am otherwise hindered with worldly business: but such excuses are not so easily accepted and allowed before God. If any man say, I am a grievous sinner, and therefore am afraid to come, wherefore, then, do ye not repent and amend? When God calleth you, are ye not ashamed to say, ye will not come? When ye should return to God, will ye excuse yourselves, and say, ye are not ready? Consider earnestly with yourselves, how little such

feigned excuses will avail before God. They that refused the feast in the Gospel, because they had bought a farm, or would try their yokes of oxen, or because they were married, were not so excused, but counted unworthy of the heavenly feast. I, for my part, shall be ready, and, according to my office, I bid you, in the name of God, I call you, in Christ's behalf, I exhort you, as ye love your own salvation, that ye will be partakers of this holy Communion. And, as the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul by death upon the Cross for your salvation, so it is your duty to receive the Communion, in remembrance of the sacrifice of his death, as he himself has commanded: which, if ye shall neglect to do, consider with yourselves how great injury ye do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same, when ye wilfully abstain from the Lord's table, and separate from your brethren, who come to feed on the banquet of that most heavenly food. These things, if ye earnestly consider, ye will, by God's grace, return to a better mind; for the obtaining whereof, we shall not cease to make our humble petitions unto Almighty God our Heavenly Father."

In what other language, than that of this exhortation, would the doctrine of irresistible grace be opposed, or what other words would they, who maintain that grace can be resisted, make use of than these?—"I bid you *all*, that are here present, and beseech you, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, that ye will not *refuse* to come, being so lovingly called and bidden by God himself."—How more strongly negate every other cause, except their own obstinacy, than by declaring, "that they who are called, *without any cause*, most unthankfully refuse to come, neglect to do so, and wilfully abstain." With what other argu-

ment, more likely to prevail, would he address the careless, than the danger of provoking God's indignation; and with what more powerful rebuke would he meet the feigned humility of the voluntary sinner, than when he pleads, "I am a grievous sinner, and therefore am afraid to come," to reply, "Wherefore, then, do ye not repent and amend? When God calleth you, are ye not ashamed to say,"—what?—that they cannot, that grace does not compel them—no, but "*ye will not come.*"—If "an atonement for the sins of all mankind in general, and of every individual in particular," were to be represented, who would choose more comprehensive words, than "the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul, by death upon the Cross, for your salvation:"—the salvation of all present,—all the negligent who are specially addressed, as well as the rest. And if the co-operation of man's rational faculties with the grace of God were to be impressed, would it be necessary to express it more plainly than by saying,—"*These things, if ye earnestly consider, ye will, by God's grace, return to a better mind.*"—This Exhortation bears the more remarkable testimony to the doctrines of universal redemption, co-operating grace, and voluntary acceptance of God's spirit, or inexcusable resistance to it, as the parable of the xxii of Matthew, which, v. 14, has this sentence—"Many are called, but few are chosen," is quoted in it, and offered a fair opportunity of inculcating special salvation. But for what purpose is it here adduced by the Church? To shew that their own fault is in their own want of will—"When God calleth you, are ye not ashamed to say, ye will not come? When ye should return to God, will ye excuse yourselves and say, ye are not ready? Consider earnestly with yourselves, how little such feigned excuses

will avail before God? They that refused the feast in the Gospel," &c.

There is a striking affinity between the views of this parable, here presented to us by the Church, and that taken of the same parable by Beveridge. 'If they perish,' says he, 'they must blame themselves for it; it is in their own choice; they choose and prefer their sins, with all the miseries which attend them, before the Gospel of Christ, with all the glory and happiness which is offered in it; and, therefore, as God said to his people, "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Ezek. xxxiii. 2. so say I to these men, repent and believe the Gospel; for why will ye die, why will ye perish eternally? Have you any reason for it? None in the world, but your own wills:" (f)—yes, their own wills, and not the decree of Predestination—"they refused, and were counted unworthy of the heavenly feast."

In connexion with this Exhortation, the Reader is requested to bestow his attention on another, in the Visitation of Prisoners. In it the Minister, he will see, is instructed to address the prisoner thus: "It is your part and duty, therefore, to humble yourself under the mighty hand of God, to acknowledge the righteousness of his judgments, and to *endeavour* that, by *his grace*, this present visitation may lead you to a sincere and hearty repentance." Shall we be told that the grace here spoken of, is any other than a grace co-operating with man's endeavours, and these the supposed endeavours of a notorious sinner? Again; "Now you are the object of God's mercy, if, by repentance and true faith, you turn unto him; but if you *neglect* these things, you will be the

(f) Beveridge's Thoughts upon our Call and Election, p. 166,

object of his justice and vengeance. *Now you may claim the merits of Christ*; but if you die in your sins, his sufferings will tend to your greater condemnation." Here surely is an atonement for the sins of every individual in particular, inculcated and applied with too affecting a pathos, to leave, one would think, a doubt that it was the doctrine of Him who came to "seek and to save that which was lost." Plainly, it is the doctrine of those who, with deep emotion, continue, "O, beloved, consider in this your day how fearful a thing it will be to fall into the hands of the living God, when you can neither fly to his mercy to protect you, nor to the merits of Christ to cover you, in that terrible day." In the same spirit is the awakening Exhortation in the Communion conceived, when it invites sinners—"Although we have sinned, yet we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins; for he was wounded for our offences, and smitten for our wickedness: let us therefore return unto him, who is the merciful receiver of all true penitent sinners; assuring ourselves, that he is ready to receive us, and most willing to pardon us, if we come unto him with faithful repentance; if we will submit ourselves unto him, and from henceforth walk in his ways; if we will take his easy yoke and light burden upon us, to follow him in lowliness, patience, and charity, and be ordered by the governance of his Holy Spirit; seeking always his glory, and serving him duly in our vocation with thanksgiving. This if we do, Christ will deliver us from the curse of the law."—Are they acts of the will, to return to one who is ready to receive, and most willing to pardon; to come unto him, yea, with definite precision, to submit ourselves unto him, to take his easy yoke, to follow him, and be ordered by the

governance of his Holy Spirit? If they are,—and they are too palpably such to be denied,—then, surely, our Church, so far from admitting the doctrine of irresistible grace, unequivocally sets forth the contrary to her children—acts of the will, too, not subsequent to our deliverance by Christ, but precedent to it, and the necessary condition of our redemption—“ This if *we do*, Christ will deliver us,” &c.

There is one feature in all these Exhortations so prominent, that it must have already caught the eye of the Reader, yet too attracting to be passed over without observation:—“ Wherefore, most dearly beloved in Christ, (says the Exhortation to the Holy Communion,) take ye good heed, lest ye withdrawing yourselves from this Holy Supper, provoke God’s indignation against you. . . . They that refused the feast in the Gospel were not so excused, but counted unworthy of the heavenly feast.” The process of their rejection is here plainly described, as commencing in their withdrawing from this most Holy Supper; it is to this their provocation God’s indignation is attributed; and, as the effect of this indignation, they are counted unworthy of the heavenly feast. Could the Church speak more plainly, except she had said in so many express terms, reprobation is not of the decree of Predestination, but of the stubbornness of man’s will; and, in fact, if these very words are not used here, they are in the Communion. “ Then shall appear the wrath of God in the day of vengeance, which obstinate sinners, through *stubbornness of their heart*, have heaped unto themselves; which despised the goodness, patience, and long sufferance of God, when he calleth them continually to repentance.” Will it be said, that this stubbornness of heart is to be resolved into God’s not vouchsafing grace? The

Church will answer it by—"Therefore, brethren, take we heed betime, while the day of salvation lasteth; for the night cometh, when no man can work; but let us, while we have the light, believe in the light, and walk as children of the light, that we be not cast into utter darkness, where is weeping and gnashing of teeth. Let us not abuse the goodness of God, who *calleth us mercifully to amendment*, and, of his endless pity, promiseth us forgiveness of that which is past, if, with a perfect and true heart, we return unto him."

Should a doubt remain of the sense in which the Church understands these expressions, let her explain herself; and if any words can be devised more unequivocally assigning the acceptance or rejection of God's grace to man's will than those quoted pages 166, 167, and re-quoted below, we are ready to acknowledge our total ignorance of the subject, and of the force of language. In the exhortation to prisoners, after the citation of these same passages of scripture, extracted from the Commination, the prisoner is desired to observe—"Now you are the object of God's mercy, if by repentance and true faith you return to him. Now you may claim the merits of Christ; but, *if you die in your sins*, his sufferings will tend to your greater condemnation. O! beloved, consider, in this your day, how fearful a thing it will be to fall into the hands of the living God, *when you can neither fly to his mercy to protect you, nor to the merits of Christ to cover you in that terrible day.*" Is this limitation of a day of grace suitable to him who *must* by the decree of Predestination be saved? Is this possibility of claiming Christ's merits at one period, and being cut off from a participation in their benefit at another, congenial to the decree which went before upon that individual, independent of his will? And how is the

guilt of that man aggravated by Christ's sufferings, who never had an interest in them?

This portion of the Liturgy has been subjected to examination somewhat diffusely, because, "here, if any where, we might hope to find the real doctrines of the Church," when she is maintaining the Cause of God against his rebellious people; admonishing the negligent; denouncing his anger and judgments against sinners; and exhorting notorious offenders against the laws of society. Here, if any where, she was concerned to defend the terrible justice of hardening, without iniquity, and to magnify the sovereign mercy of saving, without respect to the voluntary acceptance of the sinner. But, so far from setting this arrangement before the people, she tells them, that their excuses are feigned, their neglect *wilful*, and their abstaining from the Holy Communion causeless; yea, so highly provoking as to excite God's indignation. Is this a language to hold to men who could not accept of grace for repentance, and who, consequently, could not provoke God's indignation, by abstaining from an ordinance which they were utterly incapable of approaching in a state of repentance, the only state in which they are invited? So far, then, from limiting the divine mercy to *persons*, she restricts it only to *time*, and to the use made of the divine invitation: "it shall be too late to knock only when the door is shut," and then only—"too late to cry for mercy, when it is the time of justice;" and it shall be then too late, "because they hated knowledge, and received not the fear of the Lord, but abhorred my counsel, and despised my correction." What a mockery will this language be, if we are to suppose her transacting these awful concerns with men whose destruction is inevitable, whose reprobation is unconditionally predestinated.

When from these Exhortations we turn to the daily Services and occasional Offices of the Church, we shall find her recording the same consoling doctrines of universal redemption, and special grace freely given for all, freely offered to all. In the *Te Deum* adopted from St. Ambrose, (g) and which was composed before the doctrine of absolute decrees was broached by St. Augustine, our Church translates the praises for redemption in the most universal language:—"When thou tookest upon thee to deliver *man*, thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb;"—*man*, not *men*, the ordinary substitute for all mankind. "When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the kingdom of Heaven to *all* believers." "We believe that thou shalt come to be our Judge: we, therefore, pray thee help thy servants, whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood." The redemption is here applied with as little limitation to persons as the final judgment:—it is because he will judge that we call upon him for help, and we argue from his love in the redemption to his love in affording this assistance. If both the redemption and the readiness to help be not as universal as the judgment, where is either the truth or force of the supplication?

In the Litany we are instructed to address the Son as the Redeemer of the World, and to plead our redemption by his most precious blood, as an evidence of the interest we have in him;—so that we are thence enabled to say—"Remember

(g) Ambrose (quoted by Whitby on Election, &c.) saith, "God, who is no respecter of persons, gives not to our petitions, but our (foreseen) merits, according to that of the Apostle, whom he foreknew he also did predestinate."—"Non enim prædestinaret, quam præsciret, sed quorum merita præscivit, eorum præmia prædestinavit."—Lib. 5. de fide, c. 2.

not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers, neither take thou vengeance of our sins: Spare us, good Lord, spare thy people, whom thou hast redeemed with thy most precious blood, and be not angry with us for ever."—If, then, the petition deprecating vengeance, and entreating mercy, be universal, the redemption is universal too; but that the antecedent is universal it is presumed no one will deny.

In the General Thanksgiving, the redemption is expressed as universally as the creation. The preface presents us before the Throne of the Father of all Mercies, as unworthy servants, giving our most humble and hearty thanks for all his goodness and loving kindness, not only to us, but to *all men*. We specify this his goodness, and loving kindness, to us and to them, by saying, 'that we bless him for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life.' These, surely, are universal favours; and are they esteemed more universal by the Church, than those which she proceeds to acknowledge:—"But, above all, for thine inestimable love in the redemption of the world, by our Lord Jesus Christ, for the means of grace, and for the hope of glory."—If it were the intention of the Author to convey the doctrine of special redemption in this admired Thanksgiving, of how singular an oversight was he guilty in connecting the recognition of this signal proof of inestimable love, with the great, but inferior testimonies of loving kindness in our creation, preservation, and all temporal blessings. What a singular contrast would it then exhibit;—the smaller blessings universal;—the great, the inestimable privileges restricted; how could the Father of Mercies be more effectually represented as a niggard?—how could his temporal mercies be more injuriously calumniated, than by bringing them

into contact with favours, from which the majority are, of mere Predestination, excluded? The General Thanksgiving is too express to admit of such an interpretation. It ascends in an enumeration of mercies from earthly existence, the first received, to everlasting glory, the last which shall be conferred; and, as it ascends, elevates the soul upon the wings of gratitude and expansive charity, from the first survey which she takes of the equal love of God in the creation, to his no less equal and unbounded love in the redemption of the world, 'in the means of grace, and in the hopes of glory.'

Were we confined to this single testimony, we might rest with confidence upon it, as upon an indubitable record of the doctrine of our Church. We have seen, however, that it is not to an isolated testimony we appeal.

In fact, whenever the occasion suggests the propriety of introducing the mention of the redemption, we find it spoken of in the same unlimited terms. In the Collect of the Sunday next before Easter, the conception of the motive which influenced the Father to send forth the Son, to suffer death upon the Cross, and the object proposed by the Son's submitting to that death, are as universal as language itself can notify:—"Almighty and everlasting God, who, of thy tender love towards mankind, hast sent thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, to take upon him our flesh, and to suffer death upon the Cross, that all mankind should follow the example of his great humility."—God sent his Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, 'to take upon him our flesh.' If there be one whose nature he has not taken, that is one who has no interest in the love of God, no participation in the death of the Redeemer, no motive to follow the example of his

great humility; but if that nature be common to every individual, then is the love of God towards him declared to be tender, and the example of a suffering Saviour an affecting argument for the practice of humility, because "he hath borne his sins in his own body on the tree." In this Collect does the Church, as the interpreter of the Scriptures, expound the atonement to be any other than one "made for the sins of all mankind in general, and for every individual in particular."

"The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion," a feast instituted in remembrance of the Saviour's death and passion, applies the benefit of both, with no less ample charity, to the whole world. She instructs us, in the Prayer of Consecration, to offer up our petitions, saying;—"Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself, once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole World."—Her practice strictly accords with this solemn declaration of universal redemption, and individual participation in its interest. In the Rubrick she enjoins the Minister, when he delivereth the bread to *any one*, to say—"The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee;—Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died *for thee*."—And, in like manner, when he delivereth the cup to *any one*, he shall say—"The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee;—Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed *for thee*."—Were a service to be framed for the express purpose of entering a protest against absolute decrees, could a more effec-

tual method be devised than this of first testifying, that the death upon the Cross was a satisfaction for the sins of the whole World; and of next stating to each of the Communicants severally, that for him Christ's body was given—for him, personally, he died—for him, individually, his blood was shed? This unequivocal enunciation of the doctrine of the Church is no more than the reiteration of similar sentiments, contained in her administration of the initiatory Sacrament of Baptism. In the Exhortation which the Minister is directed to make, after the reading of the Gospel appointed in that Office, she assures her people—“Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that he will likewise favourably receive this present Infant; that he will embrace him with the arms of his mercy; that he will give unto him the blessing of eternal life, and make him partaker of his everlasting kingdom.” With how tender an anxiety does she banish every doubt of the Infant's reception, and quell every fear of his reprobation, by the confident declaration; “Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that he will likewise favourably receive”—whom? those predestinated to salvation? No—“this present Infant:” with how comforting an enumeration does she detail the particulars of his reception—“he will embrace him,” &c. Nay, she repeats them again, with the more express specification—“that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to release him of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, to give him the Kingdom of Heaven, and everlasting life;” privileges, she states, promised in the Gospel, and to the performance of which she pledges the truth of Christ:—“Our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised, in his Gospel, to grant all these things that ye have prayed for; which promise he, for his part, will most surely keep and perform.”—

In pursuance of this her exposition of Holy Writ, she pronounces the Child baptized, regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church:—"Seeing now, dearly beloved Brethren, that this Child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church."—And, accordingly, in the Rubrick, subjoined to this Office, she definitively interprets the Word of God, to give the most undoubted assurance of the eternal salvation of every baptized Infant:—"It is certain, by God's word, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved;"—irrefragable proofs of the all-embracing mercy which our Church contemplated for the redemption of a lost World. She can discover no forfeiture of God's promises, but by actual sin;—she will make no discrimination; but what Christians make themselves; to themselves only can they ascribe their final misery; for to all generally, to each individually, she announces the remission of original sin, the promise of sanctification of the Holy Ghost, the grant of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the hope of everlasting life. This is the uniform tenor of her doctrine, couched in the plainest words of the most unambiguous signification, "brought before us again and again, in such varied forms of expression, as can leave no uncertainty respecting the sense in which they are to be understood."

Again, in her Catechism; but the evidence, which the portion of the Book of Common Prayer would furnish, has already been anticipated.

Here, therefore, we shall close our strictures on the testimonies borne by this Established Church to the doctrine of "an atonement made for the sins of all mankind in general, and of every individual in particular."

From the investigation of the sentiments of our Church concerning Universal Redemption, we proceed to examine whether she does not breathe the same cheering spirit in her opinions of the influences of Divine Grace. The doctrine of Universal Redemption, once established to be that of our Church, necessarily involves her recognition of special Grace freely offered to all; but as independent proofs will furnish more cogent testimonies of the consistency with which she maintains this tenet and its dependencies, and will thence produce a stronger conviction, we shall venture to trespass on the indulgence of our Readers, while we point their attention to these distinct portions of her formulàries. A few general observations will introduce them to their notice. "Saving Grace," it is asserted, "is not given, is not granted, is not communicated to all men, by which they may be saved if they will. No man can come unto Christ, unless it shall be given unto him, and unless the Father shall draw him, and all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come unto the Son." This language is constructed of negatives; it denies the giving, the granting, or the communicating of Grace to all who are not predestinated; it denies the drawing of the Father to them; and thence denies the possibility of access to the Son. A bare inspection of the Book of Common Prayer will give ample refutation to this excluding scheme. It is to be presumed, is it not, that the Church deems all capable of performing those exercises in which she invites, yea, enjoins all to participate? Open now the introductory Exhortation, in which she salutes her assembled children at morning and evening prayer, and observe the dissonance between these paralyzing sentences and her maternal animating

accents :—“ I pray and beseech you, as *many* as are here present, to accompany me, with a pure heart and humble voice, unto the throne of the heavenly Grace, saying after me,” are the words in which the Minister of her voice articulates her fond entreaties. Mark her praying and beseeching all her congregations, how numerous, how widely dispersed soever, to draw nigh unto the throne of the heavenly Grace. Consider her enjoining a form of Confession, to be said of the whole of every congregation, which they are instructed to utter from pure hearts, with humble voices, and say, by what mode of argument it shall be inferred, that she, who has directed its use by all, supposed any incapable of obeying her injunctions? Where can we trace here the impassable boundaries of that line of demarcation, by which the “ few chosen of mere Predestination ” are separated from the unconditionally reprobated? Shall we find it in the assurance of forgiveness which she pledges to all those who are in a capacity to receive it? or in the claim which she commands them all to make, on the promises of the Gospel declared unto all, if mankind be allowed to include all? If we shall find it, it is only in separating what she has united, in confining what she has left at large; and if her services be understood in this restricting sense, here, at least, we shall find ‘equivocation and subterfuge.’ She prays, she beseeches, as many as are present, without exception, to accompany her Minister, the organ of her sentiments; she enjoins the common form they shall use; and yet what she requires, they cannot with truth and sincerity perform. She knows their inability, and yet commands their services; she instructs them to offer petitions to Heaven, which she knows them to be incapable of presenting, and deludes them with the **hope** of an interest

in promises from which she is certain they are excluded! The administration of a service, in the unintelligible sounds of an unknown tongue, would be charity to men's souls in comparison of so crying an abuse of their credulity. Of what perfidy would she then be guilty, to endeavour to call up a sense of gratitude in all, for favours vouchsafed to all; to entice those of less exalted feelings, by intimating the intention of making requests of things necessary for the body, that all might be induced the more earnestly to unite in acknowledging their sins before God; to excite all those whom she addresses, by motives calculated to actuate them all to the confession she enjoins, and yet to be conscious she was drawing them into a mere hypocritical declaration of their offences.

• But this is a charge from which our Church is vindicated by her reiterated declarations. In the Collect for all conditions of men, "she prays for the good estate of the Catholic Church, that it might be so guided and governed by the good Spirit of that God," who is "the Creator and Preserver of all mankind, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth." What a solemn mockery, if she supposed any insusceptible of being guided by that good Spirit into the way of truth. Of how great insincerity is she guilty, to use the very same words that an advocate of Universal Grace would employ, to convey sentiments of quite an opposite tendency. Again, when, in the Collect of the third Sunday after Easter, she offers up supplications to an "Almighty God, who sheweth to them that be in error the light of his truth, to the intent that they may return into the way of righteousness," to whom does she entreat him to vouchsafe the illuminating beams of his truth? "Unto *all* them that are admitted into the

fellowship of Christ's religion, both that they might eschew those things that are contrary to" the holy "profession" of all Christians, "and follow all such things as are agreeable to the same;" although, according to the tenets ascribed to her by the disciples of the Geneva school, she knew the Divine Grace was foreclosed by an immutable decree. In the same spirit of the universal application of the Divine Mercies to mankind, she instructs us to pray for "the true circumcision of the Spirit," by promising "that the Almighty God made his blessed Son to be circumcised, and obedient to the law, for *man*," connecting the assurance of an universal interest in the effects, with a declaration of the universality of the Creator's all-embracing love. In the first Sunday after Epiphany, she offers her petitions for illuminating and persevering Grace for the Lord's people, who call upon him; her supplications being as extensive as their cries. In the prayer for Christ's Church militant here on Earth, she charitably prays—"And to all thy people give thy heavenly Grace"—"all them that do confess his holy name"—generally; and "especially," as a nearer, and thence a more concerning object "to this Congregation here present;"—"that, with meek heart and due reverence, they may hear and receive thy holy word, truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life." And, adopting the prayer of St. Chrysostom, she closes her morning and evening sacrifices with an assurance so consolatory to a doubting mind, that these their "common supplications," which have been offered "with one accord," are the offspring of his "Grace;" that the fulfilment of the desires and petitions of his servants rest upon a divine "promise;" and that, while they should submissively entrust to his perfect wisdom the conceding or the withholding of temporal requests, "as might

be most expedient for them," they might, without reserve, upon the security of that promise, entreat "the knowledge of his truth in this world, and in the world to come life everlasting."

Here are so many direct proofs "of the real sentiments of the Church"—here are so many incontestible testimonies, that if she calls upon "as many as are present to accompany" her Minister, it is because she does not think any absolutely precluded from the benefits of the spiritual exercises to which she invites them.

From these general declarations, we pass on to her more specific expressions on this subject. In them we shall trace her dispensing the elements of spiritual existence to all infants, without discrimination; applying the benefits derived from a continued supply of that same good Spirit to all who are baptized; affording the fostering influences of special Grace, whether preventing or assisting, with as little limitation; and distinctly maintaining the co-operation of our wills, both in the reception of his motions, and in the necessity of constant efforts to obey them.

The actual regeneration of baptized infants is so explicitly affirmed by our Church, that we might content ourselves with referring to the office itself, and to the extracts from it, which have been already brought before the Reader in this Chapter, had not the Inquiry taken pains, in copious notes, to deny this regeneration to be a tenet of our Church. It is due to the Author of that Work to say, that he felt, in full force, the fundamental repugnance of this tenet to the doctrines which he has espoused, and that, in endeavouring to displace it from among those accredited by our Church, he has displayed all the ingenuity of which the case was susceptible: but his ingenuity and his learning are unavailing, because truth is

stronger than the confederation. Our Church neither "uses the sign, instead of the thing signified," nor does she merely "express her hope, that God has heard the prayers which have been offered to him in Faith," as the Inquiry suggests; but she plainly insists upon the actual regeneration of infants in baptism. At the same time, we are far from denying, "that they who, without true faith, eat the sacramental bread, eat not the very body of Christ;" or "that they, who do not rightly receive baptism, are not ingrafted into the body of Christ."^(h) To explain this subject, it is to be understood, that our Church contemplates regeneration under two aspects; under one, the transfer from our liability to wrath, as the offspring of fallen Adam, to a participation of God's gracious remission of the penalty, and to a prospective admission to all the privileges of that merciful dispensation, as the children of the covenant in Jesus Christ; under the other, the deriving of the lineaments of a new nature upon the spiritual faculties;—the fruits of which regeneration are exhibited in a godly, righteous, and sober life. The former of these requires no co-operation in the subject to which it is applied, and hence infants are as susceptible of the mercies conferred on this admission as adults; the other requires a capacity for the reception of the spiritualizing influence of the Holy Spirit, by Repentance and Faith. Repentance and Faith are not the *procuring* causes of the graces annexed to sacramental ordinances. In adults they are only *capacitating* conditions, by which the persons possessing them are rendered capable of employing the privileges of the Christian covenant to the 'perfecting of holiness in the fear of God.' But in no case are Repentance and Faith *consti-*

(h) Inquiry, Part ii. p. 179, note.

tuent parts of the Sacrament, and therefore in no case can they be required, but where they minister, as preparative means to the attainment of the object for which the Sacrament has been appointed. To infants, baptism is understood by our Church to be a laver of regeneration, by annulling the penal consequences of our first parents' transgression, and by conferring on them a covenant-title to the graces of God's Spirit; and hence she affirms, in the Rubrick already cited—"It is certain, by God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved;" because, as she assures the congregation, when a child, after having been privately baptized, is presented for admission into the flock of Christ, "that being born in sin, and in the wrath of God, he is now, by the laver of regeneration in baptism, received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life." When, therefore, the infant has not, by actual sin, invalidated this his reception into the Church of Christ, to him the promise of Christ stands assured, and "dying, he is undoubtedly saved."

But to those of riper years, baptism is a laver of regeneration, not only from original, but also from actual sin. Adults, therefore, who are presented to be baptized, she addresses not only as being "conceived and born in sin, but as living in sin, and committing many actual transgressions;" and hence she represents the promises of the Gospel offered to them, not as absolute, but conditional—as taking effect only upon "their truly repenting and coming unto Christ by faith."—Without these preparatives, they are informed, that the purposes of the institution are not answered; "for, as the same Apostle (St. Peter) testifieth, baptism doth now save us—not the

putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God." Should adults, then, approach this rite, without sincere repentance and lively faith, "without the answer of a good conscience towards God," they partipate indeed in the sign, but not in the thing signified;—they have not put on Christ;—they have not that faith in him by which they are "made children of God and of the Light," and, therefore, to them the administration of this sacrament is become, to say the least of it, a nugatory ceremony. In this plain distinction between the purposes of the sacrament, as applied to infants and to adults, we have the resolution of any difficulty that might arise from affixing to the term *Regeneration*, in its usual acceptation, spirituality of affections as its inseparable adjunct. Our Church uses it in a two-fold sense, as has been already stated; nor can any language be more peremptory than that in which she repeatedly ascribes regeneration to infants. She tells her people, that "as all men are conceived and born in sin, except that child be regenerate, and receive that which by nature he cannot have, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." She calls upon God to "wash and sanctify that infant with the Holy Ghost, that he, being delivered from his wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church." She supplicates him "for that infant, that he, coming to his holy baptism, may receive remission of his sins (derived from his ancestors) by spiritual regeneration." She prays that he would "give his Holy Spirit to that infant, that he might be born again, and be made an heir of everlasting salvation;" and she beseeches God, that he would "sanctify that water to the mystical washing away of sin." The sacrament having been administered, she then announces to the congregation the accomplishment of God's

promises, saying, "this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church." She proceeds to "yield God thanks, that it hath pleased him to regenerate this infant with his Holy Spirit." She pronounces that "he is made partaker of the death of Christ;" and, finally, she records against all possibility of cavil, that, should he "die before he committed actual sin, he is undoubtedly saved;" because he has received that which, by nature, he could not have;—because, being conceived and born in sin, he is by baptism regenerate, its water being sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin.

That our Church maintains the regeneration of every baptized infant, is thus placed beyond all doubt. 'The idea that Baptism necessarily confers Regeneration,' so far from being 'inconsistent with the avowed principles of our Church,' is distinctly her tenet. No sophistry, no ingenuity, can possibly pervert the clear, unequivocal, enunciation of her sentiments on this topic; no other construction can be put upon her words in any fairness; and the Office of Baptism, therefore, stands an unshaken pillar, inscribed with her dissent from the doctrine of an arbitrary selection of the heirs of salvation, according to the tenor of a decree, "which came unto the predestinated individual, when yet in his mother's womb."(i)

(i) The declaratory language of the Church concerning the Regeneration of baptized Infants is so strong, that the Author of the Inquiry endeavours to surmount so formidable an objection to his explaining away the peremptory and repeated affirmations of the Church into a mere pious hope of their Regeneration, by adducing passages from other parts of the Liturgy, which he pronounces equal in strength of declaration, yet plainly incapable of a higher interpretation than *hope*.* If there were not those who think that every thing which re-

* Inquiry, Part ii. Note, pp. 177—180.

Every baptized infant, by being received into the Ark of Christ's Church, acquires a security, which he must have abandoned, if he perish in the waves which shall overwhelm the wicked; and, being once delivered from the wrath of God, he must rekindle that wrath, which is extinguished by the waters of Baptism, if he be committed to the vengeance which shall consume the evil doers. *He must have fallen from Grace.* Does our Church ascribe this fall to personal

mains unanswered is unanswerable, these parallel passages might have been safely left in a harmless repose. They are in fact injurious to the cause which they are called upon to sustain, for the examination of them will shew that our Church exercises a cautious precision in her language, which exempts her from the charge of so pernicious a confusion of ideas, as such an abuse of distinct forms of speech would intimate.

The first passage relied upon by the Inquiry, is found in the Office of Ordination. 'At the Ordination of Deacons,' observes the Inquiry, 'she says, "Almighty God, giver of all good things, who of thy great goodness hast vouchsafed to accept and take these thy servants unto the office of Deacons in thy Church;" and still more strongly in the ordering of Priests, "For that thou hast vouchsafed to call these thy servants here present to the same office and ministry appointed for the salvation of mankind, we render unto thee most hearty thanks, we praise and worship thee".' This acceptance the Author assumes to be only a pious hope, because in the 26th Article it is stated that "in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments." But to our apprehension the meaning of the acceptance is perfectly obvious, and the sense of the passages very different from that ascribed to them in the Inquiry. The Acceptance is simple and declarative:—it is not an acceptance in *hope*, but an acceptance in *fact*; because it is an external acceptance to the ministry, and that alone to which the Church alludes here. She is, in these Collects, pronouncing the tests to which the Candidate for Ordination has been submitted, to be a full compliance with the Word of God, and a sufficient security for the validity of her Ordinations. She therefore receives him among her ministers, and this reception is the only acceptance to which she refers. It is manifestly an acceptance independent of in-

reprobation of mere Predestination, or does she apply to those to whom she has administered the elements of spiritual existence, subsequent benefits, derived from a continual supply of that same good Spirit, without any regard to this appointment?—Before we proceed farther, is it not natural to ask?—Whether having received them as her children, does she reject them as aliens? Having suckled them at her breasts with the milk of the Spirit, does she resign all farther interest in their

ternal holiness, because it is an acceptance which neither the rectification of conduct in her minister can improve, nor, as she maintains in the 26th Article, can his improper conduct vitiate. For as, on the one hand, a minister corrupt in principle at the time of his Ordination, does not, upon a change of heart and life, require a subsequent Ordination, so, on the other hand, a candidate for Orders, whom his piety of life, and earnest zeal for the cause of God will enable to say with great sincerity, "That he trusts he is inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon him this office and ministration, to serve God for the promoting of his glory, and the edifying of his people," does not, upon his falling from Grace, invalidate the Ordination once conferred. He continues to be the official organ of Grace supplied by the Holy Spirit, through the ordinances of the Church, to the souls of the Faithful. This Grace is the gift of God, and the distribution of it to God's people is not left to depend upon the actual state of mind of the mortal through whom it is administered. The language of the Church is therefore plain and unambiguous; she does not employ the stronger form of a declarative language of acceptance to be the vehicle of a fainter conception of the mere hope of fulfilment.

The sentences selected from the Burial Service are equally inapplicable. The first of them, "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mércy to take unto himself the soul of our dear Brother here departed," seems to have been adopted from Ecclesiastes, xii. 7, and expresses, like the passage in that inspired Writer, nothing more than the death of the person, by stating the separation of the immortal soul from the mortal body, preparatory to the consignment of the perishable part to its kindred element. In Ecclesiastes evidently nothing more is intended, and yet the language "the Spirit shall return unto God who gave it," is at least as expressive of a state of hap-

welfare; and, withdrawing her protection, leave them a helpless and devoted prey to the 'adversary, that walketh about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour?' 'Having begun in the spirit, does she end in the flesh?' Her notification of such sentiments should be express indeed, to render so manifest an inconsistency credible. But let us turn to the Collect of Easter Even, and hear her there:—"Grant, O Lord, that as we are baptized into the death of thy blessed Son, our Saviour

piness as that of "taking unto himself the soul of our dear Brother here departed." But the actual condition of the departed does not enter into the contemplation of the context in either case. The second sentence cited by the Inquiry, "We give thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our Brother out of the miseries of this sinful world," is as little indicative of the state of the departed. The Church gives thanks for the deliverance of every man out of the miseries of this sinful world, not because she would convey a certainty of his translation to a state of happiness, but because she would intimate that happiness was intended to be his destination; and because she beholds in the departure of each an approximation towards the 'hastening of the kingdom when we'—shall 'have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul in his eternal and everlasting Glory.' The *hope* which she charitably utters when she says "that we may rest in thee, as our hope is this our Brother doth," has no connexion with these declarations. It is a hope which she durst not breathe till she had stated the terms on which it will be realized.—"We meekly beseech thee, O Father," says she, "to raise us from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness; that when we shall depart, &c." Her charity hopes that the deceased has fulfilled these conditions, because 'Charity hopeth all things;' but, though she 'thinketh no evil,' yet she abstains with becoming modesty from intruding into the secrets of the Just One, by anticipating His Judgment. She only affirms of the state of the departed, that it is fixed. She intimates that it is not to be improved by prayers for the deceased. If he has departed in the true Faith of Christ, there is no Purgatory between the loving master and the beloved disciple—"our Brother doth"—he *rests* in Jesus.

Equally unsupported is the assertion in the same Note, that the Regeneration of Infants by Baptism 'is inconsistent with

Jesus Christ; so, by continual mortifying our corrupt affections, we may be buried with him; and that through the grave, and gate of death, we may pass to to our joyful resurrection, for his merits, who died, and was buried, and rose again for us, thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.”—In this prayer, the Church intimates the progress of an interest, begun by baptism in the Saviour, and she grounds the petition for that progress upon that antecedent interest. She affirms her spiritual connexion with

the avowed principles of all the Reformed Churches.’ There was a hazard of simple contradiction incurred by this statement, which few we think who had read the Augustan Confession, and that of the Saxon Churches, would have cared to encounter.

‘With respect to Baptism,’ says the former, ‘they teach that it is necessary to Salvation, as being a ceremony instituted by Christ. And that through Baptism the Grace of God is offered, and that Infants are to be baptized, and that Infants through Baptism being commended to God, *are received into the Grace of God, and are made Sons of God, as Christ testifies, &c.*’*

“We retain the Baptism of Infants too,” says the latter, “because it is most certain that the promise of Grace appertains to Infants also, and to them only who are ingrafted into the Church. Nor do we conceive that this custom is a mere ceremony, but that they are then truly received by God, and *that Infants are sanctified.* Because they are then ingrafted into the Church, and to *such the promise appertains.*”†

* “IX. De Baptismo docent quod necessarius sit ad salutem tanquam Ceremonia a Christo instituta. Et quod per Baptismum offeratur Gratia Dei, et quod Infantes sint baptizandi, et quod infantes per baptismum Deo commendati, recipiantur in Gratiam Dei, et fiant filii Dei, sicut Christus testatur, &c.”—Confessio Fidei, &c. in Comiciis Augustæ, 1530. Francofurt. 1551.

† “14. DE BAPTISMO.—Retinemus et Infantium baptismum; quia certissimum est, promissionem Gratia etiam ad Infantes pertinere, et ad eos tantum qui Ecclesie inseruntur. Nec judicamus hunc morem tantum otiosam Cæremoniam esse, sed vere tunc a Deo recipi, et sanctificari Infantes. Quia tunc inseruntur Ecclesie et ad tales promissio pertinet.”—Saxonice Confessio Eccles. Synodo Trident. oblata, A. D. 1551. Basil. 1552.

the death of the Redeemer by Baptism, that she might establish, on the one hand, her claim to a participation in a spiritual burial with her Lord, as consecutive upon a spiritual death; and that she might remind her children, on the other hand, of the continual mortification of their corruptions, to which they stand engaged, as necessarily incident to their baptismal regeneration. The petition for spiritual burial, and the engagement to continual mortification of our corrupt affections, are as universal as the title from which they derive their force; and as we have shewn that title, viz. Baptism into the death of Christ, is the property of all, can it with truth be affirmed, that that spiritual burial, and that mortification, are not permitted to all? Farther—In the Exhortation addressed by our Church to the Godfathers and Godmothers, in which they are charged with the inspection of the religious education of the child, we find her, in nearly the same form of expression, presenting the same sentiments, under a different aspect: the closeness of the affinity between the Collect and this part of the Exhortation is obvious:—the material of which they are composed is the same:—the form only is different. In that Exhortation, after instructing the sureties in the method which they are called upon to adopt for the virtuous training up of the regenerated child,—“to lead a godly and a Christian life;”—she reminds them, that “Baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is, to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and be made like unto him; that as he died and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living.”—Now, what impression does the Church mean here to convey? That if

that child be a predestinated reprobate, all their pains shall be of no avail; and that if he be pre-ordained to salvation, their neglect shall not be injurious to his eternal interests? That that Grace, which can alone bestow success on man's efforts, will not be vouchsafed, because it is shut up from the predestinated individual by an absolute decree, independent of his use or abuse of God's mercies?—God forbid. This Exhortation can have no other design than that of animating the exertions of the Sponsors, by pointing out to them the great moral purposes for which our Heavenly Father enfolds in the arms of his mercy the offspring of his covenanted people; by reminding them of the fatal consequences of failing to attain the substance of which Baptism is a similitude; and by conveying to them a comfortable assurance, that the grace vouchsafed in Baptism, is but an earnest of future supplies for the attainment of the ultimate objects which this rite represents, and to which baptismal regeneration ministers, by the merciful appointment of that all-wise God, who would neither make void his gift, nor render their efforts, co-operating with his own intentions, fruitless and unavailing.

The testimony which each of these formularies bears to the doctrine we have been considering is, we apprehend, as strong as any incidental evidence derived from the peculiarity of construction, suitable to such compositions, could be expected to supply. But the value of this testimony is considerably enhanced by their mutual dependence:—In the one, the Church charges the Godfathers and Godmothers to remember, that as that child, whom they brought to the laver of regeneration, has been by it received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life, so he is made a present partaker of these high privileges in contemplation, should he live, of successive

approximations to the example of Christ Jesus, to which he stands engaged :—In the other, she prays for the effectuating of these great purposes of Baptism to adults, by their attainment of this conformity to their Lord. Thus, what she teaches in the one to be incumbent upon all, she prays in the other may be attained by all. What she views prospectively in the one, as the due return of privileges conferred upon all, she prays, at the period ripe for their exercise in the other, may be performed by all. That the force and truth of this connexion, and universal offers of grace, consequent upon baptismal regeneration, are recognized by our Church, we are the more confident in maintaining, when we see a daily renovation of the Holy Spirit united to this regeneration in the Collect for the Nativity: “Grant that we, being regenerate and made thy children by adoption and grace, may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit.”—The petition for these renovating supplies of grace being grounded on this primary regeneration, all those who derive under that title, present their requests under the same pledge of acceptance. But that this primary regeneration is regarded by our Church as universal, we think has been already sufficiently proved; the gift, therefore, of renovating grace must be co-extended—must be equally universal—must embrace all who do not render themselves incapable of its application—who do not “judge themselves unworthy of everlasting life.”^(k)—We may add, as a corroborating argument, that in both these Collects which have been now brought under consideration, we observe these requests for grace intimately combined with the same notes of universality which have been previously noticed in this chapter.

(k) Acts, xiii. 46.

In the Preface to the Collect for the Nativity, the Church, stating, in her usual manner, the special mercy through which she hopes for acceptance, urges her plea, that "he gave his only-begotten Son to take our nature upon him;"—and in that of Easter Even, expressing the foundation of the acceptance of her prayers, she rests it upon the knowledge that Christ "died and was buried, and rose again for us."—All mankind are equally interested *a priori* in his death;—all mankind are equally participators in the honour done to our nature;—and hence the offer of special grace, conjoined with these universal boons, is itself a boon equally universal.

Should the force of these universal petitions be evaded by calling them the requests of the prayer of Faith, as we have seen that those in behalf of regenerated infants have been denominated by the Inquiry, we would ask, whether any request can be made in faith which we know to be contrary to the revealed will of God? Would it, for instance, be a subject for the prayer of Faith, to supplicate a holy God to save the wicked in their impenitence? We would shudder at the impiety. But Faith approves, and Charity utters those supplications, which are rendered unattainable only on the part of man, not God. We can avow "that by reason of the frailty of our nature, we cannot always stand upright," (*l*)—and yet pray "that we may fall into no sin, neither run into any kind of danger," (*m*)—because the latter is expressive of the warfare which it is our bounden duty to wage against all sin, and is therefore acceptable to the will of God; while it is at once the organ of those pious desires, which we are inhibited only by the

(*l*) Collect 4th Sunday after Epiphany.

(*m*) 3d Collect for Grace—Morning Prayer.

frailty of our nature from accomplishing, and the object of those repewed efforts for universal obedience, which will admit no compromise with any sin. So, also, we can pray for universal grace to be offered for the effectual salvation of all, because we know that God would "have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the Truth,"⁽ⁿ⁾—though the experience of the world mournfully intimates the defeating of the petition, by the persevering opposition of the majority to the will of God.—But let it be believed, that Universal Redemption is *contrary* to the revealed will of God :—then a petition for the saving of *all* men is no longer uttered in Faith; for the revealed will of God being exceptive, the prayer, to concur with that will, should not be universal. Under this aspect, all the universal prayers of the Church, and which of them is not universal, rise up with one voice to vindicate her Charity from want of Faith, and all unite in deprecating the imputation, by recoiling from a scheme of doctrine which will not suffer her to entertain both. The Puritans were consistent, when, in the admonition presented to the Parliament in 1572, they say ;—" they mislike that we pray in the Litany *that all men* might be saved."^(o) They held Special Redemption; and, to accommodate that doctrine, the charity of the prayer must be divorced from its faith.

But the Church has given a still more unequivocal demonstration of her intentions than the universality of her Petitions. The application of these Collects, in which the Church states the *special* mercies through which she hopes for the acceptance of the requests which she places under their protection, admit still less of being evaded,

(n) 1 Tim. ii. 4.

(o) Strype's Annals, Appendix, No. xix.

than these general petitions to which the Puritans object, and which specify no distinct ground of acceptance. In these Collects, after the manner of the Patriarchs, she looks with a holy importunity to the obtaining of her suit, by insisting upon its necessary connexion with that favour which the Almighty has already granted.—To add an example to those already given :—When the Bishop, in the Order of Confirmation, prays for the bestowing of the manifold gifts of the Spirit on the Candidates for Confirmation, he is instructed to plead the previous regeneration by water and the Holy Ghost, and the forgiveness of their sins:—“ Almighty and Everlasting God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins; strengthen them, we beseech thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter,” &c.—(p) She intimates, that their regeneration would be nugatory, and the record of their acceptance, by the forgiveness of their sins, void, were the manifold gifts of the Spirit to be withheld from those, “ who now have promised, that, by the grace of God, they would endeavour themselves, faithfully to observe such things as they, by their own confession, assented unto.”(q)—The failure of these endeavours intercepts the efficacy of the prayer only as it intercepts the efficacy of grace; and the prayer, thus conceived, is the prayer of Faith, and assures an answer to all those in whose behalf it is offered.

Thus far we have traced the Church dispensing the elements of spiritual existence to all infants without discrimination, and applying the benefits derived from a continued supply of that good

(p) Order of Confirmation.

(q) Preface to Order of Confirmation.

Spirit, in right of their regeneration, to all who are baptized. It remains that we see whether, as she affords the fostering influences of special grace, both preventing and assisting, without limitation, she does not also maintain the co-operation of our wills. The Collect for Easter-day might alone be sufficient to determine this point. In it special, preventing, and assisting grace are specifically mentioned;—their peculiar offices distinguished;—the former introduced as the harbinger of the latter;—both combined with a preface, the messenger of universal interests;—and the efficacy of both resolved into the co-operating will of man.—“ Almighty God, who, through thine only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, hast overcome Death, and opened unto us the gate of everlasting life; we humbly beseech thee, that as, by thy special grace preventing us, thou dost put into our minds good desires; so by thy continual help we may bring the same to good effect through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end.” The office of preventing grace is absolute—“ *thou dost put;*” but that of assisting grace contingent—*we may*: preventing grace is absolute, because it only stimulates to exertion—“ *thou dost put into our minds good desires;*” assisting grace contingent, because, through man’s perverseness, it may never reach effect: moreover, assisting grace is termed *help*, because auxiliary to man’s endeavours, to distinguish the character of its operations from the motions of that grace, which, as it goes before man’s endeavours, is in its *access*, though not in its *success*, independent of his will:—the will co-operating with the one, the other co-operating with the will:—thus, the peculiar offices of each, and the peculiar relation of man to each, are conveyed with definite precision in the compass of a few words. In the Collect for the Second Sunday

after Easter, this order of co-operation is appropriately marked by the words *receive* and *endeavour*—“ Give us grace, that we may always most thankfully *receive* that his inestimable benefit, and also daily *endeavour ourselves* (*r*) to follow the blessed steps of his most holy life.”

In short, the mention of these graces scarcely ever occurs without bringing with it an intimation of this order.

Thus, in one of the Post Communion Collects, we find the same relations maintained in a prayer for both preventing and subsequent grace:—“ Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings, with thy most gracious favour; and further, us with thy continual help; that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy name; and finally, by thy mercy, obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”—Here we pray that we *may glorify God's holy name in all our works*—works which are begun by the influences of preventing grace, and are as fully denominated *works* in connexion with that grace, as those which are performed by the continual help of grace subsequently supplied—so that the co-operation of man is recognized in the one as well as in the other.—The negative forms of construction subscribe to the same species of co-operation. In the Collect of the First Sunday after Trinity, the ground of our petition for the help of grace is laid in the weakness of our mortal nature—“ Because, through the weakness of our mortal nature, we can do no good thing without thee, grant us the help of thy grace.”—It is for the strengthening of this weakness, the support of this imbecility, and not for

(*r*) This verb is here taken actively, the signification which it usually bears in the writings of the period of its compilation.—See the Extract from Latimer's Sermons, (p. 110,) and that from the Homily of Faith, (p. 149,) in the first Chapter of this Apology.

the super-induced impulses of irresistible grace, independent of our co-operation, that we presume to supplicate.—We are not taught to say we possess no strength whatever, but that his sustaining grace is indispensable—“We can do no good thing without thee;” the grace of God and man together. In the 9th Collect after Trinity, as also in the 19th, not to instance in any more, the occurrence of the same construction will suggest, that two negatives are equivalent to an affirmative, and will avouch the doctrine of co-operating grace.

To recur once more to the affirmative construction.—In the Collect for the Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity, the office of grace is denominated *leading*—“lead us to all things profitable to our salvation.”—The commentary of an Absolute Predestinarian on this verb, will indicate what countenance is given by our formularies to the doctrines of his school; it is furnished by Strype in a copy of the original document.

“Cooper, Bishop of Lincoln, having preached at Paul’s Cross, a Vindication of the Church of England and its Liturgy, A.D. June 27th, 1572—he is charged with having offended many thereby, and objections to his Sermon are drawn up in a Piece entitled, “An Answer to certain Pieces of a Sermon made at St. Paul’s Cross, &c. by Dr. Cooper, Bishop of Lincoln, &c.” *Inter alia*, he is charged: “V. Because you wrested and perverted sundry places of Scripture, which you alleged—as first—*Nemo potest venire ad me, nisi Pater qui misit me, traxerit eum*—which you English twice for *failing* after this sort; no man can come, unless my Father *lead him*; which interpretation savoureth somewhat of Pelagianism, because it seemeth to attribute some small unwillingness to be in man, as coming to God.—To lead, you know, is not so forcible as to draw.—For many times we be

led thither, whither we would gladly, and without resisting, go. Our Saviour Christ's meaning in these words is, both to set forth our unwillingness to come unto him, that ful fountain and treasure of all goodness, and also to declare the forcible means that God the Father doth use; who *wil we* or *nil we*, will draw us unto his Son." (s).

The intrinsic perspicuity of the Collects we adduced, perhaps required not even our Analysis to spread the manifest opposition of their contents, to the compulsory doctrine of irresistible grace, before the minds of our Readers; still less was it necessary to have recourse for this purpose to any external criticism; but the stern character of those hard-featured doctrines is so strongly portrayed in this no uncommon specimen of the critical acuteness of that school, that we could not refuse the opportunity of placing it in contrast with the sentiments of our Church; it is a contrast, whose dark shades cast more vivid tints on her animating formularies, and bestow a more lively colouring on her all-embracing prayers, which diffuse a cheering vigour through the soul, while they both assure to her infirmities the unpredestinated supports of grace, and admonish her of their proportion being admeasured to her co-operating strength.

These are 'the principles of divine truth,' which to our apprehension are inculcated by the Liturgy, very different indeed from those which are ascribed to it by the Inquiry; but we trust it is abundantly apparent that the confidence we expressed in the approving countenance, which that monument affords to those principles, has been justified by the result. We discovered, if we have not greatly mistaken her plain language, in the addresses of the Church to the 'negligent'—their

(s) Strype's Annals, Appendix, No. xix.

guilt arraigned, their final peril exposed, and their excuses defeated by arguments drawn from their base return to his redeeming love, their injurious opposition to his means of grace, and their careless reception of his fond invitations. In the application of these arguments, we found her expounding the interest in the redemption by terms of universal import; insisting on the efficacious concurrence of man's rational faculties with God's Spirit, and infixing on the wilful obstinacy, and obdurate perverseness, of the disobedient, their ungrateful inattention to his fatherly remonstrances. We concluded, and were we erroneous in the conclusion, that in adopting the language, she adopted the sentiments of those who maintain universal redemption, a co-operating will, and resistibility of grace. Again—In her awakening calls to notorious sinners, we found her stimulating them to immediate repentance, on the one hand, by soothing their fears and exciting their hopes; on the other, by alarming their apprehensions, and banishing their self-security: she assures to them a present acceptability in Jesus, but she forewarns them of the possible loss of this acceptability, and of the limitation of a day of grace. In this limitation, and in the peril of this loss, we beheld an utter repugnance to personal Election, which equally rejects the contingency of the time of salvation elapsing, and the possibility of an existing claim to the merits of the Saviour being cancelled:—and were we deceived?

From her addresses we proceeded to her daily services and occasional offices, to discover in them the certainty of the recognition of the doctrines, from which she drew the powerful arguments and affecting motives used in her exhortations. In them, the number and the variety of her forms supplied a copious store of her frequent and diversified representation of her doctrines.—

In them, when we found the language in which she spoke of redemption universal, could we infer that her sentiments were restricting? Nay more—when we found that she knit the redemption to the general judgment, to the deprecating of vengeance for sin, to the mercy of creation, to the humiliation of the Redeemer in assuming human nature;—when we saw that he, who separated the unexcepting universality of the one from the universality of the other, should rend what she had united; we conceived a strong persuasion of the intimate combination of the universality of the redemption with her scheme of doctrines.

In the Commemorative Office of the Redeemer's Sacrifice, we heard her pronouncing that sacrifice to have been made not simply for the world, but the whole world; and we observed her practically demonstrating the extent in which its benefits were to be applied, by her reporting to every individual communicant his personal interest in the glad tidings.—We turned to the Baptismal Office, and we listened to her accents there, and there we found her dispelling doubt, and infusing the persuasion of an earnest faith, by assuring to the congregation the personal reception of the presented infant. We compared the language of these offices together, and we judged, that the former was only intimating the continuance of an interest which had been begun by the latter, and that both were stamped in most legible characters, with the impress of God's unlimited mercy in the universality of the redemption. We admitted a settled conviction—and can our Readers entertain any other?—that Universal Redemption was a standard tenet of our Church.

From the doctrine of the Redemption, we went on to the doctrine of Grace, and they were found to correspond.—Never once does her mouth utter

the chilling negative of a predestinated repulse:—never once does her hand trace the gloomy boundary between the accepted and rejected of mere Predestination.—The same endearing sounds are addressed to all;—the same prayers offered in the name of all, and assented to with the voice of all. It is to a “God, who willet not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should return and live,” that she turns the timid eye of her children; it is the troubled conscience of the penitent believer that she calms, by proclaiming to him the peace of absolution; it is the whole congregation she invites, as consequent upon this declaration of his fatherly mercies, to sue for the Holy Spirit, as the earnest of their sonship. Does she originate an individual participation of God’s mercies through the laver of regeneration, she does not recal the participation.—No; she pleads the universal boon as an argument for universal grants of grace, and she places this plea with holy importunity on the Altar, secure of its ascending in the perfume of the Mediator’s incense.

When she acknowledges the descent of the dews of preventing grace upon the soul, does she thank God that the fleeces of the Predestinate alone are moistened, while those of the ‘Spectacles of his Justice’ are left unvisited? Ah! no; to his bounty she presumes to set no limits, but those which he has set himself—the ungrateful returns of an unfruitful soil. Does she insinuate the successful power of grace, independent of the will of man? No; she designates the office of preventing grace by the good desires only which it excites, or the works whose commencement she annexes to its operation. And for assisting grace; the name itself of help, by which she denominates it, proves that she regards it but as an auxiliary. Thus, the doctrine of grace which she teaches, was

found to be consistent with the universality of the redemption which she inculcates, and the privileges which she conferred in administering the treasures of God's gratuitous mercies to be neither visionary nor defective. She neither presents a delusive picture, which, like those optical deceptions in sandy deserts, feed the gasping soul with expectations which are to be cruelly disappointed: nor does she suckle her children with her milk, and afterward refuse her meat.

Whether this result has not justified the ascribing to our Liturgy these principles of divine faith, which have been elicited from it in these pages, let them doubt, who, in reviving the lamentable doctrines which heretofore distressed our Church, are endeavouring to infix on her præscript form of worship the importations from a foreign Church, whose novel discipline is at utter variance with the constitution of the Church of England. For us, we can discern no departure from 'that faith once delivered to the saints,' witnessed by the consenting voice of all the Fathers, and which our Reformers sought for, not in the modern devices of Geneva, but in "the Missals of Sarum, York, Hereford, Bangor, and Lincoln;" (t) and, having discovered, relieved it from the corruptions with which it was obscured, and restored it to its primitive simplicity and its ancient lustre.

The Liturgy occupies a station of peculiar importance among the monuments of our Church. It had been employed for some years in the daily services before the publication of the Forty-two Articles; it was therefore not only the great authentic medium through which the doctrines of

(t) See Burnet's Hist. Ref. Part ii. B. i. pp. 71, &c. A.D. 1548.

the Reformation were conveyed to both ministers and people, but it was also an earnest and a pledge of a temper among the Reformers unambitious of innovations. To give effect to its characteristic rank, we assigned to it a separate chapter, and we avoided intermixing with our strictures corroborating commentaries drawn from other sources. By preserving to it this independent arrangement, our Readers have an opportunity of placing themselves in effect at the epoch of its publication, and of judging, from its own internal evidence, what doctrines plain, sincere, and honest men delivered then to the people, and continued to retain. Its own perspicuity rendered foreign commentary unnecessary; the advantages we desired to obtain, rendered it inexpedient.

But we did promise the sentiments of Cranmer on Baptismal Regeneration; and though we conceive no words can be more express than those of the Baptismal Office, and though we are sure his private opinion can give no authority to this public document, yet to satisfy our Readers that no language could withstand the crucible of the Predestinarian Alchymists, we shall subjoin one or two extracts from Cranmer's Catechism, which will shew with what justice the science of the Inquiry has been exercised upon that subject:

“ Good children, you shall here learn that evil lusts and appetites, which come unto us, even from our first father, Adam, be sins, and that no man or woman, no, not infants in the mother's womb, do live without such lusts and appetites. ... For infants are baptized for this purpose, that they, by the same, may enjoy remission of their sins. And in case they needed not forgiveness of their offences, then they had no need to be christened.” (u)—“ Now ye have heard, good children,

(u) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. pp. 199, 200.

how by baptism we are so planted in Christ, that by him we have forgiveness of our sins, and are grafted in him as the branch is in the vine. As by baptism we are born again, and as by the authority of the keys and penance (x) we are lifted up again, when we are fallen into sin *after baptism*, so by Communion of the Holy Supper of the Lord, we are preserved and strengthened, that we may be able steadfastly to stand and fight against the violent invasions of sin and the power of the devil. Wherefore, good children, for as much as ye be *already* planted in Christ by baptism, learn also, I pray you, how ye may continually abide and grow in Christ, the which thing is taught you in the Lord's Supper." (y)—“ The second birth is by the water of baptism, which Paul calleth the bath of regeneration, because our sins be forgiven us in baptism, and the Holy Ghost is poured into us as into God's beloved children, so that by the power and working of the Holy Ghost we be *born again* spiritually, and made new creatures. And so by baptism we *enter* into the kingdom of God, and *shall* be *saved* for ever, if we *continue* to our lives' end in the faith of Christ.”——
 “ Wherefore, seeing *all* you, that be here, are already *baptised, continue*, I pray you, in this good mind and purpose; acknowledge in your hearts before God that you be sinners; be sorry for the same, and pray to God to heal and deliver you from your sins. Beware you fall not to *sin again*; have no delight in sin, nor sin willingly, but be godly and holy, and suffer gladly such afflictions as God shall lay upon your backs. *And if you do thus, then* your baptism shall be available

(x) Penance, the ordinary term in the days of Edward VI. for Repentance.

(y) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. pp. 315, 316.

into you, and God shall work in you by his Holy Spirit, and shall *finish* in you all those things which *by baptism he hath begun.*"(z)

We should shew little respect for the understanding of our Readers, were we to point out the complete sanction which these passages give to the actual regeneration of infants in baptism, and to the consequences of that regeneration. We shall only add that this Catechism contains still stronger declarations, which have been withheld for reasons that we think our Readers would approve. These extracts suggest to us the fitness of intimating that we have intentionally declined any notice of the words 'Chosen,' 'Elect,' &c. which occur three or four times in the Liturgy, both because we think the subject has been at least sufficiently discussed, and the acceptation of the term *Election* by our Church, in a conditional sense, abundantly proved in the first chapter; and because it never occurs without bringing with it such appendages as obviously attach to it the most enlarged signification. There is a phrase used in one of the prayers, after the reception of the holy Communion, which may seem to require explanation:—"And we most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as *thou hast prepared for us to walk in.*"

Our Readers, by turning back to page 75, will perceive that the phrase "thou hast prepared for us to walk in," was familiar to the Reformers, from the time of Henry VIII. and that it is taken in this prayer precisely in the sense and construction in which it had been used in the *King's Book*.

(z) Fathers of the English Church, Vol. iii. pp. 291, 295.

In taking our leave of the Liturgy, we cannot but regret that it has fallen to our lot to be compelled to violate, in some measure, its holy peacefulness, by involving it in the contentious tumult inseparable from the upholding of contradictory opinions. We fear that the benefits derived to the Church, from the ministerial labours of the Author of the Inquiry, will but ill compensate for the withdrawing of the minds of her children from the purifying influences of her services, to the contemplation of the patronage they afford to contested doctrines. How much more delightful a duty would it be, to exhibit her as the 'steward of God's mysteries,' opening the stores of his wisdom, and dispensing their treasures, satisfying those who hunger after righteousness with bread, and those who are athirst with pure water. How much more edifying to shew her warning the wicked, comforting the penitent, and animating those who are 'working out their salvation,' to constancy and perseverance. How much more beneficial to point out how her offices meet the general wants. For, in her Liturgy, what is it we should look for, that we cannot have? She teaches us how we should be humble with our God; she instructs us how we should be comely in our praise; and she informs us how we should acceptably approach the Throne of Grace. Is there any evil which can assault the soul, or any harm which can reach the body, be it present or future, that she doth not acquaint us, both how we should think of it, and in what manner we should speak of it? And in the administration of these great benefits, she has supplied 'milk for the babes,' while she is procuring 'meat' for the strong; for all the parts of her service are linked together in so easy and dependent a manner, that they naturally conduct all, the unlearned as well as the learned, into a

sympathy of pious sentiments, if they have spiritualized dispositions to feel them; and at the same time give an inexpressible pleasure to those of judicious minds, while they perceive and feel this harmony: Humiliation, Praise, the Word of God, Hymns, Confessions of Faith, and Prayer, succeeding to one another, in a rational and instructive order. Charged with this duty, we should hail the eloquence of the Author of the Inquiry, employed in so sacred a cause. We should greet it as a well-directed effort to inspire the careless with a sense of the comfort of devotion; we should follow him with emotion as he delineated this comfort, thought mounting upon thought, till the whole heart swelled with pious gratitude, and the tongue sought for utterance;—we would rejoice in the prospect that it opened of convincing the lukewarm that there is a holy joy in worship which they have yet to feel;—in rousing the worldling to learn, from the lesson of experience, that, in pursuing sensual gratifications, he has rendered the soul unfeeling to these spiritual delights, and unfairly cheated her of her best, her most natural, most exquisite, and alone lasting enjoyments.

CHAPTER III.



The prevalence of the doctrine of Absolute Decrees in England is to be attributed, not to an unbiassed Investigation of their Merits, but so essentially to the sole Authority of Calvin, that the credit which is apparently derived upon the doctrine, from its general reception during the Reigns of Elizabeth and James the First, should not enhance its title to acceptance.

IT will be in our Readers' recollection, that we declined the private sentiments of the Revisers of the Articles and Liturgy in 1562, as the Interpreters of the public doctrines of our Church:— with what justice they have already had some opportunity of judging. Had we no other plea, it were sufficient to observe, that they were the Revisers, and not the Compilers of the Articles; and it is most evident, that an Article could not have received a new sense by merely passing their review, when it underwent no alteration that could affect its signification. The 17th Article stands now precisely as it did in the Reign of Edward the Sixth, with the exception of reading—“*Chosen in Christ* out of mankind,” for—“*Chosen* out of mankind”—“*Sons of God* by adoption,” for “*Sons of adoption*”—“*The image of his only-*

begotten," for "the image of the only begotten," and expunging in the last clause, "though the decrees of Predestination be unknown to us yet;" (a) probably because this member was thought to be a tautology,— "secret unto us," having represented it in the first clause.—Manifest it is, therefore, that our liberty remains as unaffected by that Review as if it never had taken place, and, that all considerations of it, and of the Divines who were engaged in it, might, so far as the point at issue is concerned, be passed over without remark. It is due, however, to the interests of truth, and to the received opinion of the most distinguished Doctors of our Church, since the Synod of Dort, to examine what degree of influence the names of our Divines, at the period of the Revision of the Articles and Liturgy, are entitled to have in stamping validity on the doctrine of Absolute Decrees. If it can be shewn that the dazzling effulgence which these Authors shed round this doctrine, is like the concentration of light reflected upon a substance naturally opaque, from mirrors disposed at different angles round a luminous body—then, though the collected flood of light may have, at first, deceived the eye into mistaking each reflection for an independent irradiation, yet sober examination will trace the effect to the emanation of a solitary lamp.

Calvin was that lamp.—From him this doctrine was diffused. The energy of his character, his zeal for the Reformed religion, his talents, his writings, the reputation of his name, the celebrity of the Academy of Geneva, and the circumstances of the times, all contribute to constitute him that centre, round which most of our Divines of the age of Elizabeth ranged themselves. Should we

(a) Burnet's History of the Reformation of the Church of England, Part ii. Book I. Records, No. 55.

succeed in establishing this fact upon unquestionable evidence, the authorities of that age, which are quoted in the second part of the Inquiry, will be equipollent to no more than the mere authority of Calvin. (b)

About the time that Luther raised his voice against Tetzels in Germany, Zuinglius, another Father of the Reformation, opposed with no less zeal a similar iniquitous traffic of Indulgences by Samson in Switzerland. (c) Zuinglius's biblical researches, under the direction of that good Spirit through whom the Scriptures were indited, conducted him to the same solemn conviction of the corruptions of the Roman Church, that Luther, under the same guidance, and a similar pursuit of truth, also entertained. No interchange of sentiments had produced a corresponding similarity of opinion; no communication of designs had excited this simultaneous opposition to the Papal See. (d)

At this period, A. D. 1519, Calvin, a native of Noyon in Picardy, had scarcely attained his tenth year. He was not, however, debtor to their writings for those deep convictions of the Papal corruptions, with which, when but the pupil of Cordierius, his mind was impressed. The study of the same sacred Scriptures, "which are able to make us wise unto salvation," was rewarded to him by the same decided convictions of the errors and corruptions of the Roman Church, (e) that it was

(b) "Though ten persons be brought to give testimony in any cause, yet, if the knowledge they have of the thing whereunto they come as witnesses, appear to have grown from some one amongst them, and to have spread itself from hand to hand, they all are in force but as one testimony."—Pref. to Eccles. Polity.

(c) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvi. Sect. 1. c. ii. § xii.

(d) Ibid. Maclaine's Notes, (κ) & (λ)

(e) Preface to Eccles. Polity.

to the venerable Fathers of the Reformation ; and his opinions were avowed with as undisguised a zeal. (f) It is not unworthy of remark, that these three self-taught inquirers into the unerring word of truth, with one mouth, with entire uniformity, declare the will of God in all the fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith ; and that, where they differ, the disagreement lies in speculative tenets. Each of them, however, acted upon his own discoveries, as if he alone had attained the truth ; and it does not appear, that either Zuinglius at one period, or Calvin at another, could prevail upon Luther, nor Luther upon either of them, to resign peculiar sentiments which had been once adopted. Zuinglius, the founder of the Helvetic Churches, perished in 1531. The same year was fatal to Oecolompadius too, his friend and fellow-labourer. It was in a few years after their death, that Calvin found a refuge in Basil from the persecution of Francis I. Geneva having shaken off the Papal yoke in the following year, invited him to the exercise of ministerial functions. Calvin was then but 27 years old, a period of life when the animal spirits concur with the impulse of a vigorous mind in the execution of a daring enterprise.—Calvin conceived the bold design of modeling the discipline of the Church, in which he possessed no other authority than that of an ordinary functionary, upon a plan, whose original was found only in the depths of his own profound mind. Having united Farel and Beza to him in the execution of the scheme, his momentary success threw a shade over the unwarrantable means by which it was obtained. (g) It is unnecessary to

(f) Mosheim ut supra, § xxxiv.

(g) Calvin—"taking unto him two of the other Ministers for more countenance of the action, (albeit the rest were all against it), they moved, and in the end persuaded, with much

detail here the scenes which followed. Expelled, invited back with earnest supplications, and restored after a five years' exile in Strasburgh, he returned to Geneva, A. D. 1541, with all the additional self-importance which a man of Calvin's temper would naturally feel, whose presence was to be purchased as an indispensable blessing upon any terms. Calvin saw the discipline for which he had been ejected triumphantly established; but once more it was put to hazard, when his inflexible constancy first suspended the danger to which it was exposed; and the suffrages of the Helvetic Churches, which had been appealed to by the Senate, and which were not refused by him, gratified his utmost wishes for plenary power, even at the expense of an oblique reflection upon their own Ecclesiastical Constitution.^(h) The undisputed supremacy which he thus acquired at Geneva, served only to stimulate him to more extensive projects. He grasped at nothing less than a species of universal dominion over all the reformed Churches of Europe, by the establishment of his discipline and doctrine among them.⁽ⁱ⁾ And certainly there was no man better qualified to succeed. His Institutes, published when he was but twenty-six years of age, reflected back from many approving nations a distinguished reputation, to which the various merits of the work gave a just title. Geneva became the resort of strangers,

ado, the people to bind themselves by solemn *Oath*—1st, Never to admit the Papacy amongst them again; and, 2dly, To live in obedience unto such orders, concerning the exercise of their Religion, and the form of their Ecclesiastical Government, as those their true and faithful Ministers of God's Word had, agreeably to Scripture, set down for that end and purpose."—Pref. to Eccles. Polity.

^(h) Preface to Eccles. Polity.

⁽ⁱ⁾ Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. Cent. xvi, Sect. iii. Part. 2. C. 2. § xi.

whose curiosity was attracted by the celebrity of the Author of the Institutes; (k) and their admiration was secured by the vigour of his character, and his fervid zeal for the Reformation, displayed in a manly, unaffected, and flowing eloquence. To a towering genius, Calvin added indefatigable application, inflexible perseverance, and unshaken constancy in the prosecution of his designs. Obstacles which would appal an ordinary mind, served only to animate him to overcome them; and dangers, which would intimidate others into the abandonment of an undertaking, were but a stimulus to his steadfast courage. The success which finally crowned his projects in Geneva, is to be mainly ascribed to his undeviating firmness; and, as we might naturally expect, so flattering a tribute to that quality did not fail to increase it to pertinacity. His virtues and his faults flourished in the same soil, and they were all of a gigantic growth. He was not content with seeing the Ecclesiastical Constitution of Geneva moulded by his hand; self-approbation deceived him into the persuasion, that this newly-devised form of Government, for which antiquity afforded no model, was actually divine; and his active spirit could not rest, till he had both theoretically instilled this belief into others, and practically obtained a confirmation to it. The Helvetic Churches, which acknowledged for their founder Zuinglius, a man whose even judgment was not swayed by disturbing passions, and whose penetrating mind discovered with facility the depths of the Roman corruptions of the Apostolic doctrines, which were fathomed by others only by degrees—these Churches, however, through whose suffrages Calvin was firmly seated in his supremacy, were the first

(k) Mosheim, ut supra.

objects of his revolutionizing adventures. For some time, steadfastly adhering to the Institutions of their illustrious founder, they resisted his endeavours for effecting a union with the Church of Geneva, which was to be obtained by the sacrifice of the differences between Calvin's and Zuinglius's doctrine and discipline; but at length, in the years 1549 and 1554, the agreement was completed, and *Absolute Decrees, after a struggle, (l)* became, among the rest, the public tenets of the Swiss Churches. *(m)* About the same time Calvin having, by his letters, solicited some of the most learned men of the times to assist in forming and conducting an academy, his renown had acquired additional lustre from their presence, and the recent foundation of this distinguished seminary.

It was precisely at this period that the English Protestants fled to the Continent from the persecution of Mary. Their distresses were a sufficient title to protection among any people, especially among those united in the same great cause of shaking off the Papal yoke, but the Lutherans could not be prevailed on to view them with any other sentiments than those of disgust and abhorrence: because of their denying Consubstantiation, they reviled them as Sacramentarians; they refused them an asylum, and forced these distressed exiles to throw themselves upon the hospitality of the Calvinistic Churches. Among them they met with a generous reception; *(n)* the more striking, and the more affecting,

(l) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Part. 2. C. 2. § xii.

(m) This fact alone may suffice to justify the exception we have taken (p. 39.) to the name of Zuinglius being included in the catalogue of abettors of Absolute Decrees. An investigation of his works has confirmed this opinion, the result of which has been given in the Preface.

(n) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. ut supra, § xvii. Maclaine's Note.

by its contrast with the treatment experienced from the Lutherans. Had they entered these friendly territories without prepossessions in favour of the doctrine cherished there, who does not know that the understanding is half won when the heart has been gained?—but, add to the effects of kind treatment, strong prepossessions, the imposing grandeur of the brilliant reputation and admitted authority of the great Patriarch of Geneva, and we should rather think it surprising that any escaped the united influence of so powerful appeals to the senses, the passions, the feelings, and the understanding, than that so many felt their sway. Never was there a Professor whose edict was submitted to with a more profound deference. The Christian world beheld, “the Master said so,” revived, and the apophthegm once more enforced, by substituting Calvin’s Institutes and Calvin’s Expositions of the Scriptures for the precepts of Pythagoras.^(o) At this day, however, when the very abettors of his doctrines candidly acknowledge his faults,^(p) we may be permitted to doubt, if his undisguised contempt for the opinions of those who differed from him, his supercilious arrogance, haughty impatience of contradiction, and the general asperity of his temper, may not have influenced his judgment in adopting the excluding doctrine of Absolute Decrees. Certainly there is a strong affinity between its revolting partiality, and

(o) “Of what account the Master of Sentences was in the Church of Rome, the same and *more* amongst the Preachers Calvin had purchased: so that the perfect Divines were judged they which were skilfullest in Calvin’s writings, his Books almost the very canon to judge both doctrine and discipline by.”—Preface to Eccles. Polity.

(p) “As he also did (exceeded) the most of them, (the Reformers) in obstinacy, asperity, and turbulence.”—Mosheim’s Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvi. Sect. i. Chap. 2. § xxxiv. Maclaine’s note —and Ibid. Sect. iii. Part 2. C. 2. § xl. note.

the violent deposition and subsequent expulsion of the learned Castalio, and the no less violent prosecution of Bolsec and Ochinus, for presuming to express, within the precincts of his Government, opinions which might argue a distrust of his infallibility, on this subject of Absolute Decrees; (q) but be this as it may, it is certain, that the doctrine became predominant in England, and that, while *the Articles of our Church remained unaltered*, the sentiments of its Dignitaries, and of the Professors of our Universities, with very few exceptions, were formed in the School of Geneva. Nor was this acquiescence a derogation from that independence of mind which characterized many of the exiles; they will be justly acquitted from servile submission to the name of Calvin, or the milder influence of Peter Martyr, his disciple, and their friend and Professor, or that of Theodore Beza, Bullinger, Gualter, &c. when we recollect, that it was the general, though too precipitate, opinion of that day, that a necessary connexion subsisted between justification without works and unconditional election. Hence, when Melancthon, A. D. 1548, in the Conference at Leipzig, supported the concurrence of the will, (r) he was much censured, as if, in this admission, he was countenancing the doctrine and the interests of the Roman Church. (s) The same notion, however unfounded, possessed the majority of our own Divines in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and hence the acknowledged motive for their strenuous support of this doctrine of the Institutes. But to

(q) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Part 2. C. 2. § xl. xli. xlii.

(r) Yet Melancthon has been compelled, by the Inquiry, to give his suffrage to the doctrine of Absolute Decrees!—See p. 39, of this Apology.

(s) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. C. 1. § xxix. and xxx.

the real influence of this motive was superadded, no doubt, the effect of their intercourse with the disciples of Calvin, whom they regarded with the utmost veneration, and to whom, in their differences concerning discipline, after their return to England, all parties agreed in referring. Certainly, could they have given effect to their wishes, or even to their attempts, the Tigurine Confession would have been substituted for the 39 Articles, and the Church of Zurich would have furnished a model to our own, even to the minutest particle. "We have," says Jewel to Martyr, "exhibited all the Articles of Religion, and of our Doctrine, to the Queen; and we have not, even in the minutest accent, departed from the Tigurine Confession."^(t) The subsequent progress of the doctrine in England was maintained by the undiminished celebrity of the Academy at Geneva, and by the practice of our own Universities. At Geneva all our youths, whose talents gave promise of beneficial exertions, and whose fortunes could meet the expense of a foreign education, prosecuted their studies. There, at the fountain head, they drank the strongest draughts of this doctrine—there the tenet was blended with the very nutriment of the understanding, was incorporated with the elements of religious knowledge, its truth admitted as an axiom in theology, and the persuasion of its certainty enrolled, in their habits of thinking, among the settled principles of divine knowledge.^(u) In our Universities at home, the high hand of authority repressed, with rigid severity,

(t) The original is given (p. 69): the importance of the passage, the distinct purpose for which it is adduced here, and the luminous testimony which it supplies, will, it is hoped, excuse its re-insertion in the text.

(u) Mosheim, *ut supra*, C. 2. § xi.; and particularly Cent. xvii, Sect. ii, Part 2. C. 2. § x.

the presumptuous broaching of any other doctrine. William Barret, Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, was summoned before the Consistory of the Doctors, A. D. 1595, for having presumed to deny the truth of Absolute Decrees, and their concomitants, in a Sermon preached in St. Mary's for his degree, and was compelled, if we may believe Fuller,^(x) not only to pronounce a recantation of the doctrine, but also to retract his judgment of Calvin, of whom he is now desired to confess, "That he hath very well deserved of the Church, and was a most learned and right godly man"—of Peter Martyr, Theodore Beza, &c. whom he is now compelled to style the "lights and ornaments of our Church," and to say, "whom, because our Church doth worthily reverence, it was not meet that I should take away their good name from them, or any way impair their credit, or *dehort others of our countrymen from reading their most learned works.*"^(y) Dr. Peter Baro, too, Margaret Professor of Divinity, a man not more distinguished for his great learning than for unblemished manners, "foreseeing that subscription to the Articles of Lambeth, lately sent to the University, would be expected from, yea, imposed on him, to which he could not condescend, therefore resolved to quit his place, so that his departure was not his free act, out of voluntary election, but that where.

(x) But in the "Letter from some of the Heads in Cambridge to the Lord Burleigh, &c." it is stated, "Which he was enjoined to retract, but hath refused so to do, in such sort as hath been prescribed." Heylin's *Quinquart. Hist.* Part iii, p. 84. London, 1660. Fuller, finding the form of Recantation among the Records of the University, took for granted that it had been executed; but its existence is sufficient for our purpose.

(y) Fuller's *Hist. of the University of Cambridge, 1591-5*, p. 150, 151.

" unto his will was necessarily determined ; wit-
 " ness his own return to a friend, requiring of him
 " the cause of his withdrawing:—Fugio, saith he,
 " ne fuga rer—I flie for fear to be driven away."^(z)
 While Professors and Fellows were thus restrained
 on the one hand, the minds of the Students were
 diligently pre-occupied on the other with the doc-
 trine of Geneva. " The Book," says Sanderson,
 speaking of his own studies, " generally com-
 " mended to all young scholars in those times, as
 " the best and perfectest system of divinity, and
 " fittest to be laid as a ground-work in the study
 " of that profession, was Calvin's Institutions. The
 " method of it is exact, the expressions clear, the
 " style grave and unaffected, and," as might natu-
 rally be expected, " the doctrine of it was received
 " upon trust," and " the opinions there insisted
 " upon, concerning Absolute Decrees, and the
 " other points depending thereupon, acquiesced
 " in, as being the more commonly received."^(a)
 The evil of this perverted course of education
 began at length to be felt. King James, A. D.
 1616, first arrested its progress by his letters to
 the Universities, advising " that young Students
 " in divinity should be excited to study such
 " Books as were most agreeable in doctrine and
 " discipline to the Church of England; and to
 " bestow their time in the Fathers and Councils,
 " Schoolmen, Histories and Controversies; and
 " not to insist too long upon compendiums and
 " abbreviators, making them the grounds of
 " their study; and I conceive (says Heylin) that
 " from that time forwards, the names and repu-
 " tations of some leading men of the foreign

(z) Fuller's Hist. of the University of Cambridge, 1595-6, p. 152, 153.

(a) Sanderson's Letter to Dr. Pierce, quoted in Wordsworth's notes to Bishop Sanderson's Life, Vol. v, p. 479,

“ Churches, which till then carried all before
 “ them, began to lessen ; Divines growing daily
 “ more willing to free themselves from that servi-
 “ tude and vassalage to which the authority of
 “ those names had enslaved their judgments.” (b)

A new *Æra* then began to arise ; the deluding vapour which had been raised by the vigour of Calvin’s authority, and which was sustained by false conceptions of the necessary connexion of this doctrine with that of justification, at length vanished before the beams of a more enlightened pursuit of truth. Montague, Laud, Hammond, Sanderson, Potter, &c. &c. &c. became the champions of Conditional Election, and from this period we may date the downfall of the tenet of Absolute Decrees, which till then had maintained so unrivalled an ascendancy in the Universities, that to propound an opinion which was not in perfect unison with them, was not merely deemed an act of overweening presumption, but, as we have seen, was visited with penal castigation.

This epoch of our ecclesiastical history is highly interesting to the observer of the progress of the human mind. He will here have an opportunity of contemplating the reluctance with which truth is admitted, when it enters the lists against the prejudices of early education, and the authority of great names, and of observing the struggles with which ingenuous minds at first resist, and finally yield to convincing arguments. Among the examples which it furnishes, he will find illustrious precedents of Divines who were not ashamed to confess their mistakes, and to recant the errors of their early days ; in whose number he will meet the name of Archbishop Usher, peculiarly distin-

(b) Heylin’s *Sum of Christian Theology*, in the Address to the Reader, 1673, folio, quoted by Wordsworth, *Eccl. Biog.* note, Vol. v. p. 343.

guished, as the most solemn public acts, recording his strenuous support of the doctrine to the fullest extent of the Lambeth Articles, seemed to present an impassable barrier to a change of opinion.

Dear Potter's letter to Mr. Vicars, presents so admirable a delineation of the workings of a candid mind, compelled to yield to the force of an honest scrutiny, that we are persuaded such of our Readers as cannot refer to the original, or to the quotation in Wordsworth, will not be displeased in having them presented here to their inspection:—"In divine truths," says he, "my conscience cannot serve man, or any other master besides him who hath his chair in Heaven. I love Calvin very well, and I must tell you I cannot hate Arminius; and for my part, I am verily persuaded that these two are now, where they agree well, in the kingdom of Heaven, whilst some of their passionate disciples are so eagerly brawling here upon earth. But because you are my friend, I will yet farther reveal myself unto you; I have laboured long and diligently in these controversies, and I will tell you with what mind and method, and with what success. For some years in my youth, when I was most ignorant, I was most confident; before I knew the true state, or any grounds of the questions, I could peremptorily resolve them all, and upon every occasion, in the very pulpit, I was girding and railing upon these new heretics, the Arminians, and I could not find words enough to decipher the folly and absurdity of their doctrine; especially I abhorred them as venomous enemies of the precious grace of God, whereof I ever was, and ever will be most zealous and tender, as I am most obliged, holding all I am, or have, or hope for, by that glorious grace. Yet all this while, I took all this, that I talked upon trust, and knew not what they,

(the Arminians) said or thought, but by relation from others, and from their enemies; and because my conscience in secret would often tell me, that railing would not carry it in matters of religion, without reason and divine authority, that I might now solidly maintain God's truth, as it becometh a minister, out of God's word, and clearly vindicate it from wicked exceptions, and that I might not only revile and scratch the adversary, but beat and wound him, and fight it out, *fortibus armis non solum fulgentibus*, I betook myself seriously and earnestly to peruse the writing of both parties, and to observe and balance the Scriptures produced for both parties. But my aim in the inquiry was not to inform myself whether I held the truth, (for therein I was extremely confident, presuming it was with us, and reading the opposers with prejudice and detestation,) but the better to fortify our tenets against their cavils and subtillies. In the mean while, knowing that all light and illumination in divine mysteries descends from above, from the Father and Fountain of all light, without whose influence and instruction all our studies are most vain and frivolous; I resolved constantly and daily to solicit my gracious God, with most ardent supplications, as I shall still continue, that he would be pleased to keep his poor servant in his true faith and fear; that he would preserve me from all false and dangerous errors, how specious or plausible soever; that he would fill my heart with true holiness and humility; empty it of all pride, vain-glory, curiosity, ambition, and all other carnal conceits and affections, which usually blind and pervert the judgment; that he would give me the grace to renounce and deny my foolish reason in those holy studies, and teach me absolutely to captivate my thoughts to the obedience of the heavenly word; finally, that

he would not permit me to speak or think any thing but what were consonant to his Scriptures, honourable and glorious to his Majesty.

“ I dare never look upon my Books, till I have first looked up to Heaven with these prayers. Thus I begin, thus I continue, and thus conclude my studies. In my search, my first and last resolution was, and is, to believe only what the Lord tells me in his Book; and because all men are liars, and the most of men factious, to mark not what they say, but what they prove. Though I must confess, I much favoured my own side, and read what was written against it with exceeding indignation, especially when I was pinched, and found *many objections* to which I could *find no answers*; yet, *in spite of my judgment, my conscience stood as it could*; and still multiplying my prayers, and recurring to my Oracle, I repelled such thoughts as temptations. Well, in this perplexity I went on; and first observed the judgments of this age since the Reformation. And here I found, in the very harmony of the confessions, some little discord in these opinions, but generally, and the most part of our Reformed Churches favouring the Remonstrants; and among particular writers, many here differing in judgments, though nearly linked in affection, and all of them eminent for learning and piety, *and being all busied against the common adversary, the Church of Rome*, these little differences amongst themselves were wisely neglected and concealed. At length some of our own (c) gave occasion, I fear, to these intestine and woeful wars, letting fall some speeches very scandalous, and which cannot be maintained. This first put the Lutheran Churches in a fresh alarm against us, and imbittered their

(c) Prynne, possibly.

hatred ; and now that which was *but a question*, is made a quarrel—that which before was *sweetly debated between private Doctors*, is now become an appeal to contention between whole Reformed Churches ; they in one army, we in the other.— But still the most wise and holy in both parties desired a peace, and ceased not to cry with tears, *Sirs, ye are Brethren, why do ye strive?* and with all their power laboured that both the armies might be joined under the Prince of Peace. But whilst these laboured for peace, there never wanted some eager spirits, that made all ready for war, and whose nails were still itching till they were in the wounds of the Church, for they could not believe they had any *zeal*, unless they were *furious* ; nor *any faith*, unless they wanted all *charity*. And by the wicked diligence of these *Boutefeus*, that small spark, which at first a little moderation might have quenched, hath now set us all in a woeful fire, worthy to be lamented with tears of blood.

“ But now you long to hear, what is the issue of all my study and inquiry, what my resolution. Why, you may easily conjecture. Finding, upon this serious search, that all doubts are not clearly decided by Scripture ; that in the ancient Church, after the age of St. Augustine, who was presently contradicted by many Catholics, as you may see in the Epistles of Prosper and Fulgentius to him, upon that very occasion, they have ever been friendly debated, *and never determined in any Council* ; that in our age whole Churches are here divided, either from one another, as the Lutherans from us, or amongst themselves, as the Romanists, amongst whom the Dominican family is wholly for the Contra-remonstrants ; that *in all these several Churches some particular Doctors vary in these opinions*. Out of all this I collect, for my part, that these points are *no necessary Catholic verities*, not

essential to the Faith, but merely matters of opinion, problematical, of inferior moment; where a man may err, or be ignorant without danger to his soul; yet so still, that the glory of God's Justice, Mercy, Truth, Sincerity, and Divine Grace, be not any ways blemished, nor any good ascribed to man's corrupt will, or any evil to God's *decree of Providence.*" (d)

Archbishop Usher's change of sentiments is affirmed on the authority of a letter from Dr. Hammond to Mr. Peter Stainough, dated June 12th, 1657. From his testimony it appears, that Usher preached Universal Redemption, in what he himself termed a soul-saving Sermon, at St. Peter's, Paulwharf, and at several places, "pressing throughout all his Sermon, the universal free invitation of all by God. *Apocal. xxii. 17.* 'Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely,' *Isaiah lv. 1, 7.* 'Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.'—Adding, that without this made good, all preaching to convert sinners, yet in their sins, from the evil of their ways, would want a firm foundation." What he thus delivered in the pulpit, he confirmed in private, saying that "*all can will*; and that so many will not; 'tis because, as I then taught, they resist God's grace;—alleging, *Acts vii. 51.* 'Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye.'—This, and much more, he then declared; and, in fine, concluded

(d) Collection of Tracts concerning Predestination and Providence. Cambridge, 1719. Wordsworth's *Eccl. Biog.* Vol. v. p. 504, & seq.

in these words: "Bishop Overal was in the right, and I am of his mind."—And it is more particularly reported of him, that before his death, he declared "he wholly disliked the Genevan form of doctrine in this matter." (e)

Reader, if, after this analysis of Potter's arduous combat with his prejudices, and the very learned Usher's renunciation of his most fondly cherished opinions, thou shouldst find in this Apology one expression, the child of pertinacity or of uncharitable feeling, perform an act of kindness, let it be expunged. While we meditate on the solemn arguments with which such examples enforce diffidence of opinion on so abstruse a subject, how melancholy a reflection, that the voice of moderation, which issues from the mouth of Christian love, and which is echoed back by true philosophy, should be drowned in the clamours of intemperate zeal. Such, notwithstanding, has most commonly been its fate. Passion and ignorance unite in rendering the advocates of party insensible to the merits of an opponent's cause, and the intrinsic weakness of human reason:—an inattention which has bequeathed to us the miserable legacy of large materials for reflecting on the extreme evils arising from unfledged judgments being exercised on questions placed so high above the flight of man's ability, that they who soared on the strongest and steadiest pinion, only discovered, from their more exalted situation, that the resting-place of unclouded certainty was inaccessible.

The spirit which we have seen actuating the Universities, A. D. 1595, was diffused with increasing zeal throughout the nation. The doctrine of Absolute Decrees was delivered from the

(e) Nineteen Letters of the Rev. Henry Hammond, D. D. now first published from the Originals, by Francis Peck, A.M. at London, 1739, 8vo. p. 17. Wordsworth's Eccl. Biog. Vol. v. p. 503. Q 2

Pulpit with such unhappy success, that the *profligacy of manners to which the practical application of "if I shall be saved, I shall be saved,"* gave (*f*) rise, called forth the letter already mentioned, which King James addressed to the Universities; (*g*) and, in a few years after, A.D. 1622, produced the 'Orders' which enjoined; "That no preacher, of what title soever, (under the degree of a Bishop or a Dean at least,) do from henceforth presume to teach, in any popular auditory, the deep points of Predestination, Election, &c." (*h*) These tenets had not, however, at the former of these periods at least, been renounced by that King, the Divines whom he selected for the Synod of Dort being all men who maintained the doctrine of Geneva, while their practical consequences were earnestly deprecated; but, from that period, a remarkable change began to take place in England. After the return of the exiles from the Swiss Churches, the doctrine of their friends Beza, Bullinger, Gualter, &c. was generally acquiesced in, while Ecclesiastical Discipline, Ceremonies, and the use of the Liturgy, divided their opinions; but, after the Synod of Dort, the doctrine of Conditional Election, and an adherence to the Establishment, were commonly united, while the doctrine and discipline of Geneva thenceforth entwined their kindred roots together, and both flourished in the same congenial soil. The deference which many of the English exiles, during the troubles of Frankfort, paid to Calvin's denunciation of the ineptiæ of our

(*f*) A pretty general 'neglect of holiness of life,' derived from this doctrine, is incidentally, but explicitly noticed by Bishop Bancroft, in the Hampton Court Conference. (See p. 77. of this Apology.) An increase of the corruption of manners attended an increased earnestness in the propagation of the doctrine.

(*g*) Bishop Sanderson's Life, Wordsworth's Eccl. Biog. Vol. v. p. 466, 467.

(*h*) Heylin's Quinquart. Hist. Part iii. p. 108.

Liturgy, was so great, as to change their affection for that service into dislike;*(i) and so high was their respect for his authority, that Ridley's fervent refutation of Knox's objections, though coming from the prison in which he was awaiting the crown of martyrdom, could not counterpoise the influence of Calvin and his disciple.(k) Affection for the discipline, as well as the doctrine of Geneva, daily gained ground after the return of the exiles, so that Calvin was all in all, till, in the reign of Charles I. the majority of the House of Commons was decidedly Presbyterian. It was then that Montague's appeal to Cesar, A. D. 1625, appeared, the *first publication* that ventured to *oppose* the received doctrine. We need not dwell here on the national importance attached by the Commons to this "audacious appeal;"—the proceedings of that Assembly denouncing all who should, "by favour or countenance, seem to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, (for it was the trick of that day, a trick which is not yet forgotten, to unite the two), capital enemies to this kingdom and commonwealth;"(l) and the inability of the Court to protect the Author: these are topics too generally known to be insisted upon. On the unmerited detestation with which that publication, at first, dedicated to King James, and after his demise to King Charles, was received, we shall offer no other remark, than that the Professors of the Absolute-

* Fuller's Ch. Hist. B. viii. Sect. iii. § 2.

(i) As an instance of Calvin's influence, take the following—
"Sir Francis Knowles, treasurer of the Queen's Household, and Knight of the Garter...being bred a banished man in Germany, during the Reign of Queen Mary, and conversing with Mr. Calvin at Geneva, was never after fond of Episcopacy."—
Fuller's Church History, B. ix. p. 152.

(k) Dr. Covell's Answer to the Apology of Mr. John Burgess, quoted by Wordsworth, Eocl. Biog. Note, v. iii. p. 384.

(l) Rushworth, Tom. i. p. 660. Rapin's Charles I. A. D. 1628-9.

Predestination tenets have ever been as remarkably tenacious of their inviolability, as if unmixed blessings to society, not gross evils, had followed in their train.

Here we shall terminate this sketch with observing, that, after the famous Declaration of Charles I. prefixed to the Articles imposing silence on all parties on this subject, and formally recognizing the latitude of interpretation of which the Article is susceptible, the doctrine successfully revived by Arminius, and most ably supported by Episcopius, became ascendant in our Church,^(m) and has since maintained its superiority among her Ministers. The authenticity of that instrument has indeed been questioned, because it has appeared without the King's name, and because it has not even the countersign of a Minister. The want of these may perhaps be accounted for, by its being printed by royal authority, together with the Articles; but with that difficulty we are not concerned. Of its genuineness there can be no doubt; and, of the *obedience* which the Ecclesiastics thought was due to it, as little. In the King's "Declaration, addressed to *all his Subjects*," he notices it, saying, "We had reprinted the Articles of Religion established in the time of Queen Elizabeth, of famous memory; and, by a Declaration before those Articles, we did tie and restrain all opinions to the sense of those Articles, that nothing might be left for *private* fancies and inno-

(m) When the doctrine revived by Arminius is said to have become ascendant in our Church, we would be understood to mark only the period of the successful restoration of our Church to its primitive doctrines. Our Divines were far from embracing *all* the tenets of Arminianism; they concurred in those stated by the followers of Arminius, as exhibited at the head of the 2d Chapter of this Apology, but they were not his disciples—they went no farther. The controversies in Holland aroused the Divines of England to a careful examination of doctrines which they had received upon trust, and the inquiry was attended with very remarkable changes of opinions.

vations.”(n)—From Bishop Hall we learn, “that the royal edict of a general inhibition meeting with the confused noise of the misconstruction of those who never saw his work,(o) (crying it down for the name’s sake) buried it in a secure silence.”(p) Sir Henry Wotton, addressing the King on his return from Scotland, A. D. 1633, panegyricizes him for having, “with most laudable temper, by proclamation, suppressed on both sides all manner of debates.”(q) And to add one testimony more from Fuller, “Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, when preaching before the King, A. D. 1631, in his Sermon touched upon some of those forbidden points,” for so Fuller calls them, “for which offence he was called before the Council; at which time he was charged by the Archbishop of York with having violated the injunctions of his Majesty’s Declaration, and *reviving* those controversies *which by it had been buried in silence.*” The Bishop promises obedience in future to his Majesty’s wishes; and, after having seen the King, and received from his own mouth a similar injunction, and repeating his promise of obedience, he is dismissed.(r) The genuineness of that Declaration stands therefore unimpeached, and the testimonies of its beneficial effects prove it not to have been abortive.

In this Chapter it will be seen, that so far from shrinking from the admission of the prevalence of the doctrine of Absolute Decrees, during the reign of Elizabeth and her two successors, we shall be found perfectly to accord with the position, so laboriously supported by the Author of the Inquiry; a position

(n) Rushworth, Tom. i. App. p. 1.—Rapin’s England.

(o) The way of peace, in the five busy Articles, commonly known by the name of Arminius.

(p) Life of Bishop Hall, Wordsworth’s Eccl. Biog. Vol. v. p. 303.

(q) Wotton’s Remains, p. 147, quoted by Wordsworth, *ibid.* p. 57.

(r) Fuller’s Church History, B. xi. § 16.

which history affirms, and which required nothing more than simple statement to be conceded. It will be seen that we have gone even a step farther; and have presented it to our Readers, ominously triumphant in the great Council of the nation, during the reign of the martyred Charles, while among the Clergy devoted to the Established Church, all debate on these subjects was so effectually suppressed, that the controversy was buried in silence.^(s) But, while we concur with the Author of the Inquiry, in this statement of the private sentiments of the Divines of our Church of that day, we distinctly repeat, that our liberty is not in the slightest degree compromised by their sentiments.

How far we have redeemed our pledge of assigning the predominance of this doctrine upon abundant evidence to the oracular authority of Calvin, we leave to the candid Reader to decide. If he coincide in this opinion with us, he will say whether we are not fully justified in making the deduction which we required, from the influence to which the names of the Divines of that day might be entitled, had they given the credit of an unbiassed authority to this "Genevan form of doctrine." But while we are deprecating the influence of opinions, adopted under circumstances unpropitious to free inquiry, let us, at the same time, offer a tribute of just applause to the genuine legislative spirit of those men, who, so far from following the example of one of the Universities, in binding down the Clergy to an unequivocal subscription to this doctrine, continued to leave to it a latitude of interpretation suitable to the imperfection of human knowledge, and indulgent to the tenderness of scrupulous consciences.

(s) The happy and long-continued effects of the Royal Interposition will be noticed in the next Chapter.

CHAPTER IV.

The Inquiry, in asserting that the United Church of England and Ireland demands from her Clergy and Laity "an unfeigned belief of her doctrines," and enjoins it "as the only way of salvation," ascribes to this Reformed Church pretensions not more injurious to her character, which has been distinguished for moderation, than repugnant to the principles by which she vindicated her own dissent from the erroneous determinations of Councils.

THE consequences derivable from principles have, not unfrequently, been made the test of the principles themselves. The justice of this mode of argumentation is exposed to suspicion: when consequences are drawn by an opponent, they may not be fair, they are possibly uncharitable. Had we therefore affirmed, as the result of the positions of the Inquiry, that by the Fifth Canon all the members of our Church must be concluded to an unfeigned belief, not only of Articles of Faith, but of Articles of Doctrine; and that the conscientious assent expressed by subscription to the propositions contained in the Articles of our Church, by which she guarantees the unanimity of the Clergy, and

“the avoiding of diversities of opinions touching true Religion,” must be construed into the unfeigned belief of them all equally. Had we gone farther; had we first constituted a partial construction of an Article to be the object of that unfeigned belief; and then denounced any deviation from that construction to be the violation of that highest possible species of assent, either implied by the sanction of the Canon, or expressed by subscription to the Articles: had we, enlarging upon the practical consequences of ‘withholding that unfeigned belief,’ implicated in charges which involve the deepest moral turpitude, a body of men called to the exercise of the most sublime duties, and whose efficiency depends upon the unspotted purity of their conduct: had we upbraided the Candidates for Orders who declined that construction, with equivocation, subterfuge, or falsehood, in connexion with the most sacred rites of religion, and the most solemn appeals to Heaven: had we inculcated the Clergy who continued to decline it, in the profane violation of the most solemn guarantees of their fidelity; in the most treacherous abuse of the most sacred trust which can be confided to a human being; in the unprincipled wresting of the authority with which they were invested, to purposes the very opposite to those for which they were conferred: had we presented them decrying the truths which the Church commissioned them to enforce, and inculcating the errors which she renounced, because they were corruptions of Christianity, and incompatible with salvation: had we ascended to her Prelates, the executive Ministers of her enactments, and, infixing upon them, for a similar offence, the guilt of ruined souls, exposed them to the hottest fury of the divine vengeance: (a) had WE insisted that these were

(a) See the concluding pages of the first Chapter of this Apology.

the awful charges which necessarily resulted from the positions maintained by the Inquiry:—had WE resorted to this method of exposing the character of the positions, by annexing to them this hideous train of practical consequences; what might be asserted, but that the absence of argument was to be supplied by obloquy; that a malignant catalogue of virulent accusations, never once contemplated by a Christian writer, was to be substituted for a confutation; that public disgust was to be excited, and the passions to be enlisted in our cause, to which we trusted for a victory, not to be obtained by the force of truth. These hideous consequences have been drawn, but not by an opponent; they emanate from the Inquiry itself; and we must say, that it is not a little surprising that they did not startle the Author, and awake him to a more careful examination of the premisses with which they are connected. He would have perceived that in confounding the different degrees of assent, which should be proportioned to the importance of the subject of each Article, the evidence on which it rests, and the clearness of its enunciation, with the highest term by which an internal persuasion of the unshaken certainty of the most clearly revealed divine truth is intimated, he had given to precipitation what was due to calmness; and had injuriously represented our Church as upholding in practice an infallibility, which she expressly reprobates in every human assembly.^(b) The desire of truth, and the anxiety which we feel for vindicating our Church from the imputation of want of modesty and moderation, are our motives for entering into the disquisition which the following sheets will contain. We can have no partial interest in opening the terms of admission prescribed by our

(b) Article xxi.

Church, or enlarging the latitude permitted by the Articles; for we feel, be the presumption well or ill founded, that we have demonstrated those sentiments of the Inquiry, which we combated, not to be the private sentiments of the framers of our Articles and Liturgy; not to be the sentiments of the public monuments of our Church; and, with this feeling, we can have no fear for ourselves. To our apprehension, we are pleading against the rigorous exclusion of the opinions of the Author of the Inquiry, when we maintain this moderation; and we may therefore assume, without presumption, that we shall enter upon the investigation with an unprejudiced mind.

To the consequences stated above, we have had already frequent occasion to advert: they, with their premisses, are at present the formal object of discussion; and we must therefore be excused if we bring them again into notice.

The consequences drawn by the Inquiry are, —“ That the Church requires from all her Members the unfeigned belief of *these doctrines*, as necessary to salvation,” (c) from the Laity, as well as from the Clergy;—all are included.—From the Laity; for “ the Layman who withholds it, in his attendance on public worship, exposes himself to the guilt of avowing before God, what he does not believe; and if the Church to which he professes to belong be not in a most dangerous error, he is, for he rejects as false, what she teaches as the truth of God, and *the only way of salvation.*” (d) —From the Clergy; for “ they cannot withhold this belief, and be free from the weighty charges of violating promises which they most solemnly made; of denouncing as error what the Church commissioned them to preach as truth; and finally,

(c) Part ii. p. 252. (d) Ibid. iii p. 249.

of instructing their flocks in principles which the Church has renounced as corruptions of Christianity, and incompatible with salvation.”(e)—“As the Church demands the belief of these doctrines from all her Clergy, she must of course most particularly require it of those whom she has placed in the highest rank of her ecclesiastics: from her Bishops and Archbishops, to whom she has committed the chief government in her Communion.”(f)—“The Candidate for Orders (too) cannot withhold this belief, and be innocent of the aggravated crime of entering upon a sacred office, by subterfuge, equivocation, or falsehood, and that in subjects of the utmost importance, in connexion with the most sacred rites of religion, and the most solemn appeals to Heaven.”(g)

Such are the conclusions;—let us now hear the premisses.

The first class of them is furnished by “that series of evidence laid before the Reader (in the Inquiry) respecting the tenets under consideration—a series of evidence; it expresses a hope, sufficiently strong to satisfy an unprejudiced mind, that these tenets are the very principles of the Reformation, and the very doctrines of the Church, as by law established.” “The genuine doctrines of our Church, on the subjects of inquiry, having (as it states) been ascertained, (by this series of evidence,) an important question immediately presents itself, which is this; what does the Church require of her members respecting these doctrines? The answer is obvious—the belief of them.”(h) The examination of that series of evidence is already before our Readers. It has occupied too much of their attention, to make it necessary to obtrude

(e) Part ii. pp. 249, 250.

(f) Ibid. pp. 248, 249.

(g) Ibid. p. 249.

(h) Ibid. p. 239.

one additional observation here. This extract from the Inquiry is presented merely for the sake of preserving to its argumentation an unbroken and consecutive arrangement. We shall, therefore, pass on to the other arguments which the Inquiry offers.—“ But our Church has not left it, even to such a plain and natural inference, that she requires these doctrines to be believed; for she has attached her highest censure and severest punishment to the denying the truth of *any* of them. The fifth Canon says, “ whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that *any* of the Thirty-nine Articles are, in any part, superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not, with a good conscience, subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored; but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance, and public revocation of such, his wicked errors.” As a specimen of the application of this Canon, the Inquiry proceeds—“ According, therefore, to the tenor of this Canon, the Church pronounces it a wicked error, and deserving of Excommunication, for any of her members to deny (*inter alia*) the gratuitous election of the people of God; for this is declared in the Seventeenth Article:”(i)—in other words, to state, “ that there was no such thing as *personal* Election, or that if there were, it was founded on some *foreseen* merit in the individual elected,”(k) or that the Reformers “ would so frame the Article on Predestination, that, as has been asserted, it might be equally subscribed by those who believe that it is of the mere mercy of God in Christ, and by those who consider it as depending on the *foreseen* merits of men. This would be to countenance false religion, while they endeavoured to establish the true; an absurdity of which we have no rea-

(i) Inquiry, ii. pp. 239, 240. (k) Ibid. p. 156.

son whatever to suppose they could be guilty.” (l)
 —These are demands which she makes of all her members; and “she does not bring them before us as matters of little importance, which we may embrace or reject without injury to our immortal souls. She considers the belief of them as *essential* to salvation.” (m)

“While the Church requires the belief of these doctrines from her members in general, there are some from whom she more particularly expects it. This she does from Candidates for Holy Orders, who are obliged to subscribe the Articles before they can be ordained.” (n) “It is not by this subscription only that the Clergy are obliged to the belief of these doctrines; the promises they make at Ordination likewise oblige them to the same, &c.” (o)

Is it not amazing that the Author of the Inquiry, as if in pure zeal for the United Church of England and Ireland, should, in the Nineteenth Century, insist upon the same topics, argue for the same undeviating compliance with her code of doctrine as essential to salvation, and the same infallibility in imposing this code upon all her members, that the advocate of the See of Rome, the adversary of our Church, in the 17th century, laid hold upon, to retort upon the Church of England herself the charge of injustice and tyranny made by Protestants against the Church of Rome? Yet such is the fact. “Every unjust excommunication (says the Advocate, alluding to the 5th Canon, referred to by the Inquiry,) inflicted for opposing the doctrine, must necessarily suppose the doctrine to be infallibly true, and absolutely exempt from error; otherwise, the sentence itself would be unreason-

(l) Inquiry, ii. pp. 158, 159.

(m) Ibid. p. 242.

(n) Ibid. p. 242.

(o) Ibid. p. 245.

able and unjust, as wanting sufficient ground.”(p) This position, the Inquiry, as well as he, has been endeavouring to establish; and, agreeing thus far with the Advocate, we believe it would require all the ingenuity and talents of the Author of the Inquiry to separate from the concession the inference attached to it by that Advocate. “From whence, (says Stillingfleet, addressing the Advocate, and quoting his inference,) you charge Protestants with greater tyranny and injustice towards their people, than they can, with any colour or pretence of reason, charge upon the Roman Church, which excommunicates no man, but for denying such doctrine as is both infallibly true, and also fundamental, at least, as to its formal object.”(q)

Our moderate Church is not guilty of tyranny or injustice towards her people, because she is not guilty of attaching a penal sanction to the denial of each of the Thirty-nine Articles, on the supposition of the belief of them being necessary to salvation. This we undertake to maintain equally against the Advocate of the See of Rome and the Author of the Inquiry.

The right of private conscience and of private judgment, like the right of personal liberty, is natural, and is inherent in every individual. As the exercise of the latter is surrendered to the conventional modifications of society, the overt acts of the former may also be restrained for beneficial purposes. These beneficial purposes, we conceive, are obtained by a National Church. But the Church that requires this surrender, should act with the utmost circumspection. The Church of

(p) Quoted in “A Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion, &c.” p. 96. By Edward Stillingfleet, D.D. &c. London, 2d Edition, 1681.

(q) Ibid.

Rome exerts an imperious authority over the members of her Communion, because she first defines her doctrines to be Articles of Faith, and then, as the consequence of this definition, determining them to be fundamental, enjoins them upon the conscience as infallible, and essential to Salvation. The Church of England, we affirm, did not adopt her maxims. She was under the necessity, indeed, of delivering opinions upon some subjects, which had been left at large at early periods of the Church; but she has abstained, with becoming modesty, from affirming them to be *fundamental*. She does not bind them as *such* upon the conscience; she does not state them to be necessary to Salvation. The earlier ages of the Church enjoyed the benefit of a simple form of sound words, embraced with the ardent faith of Christians, and evidenced by their fervent love one towards another. Succeeding ages unhappily witnessed the growth of heresies in the broaching and the spreading of strange opinions. Their progress was arrested, either by additions to the Symbols of Faith, or by new and more precise Forms. These alterations were made under the authority of numerous Councils, and thus far the decisions of these assemblies deserve respect. But, in process of time, Councils were abused to party purposes, and they, as the Twenty-first Article truly states, "sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God." At the Æra of the Reformation, the German Protestants found it necessary to obviate the calumnies of their enemies, by drawing up a declaration of their religious principles. This was termed a Confession of Faith, and the first of them was presented to the Diet of Augsburg. The example which had been set by the German Protestants, was followed by the other Continental Churches. The Church of England, too, though under no neces-

sity of disarming the vengeance of the Supreme power of the State, by repelling calumnies, found it expedient to secure herself against the injuries to which she was exposed from false friends, and open enemies, by embodying the doctrines which she recognized, under the form of Articles of Religion. These Articles relate to Faith, to Doctrine, and to Discipline:—of the two former, the one comprehends such doctrines as were assented to by all the Churches; the other, partly such as were maintained by all the Protestant Churches, in opposition to that of Rome; and partly such as were assented to only by some of the reformed Churches, and dissented from by others. The Articles relating to Discipline, far from being peremptory, are few and indefinite, being confined to some general declaration concerning the King's power, and the authority of the Church. Now is it, *primâ facie*, to be supposed, that all these Articles would be proposed, under the same sanction, as equally necessary to Salvation—as equally ascertained by the verity of God's word? Are the members of the Established Church, for instance, called upon, under the penalty of excommunication, by the operation of the 5th Canon, to yield the same degree of assent to the declaration of the 8th Article, which states, that "The three Creeds ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture," and to that of the Twenty-eighth, which determines against the Consubstantiation of the Lutheran, as against the Transubstantiation of the Roman Church?—who would think so? Of this tyranny and injustice she is not guilty, as, we trust, the following observations will more fully evince. The sentence of excommunication and its penalties, annexed to the 5th Canon, are equally annexed to the 6th, 7th, 8th, &c. English Canons. The conclusiveness of

the argumentation of the Inquiry, deduced from the annexation of that censure to the violation of a Canon, will therefore be shewn by adapting the same form used in the application of the 5th Canon, to any of these. To transfer the language of the Inquiry, from the Fifth to the Eleventh, for example.—According, therefore, to the tenor of the Eleventh Canon, the Church pronounces it a wicked error, and deserving of excommunication, for any of her members to affirm, “That there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the King’s born subjects, than such as by the laws of this land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful Churches.” Does the Author of the Inquiry persuade himself, that because the censure of excommunication is denounced in the Eleventh Canon, the denying of the Trinity, and the assuming to any other congregation of the King’s born subjects than such as by Law established, the name of a true and lawful Church, are equally objects of Faith; and that, by being equalized in penalty, they are equalized in criminality? Or again,—since the Fifth Canon makes it equally penal to affirm, that *any* one of the Thirty-nine Articles is in *any* part superstitious or erroneous, without distinction of their subject, are we to understand that the opinions of the Baptists, who do not retain the baptism of young children, contrary to the determination of the Twenty-seventh Article; and those of the Quakers, who refuse to swear before a Magistrate, contrary to the decision of the Thirty-ninth, are fatal to Salvation?—These, however, are consequences which are plainly involved in his application of that Canon; but this monstrous construction was never contemplated by the Canonists. These “Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical” were drawn up for directing the procedure, and

determining the jurisdiction of the Spiritual Courts. The disciplinarian Calvinists had, with an unwearied zeal and perseverance, endeavoured to establish the Genevan Form of Worship in England. Their attempts were opposed by Archbishop Whitgift, with a zeal scarcely inferior to their own. The civil penalties attending excommunication are severe; and these Canons, to which that sentence is annexed, were enacted for the purpose of restraining, by these disabilities, their unbounded abuse of the Constitution of the Church of England in all its parts, and of preventing their erecting of Congregations into the denomination of Churches. But farther than overt acts this 5th Canon does not look.—“Whoever *affirms*,” it interferes not with any man’s private conscience; it interferes not with his conduct as a matter of faith, it only brings him as a man convicted of a breach of the peace of the Church by law established, under the penalty which the Magistrate empowers the Ecclesiastical Officers to inflict for this violation of good order, and defines the punishment annexed to the offence.^(r) Indeed, in the contemplation of our Canonists, so little connexion is there between excommunication and erroneous doctrine, much less between that censure and a departure from fundamental tenets,—that, in the 5th Canon, Irish, 1711, that penalty is enacted against “the parties clandestinely married, who shall refuse to discover the person that married or pretended to marry them.” So far then as the people at large are concerned, they are not, *by the tenor of this 5th Canon*, called upon to give any assent whatever to the Thirty-nine Articles. Had our Church, as Stillingfleet observes, pretended

(r) See, for farther satisfaction on this point, the Letters interchanged between Lord Burleigh and Archbishop Whitgift. —Fuller’s Ch. Hist. B. ix. Sect. v.

to infallibility, then her excommunication would be "directed against persons for refusing to give internal assent to what she defines; but where she does not pretend to that, the excommunication respects wholly that overt act, whereby the Church's peace is broken"^(s)—an exposition which is fully supported by the 3d Canon, Irish, which interprets the "affirming" of the corresponding 4th Canon, English, by "preaching," &c. "And if any one shall preach, or by other *open* words declare, or speak any thing in the derogation or despising of the said Book, (of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments), or of any thing therein contained, let him be excommunicated," &c. A just attention to her own preservation rendered the enactment of this Canon expedient, if not necessary; but she does not exceed the limits prescribed by prudence to lord it over God's heritage. Excess of zeal alone could have precipitated the Author of the Inquiry into so unadvised a judgment. The very title of the 5th Canon, "Impugners of the Articles of Religion," &c. would have intimated both the persons and the acts within its purview; it would have pointed out persons not well-affected to our Church, still more than its members, for the immediate object of its provisions; and would have indicated it to be a Canon that punished a violation of the Thirty-nine Articles, as a violation of Articles of Peace.

The Advocate of the See of Rome, and the Author of the Inquiry, are therefore both mistaken in attaching to the penal sanction of that Canon the consequences of unfeigned belief of the Articles of Religion; and Stillingfleet will as satisfactorily answer the latter, as he effectually foiled the former.

(s) Rational Account, &c. p. 97.

But, while we vindicate the moderation of our Church, let it not be supposed that we would represent her indifferent to the doctrinal opinions of her people—far from it. She neither, on the one hand, decides infallibly, that the unfeigned belief of her doctrines is indispensably necessary to Salvation; nor, on the other, does she resign her children to be carried about by every wind of doctrine. No; whether, as a member of the universal Church of Christ, or as a national Church, she maintains her station with due regard to the relative importance of each. She withholds no part of the counsel of God from her children; nor yet does she exercise them in matters which, not being clearly revealed, are too high for them. The divine truths which she proposes to their acceptance, she accordingly expects to be received with a deference suitable to their importance, and her earnest care in providing for their purity. Where the Scriptures are express, where the testimonies they supply are plain and repeated, where the consent of all the Churches concurs in the sense affixed to these testimonies, there she unhesitatingly unites her voice with that of the universal Church. Thus the adoration of the Trinity ascends from her altars. This doctrine she exhibits as an Article of Faith, and the implicit belief of it she regards as essential at once to Salvation, and to Church Membership. But where there is not similar ground for constituting Articles of Faith, she does not admit any as such; (†) and she expects acquiescence to her doctrines only as the submission due to a venerable, honest, careful, and judicious interpreter of Holy Writ. Her claims to this distinguished office are indeed so

(†) See Burnet's Exposition of the Title of the Thirty-nine Articles.

strong and so just, that her exposition is entitled to the utmost respect which human authority may challenge; and a wise man will, of course, be extremely cautious in setting up his private commentary in opposition to her judgment. But the terms which she prescribes to Church communion does not exceed these limits. Her laity are not commanded to suspend the exercise of private judgment, and to await her decisions in doctrines, as the fiats of an ever-lasting doom. So far were the Revisers of 1562, at least, from conceiving this scrupulous submission to be inseparable from Church Membership, that they enlarged the construction of some of her offices, with the express design of rendering them not inaccessible, even to those who differed so materially from her tenets, as to believe in Transubstantiation; (*u*)—a concession the more remarkable, and an instance the less ambiguous, as the denial of the Corporeal Presence is, perhaps, the most *distinguishing* doctrine of our Church; Transubstantiation being denounced by the Reformers to be one of the two massy rotten posts of Popery, (*x*) and being determined by the Twenty-eighth Article to be repugnant to the plain Word of God.

The Revisers intended, by their concessions, to

(*u*) This fact has been already stated in the 46th page of this work, which may be consulted. Let it be observed, that the Author of this Apology does not commit himself to the approbation of the alterations made in the Offices of the Church, *as for this specific purpose*. He is to be understood to be producing only an undisputed fact of the highest authority, to establish the force and justness of his statement. The addition of two sentences in the Office of the Holy Communion, are the alterations alluded to. The one begins with, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c.; the other with, "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. In King Edward's Liturgy, the Prayers commenced with, "Take and eat this," "Drink this," &c. See Strype's Annals, 1559.

(*x*) Life of Ridley, Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog. Vol. iii, pp. 361, 362.

heal the unhappy differences which divided the people, and, for a time, the design was answered; its effects were visible; for eleven years the Churches were frequented by numbers who had not renounced that doctrine; and the harmony thus produced would have continued to subsist, had it not been dissolved by the mischievous intervention of Jesuits.(y) But the Inquiry in effect assures us, that in these concessions the Revisers of the Offices were only laying snares for the souls of the unwary people; for it tells us, that "the layman who withholds this unfeigned belief, in his attendance on public worship, exposes himself to the guilt of avowing before God, what he does not believe; and if the Church, to which he professes to belong, be not in a most dangerous error, he is, for he rejects as false, what she teaches as the truth of God, and the only way of Salvation."

Nor does the personal subscription of the Clergy imply an unfeigned belief of the doctrinal Articles. This is our next position. Indeed the foregoing observations, which were made under the supposition of the *implied* assent of the Laity to the Thirty-nine Articles, are evidently applicable to the formal acknowledgment of the Articles by personal subscription. We shall, however, add here, that the English Clergy, for of the Irish we shall speak hereafter, by the terms of subscription are called upon to avow no more, than that each subscriber "acknowledgeth all and every of the Articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the Word of God."(z) This is an acknowledgment which belongs to *all* the Articles; and as it can be construed, in its reference to some of the Articles, into no more than the allowance, that they are not con-

(y) Fuller's Ch. Hist. B. ix. Sect. ii. § 29.

(z) Thirty-sixth English Canon.

tradictory to Scripture, or, at most, that though they are not explicitly supported in the sacred volume, they are yet agreeable to its tenor, it cannot be construed, in any instance, into a higher claim of the conformity of an Article to the Word of God, than the Article itself on the *face of it* sets forth. Now, will the Author of the Inquiry produce a single one of the *Doctrinal Articles*, whose doctrine he affirms *the Church teacheth to be the only way of Salvation*, bearing upon it such a characteristic?—The Eighth Article contains in express terms the degree of assent which must be given to the propositions in the three Creeds; that is, “an unfeigned belief;” and the reason of this high demand is stated to be, “for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture;” but to which of the *doctrinal* Articles is the same high assent required? If there were any, “Justification by Faith alone, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings,”^(a) would claim the pre-eminence. This doctrine is a corner-stone of the Reformation; and it is so strongly insisted upon in the “Homily of the Salvation of all Mankind,” to which the Article refers for a full *exposition* of the doctrine, that it is asserted in the second part of that Sermon; “This whosoever denieth, is not to be accounted for a Christian man, nor for a setter-forth of Christ’s glory; but for an adversary to Christ and his Gospel, and for a setter-forth of men’s vain glory;” yet the Article contents itself with declaring it to be, “a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort:” it adopts the exposition, but not the penal language, of the Homily.

There is an instrument preserved among the records of our Reformation, which was drawn up

(a) Article xi.

A. D. 1559, as a temporary substitute and *locum tenens* for our Articles, purporting to be, "*A Declaration of certain principal Articles of Religion, set out by the order of both Archbishops, Metropolitans and the rest of the Bishops, for the unity of Doctrine to be taught, and holden of all Parsons, Vicars and Curats, as well in testification of their common consent in the said Doctrine, to the stopping of the mouths of them who go about to slander the Ministers of the Church, for diversity of judgment, as necessary for the instruction of their people, to be read by the said Parsons, Vicars and Curats, at their possession-taking, or first entry into their cures.*" (b)—This document may serve to shed some additional light upon this subject. It is remarkable that not one of the Articles relating to Original Sin—Free-will—the Justification of Man—Good Works—Works before Justification—is found among the *principal Articles of Religion*, and that it is declared that the Articles contained in the three Creeds do briefly contain the principal Articles of our *Faith*. The same form of assent, "I do firmly believe," is accordingly given to *them* in this Declaration, which is directed in the Eighth Article; but all the other subjects of that declaration are assented to by the words—"I acknowledge,"—"I confess,"—"I grant and confess,"—or, "I am of that mind also,"—and yet this was deemed a sufficient security to be taken of 'Parsons, Vicars, and Curats, at their possession-taking.'

In short, we conceive it to be abundantly evident, that as our Church draws a broad line of distinction between Articles of Faith and Articles of Doctrine, and as she has determined nothing to be an Article of Faith, and essential to Salvation, but that which is found in the three Creeds, so the

(b) Burnet's Hist. Reform. Part 2. B. iii, Records No. 11.

subscription of her Clergy commits them in *unfeigned belief* no farther. Had we no other evidence of this distinction which she makes between Articles of Faith and Articles of Doctrine, the Statute of Uniformity, the second of Elizabeth, would alone be sufficient testimony on this subject ; as it determines the denial of the matter of these only to be Heresy.

But to banish the very shadow of a doubt upon this subject, we call upon the Office of Baptism, the Catechism, and the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, for their unanimous testimony. In the Office of Baptism, our Church takes security through the Sponsors for the prospective Faith of the Infant, saying ; “ Wherefore after this promise made by Christ, this Infant must also faithfully, for his part, promise by you that are his sureties, (until he come of age to take it upon himself,) that he will...constantly believe God’s holy Word.” And this belief is accordingly demanded, on the part of the Church, and assented to on the part of the Infant ; how ? By a recital of the doctrinal Articles ? No ; by a recital of the Apostles’ Creed. Again—When, in her Catechism, she is instructing the Child in the extent of this obligation undertaken by his sureties, to the question, “ What did your Godfathers and Godmothers then for you ? ” he is instructed to say, “ that I should believe *all* the Articles of the Christian *Faith* ; ” and when, in compliance with her instruction, he rehearses *all* those Articles which he acknowledges himself bound to believe,—it is the same Apostles’ Creed which he repeats. In the solemn transactions of our Church with the Sick, when her Minister is commanded to remind the sick man of the obligations which he entered into with God at his Baptism ; to press upon him the solemnity of the present occasion by the admonition, that, “ after this life,

there is an account to be given unto the righteous Judge; to "require him to examine himself and his estate, both towards God and towards man;" to instruct him that, "accusing and condemning himself for his own faults, he may find mercy at our heavenly Father's hand for Christ's sake, and not be accused and condemned in that fearful judgment;" at a time when, if ever, doctrines essential to Salvation were to be laid before this member of her community; and when by her orders, "the Articles of our Faith are rehearsed," that this man, as on the borders of eternity, "might know whether he believed as a Christian man should or no," what Articles are then rehearsed to him? The Articles of the same Apostles' Creed, and no other. These, therefore, and these alone, in her estimation, contain those propositions which she esteems necessary to believe, as *essential to Salvation*.(c)

Thus far we are of opinion, that we have repelled from our Church the inconsiderate imputation of requiring from her Clergy, and her Laity, the unfeigned belief of her doctrines as essential to Salvation. Had we not succeeded in establishing this point, we trust enough has been said in the preceding Chapters, to shew that the failure would only have recoiled on those who hold the opinions avowed by the Author of the Inquiry.

The demand of an unfeigned belief of her doctrinal Articles being incongruous with the spirit of our Church, the same motives by which we were actuated to relieve her from so arrogant a pretension, continue to operate in leading us to examine into the degree of assent which she expects from her Clergy to her doctrines in general, and more particularly to that doctrine referred to

(c) See Whitby's Commentary on the New Test. General Pref. to the Epistles, § i. Obj. 4. An. 2.

by the Seventeenth Article. This is a subject to which we are summoned by the peremptory sentence pronounced by the Inquiry, on the guilty absurdity of her leaving by that Article any latitude to the opinions of her Divines upon that dangerous, speculative, and intricate doctrine.^(d)

The assent which the Church demands from those whom she appoints to the administration of her offices, and "to the teaching and premonishing, the feeding and providing for the Lord's family,"^(e) must be such as to constitute a sufficient pledge for their execution of these sacred functions with sentiments conformable to her intentions. The spiritual welfare of her members, and an attention to her existence as a National Church, unite in testifying the propriety of this security; while the purposes for which it is required, plainly intimate that this assent should be the result of the conformity of the sentiments of the subscribers to her judgments.

The terms of Church Communion are not sufficiently strict to answer this design; but as there are doctrines which might be left undetermined without injury either to the spiritual welfare of her people, or her existence as a National Church, the question is, whether, in *these doctrines*, she has left such a scope to the opinions of her Divines, as the difficulty, the uncertainty, and the speculative nature of them would suggest to be appropriate; or, whether having departed from the course prescribed by prudence and moderation, and unauthorised by a sense of duty, she has restrained within the strictest limits the exercise of every man's natural right of private judgment? If she has, her imprudence can be no excuse for her Clergy's assuming to themselves an indepen-

(d) Inquiry, Part 2d. p. 158.

(e) The Ordering of Priests.

dence of her prescription. They voluntarily approach to the discharge of the duties which she enjoins, and they are not at liberty to entertain sentiments hostile to that compact, under which she admitted them to her administration. But to come to the point:—Has she, in the Article of Predestination, restrained them? We have no hesitation in saying, she has not; because the pressing conviction of truth associates itself with the spirit of forbearance, and both unite in calling upon us to hang up the spoils of victory in the temple of peace. We have reason to think that a latitude of interpretation was from the beginning designed to that Article from still more cogent motives than those for which an enlarged construction was afterwards given, as we have seen (p. 56) to the Third Article, and was reserved from the beginning for the Twenty-third.

With this impression on our minds, we cannot for a moment put the petty triumph of appropriating the Article exclusively to the opinions which we hold, in competition with the cause of truth and the benefits of peace. A bare susceptibility of different construction, without violation of the sense of the text, ought to secure to our Zion this great object; but we cherish the persuasion that this latitude was actually contemplated by the framers of the Articles. We say that a bare susceptibility of different constructions ought to secure to our Church this great object. This is a point on which we shall offer some observations before we advance to the considerations which induce us to assign an original inherent latitude to the Seventeenth Article.

We persuade ourselves that a position in a case of conscience runs little hazard of being refuted, when protected by Bishop Sanderson's reasoning. In the case of 'The Engagement,' one of the few determined by that cautious casuist, we find a train

of argument strictly applicable to the present occasion ; the more valuable as the coincidence is undesigned. " I take that," says he, " for a clear truth, that all promises and assurances, wherein faith is required to be given to another, ought to be understood, *ad mentem imponentis*, according to the mind and meaning of him to whom the faith is to be given ; so far forth as the meaning may reasonably appear by the nature of the matter about which it is conversant, and such signification of the words whereby it is expressed, as, according to the ordinary use of speech amongst men, agreeth best thereunto. The reason whereof is, because the faith so required to be given, is intended to the behoof and for the interest of him that requireth it ; namely, to the end he may have the better assurance from him that giveth the faith, that what is promised shall be accordingly performed ; which assurance he cannot have, if, after his meaning, sufficiently declared by the words, it should yet be at the liberty of the promiser to reserve another secret meaning in his own breast, differing therefrom."

Here equivocation is provided against : the promise entered into by the subscription is to be understood according to the mind and meaning of him to whom it is given. But it follows—" But secondly, what if the intention of the imposer be not fully declared by the words and the nature of the business, but that the same words may in fair construction be still capable of a double meaning, so as, taken in one sense, they shall bind to *more*, and in another to *less* ? I conceive in such case it is not necessary, nor always expedient (but rather for the most part otherwise) for the promiser, before he give faith, to demand of the imposer, whether of the two is his meaning. But he may by the rule of prudence, and that (for aught I

see) without the violation of any law of conscience, make his just advantage of that ambiguity, and take it in the same sense which shall bind to the less. And this I ground upon the very same reason as before; for sith the faith to be given, is intended to the behoof of him to whom it is given, it concerneth him to take care that his meaning be expressed in such words as will sufficiently manifest the same to the understanding of a reasonable man; which, if he neglect to do, no law of equity or prudence bindeth the promiser by an over scrupulous diligence to make it out, whereby to lay a greater obligation upon himself than he needs to do;...for it is *the declared intention only*, (viz. that which the words, according to the common use of speech, do in relation to the nature of the subject, most naturally and properly represent to the understanding of reasonable men, when they hear them,) and not to the remote, secret, and *reserved intent*, which the promiser is obliged unto. The reason whereof is manifest; because, he that requireth faith to be given from another, by words of his own contriving, is ever presumed so to have determined the sense thereof, in the contrivance of the words, as may sufficiently declare what he intendeth the promiser should assure him to perform. If, therefore, he have not so determined the words, as to *signifie the more*; it is in all reason to be presumed, that he intended to oblige him but to the *less*; for being at liberty to make his own choice of words, whereby to express his own meaning, who can think otherwise, but that he would make the choice with respect to his own interest? and therefore, though he might have a secret desire, which he is loth to discover, that the promiser should be bound to *the more*, and would be marvellously well pleased that he should so understand the words, as if they intended to bind him to *the more*: yet since it had

been so easie a matter for him, by adding or altering a few words, to have declared that intent, if he had thought it conducive to his own ends. It will be presumed also, that it was out of respect of self-interest that he forbare so to do, and chose rather to leave his meaning in such general words as will not exclude the sense, which bindeth but to *the less*; and, consequently, that his declared intent obligeth to no more, but to *the less only.*"(f)

This rule of construction once admitted, there can be no difficulty in bringing the Seventeenth Article under its government. To prove the capability of its adaptation to *the more*, or to *the less*, there can be no necessity that we should again place its internal structure under review.—Suffice it to say, that we know that men whose conscience was more precious to them than their possessions, more dear than their lives, subscribed this Article with differing sentiments, both at the same time, and at different periods; and can we doubt that such men would not stoop to make a surrender of their conscience to some sordid motive? Have we not seen with what sentiments it was subscribed by the framers of it, Cranmer, Latimer, Hooper; and by Cheney, Harsnet, Hooker, &c. on the one hand? and we are free to admit, that it was subscribed by Whitgift, Sandys, Whitacres, &c. &c. on the other:—not to mention the Divines of the days of Charles I. when the construction of the Article was so much an object of dispute, and when, if the language of it were express, one of the parties would have succeeded in establishing the interpretation which it advocated against the other. The very Framers of the Articles and the majority of their successors, the Revisers of them,

(f) Eight Cases of Conscience, &c. by Robert Sanderson, pp. 116, 117, 118, 119, 120. London, 1674.

held differing opinions on the subject of Predestination, and yet the Article drawn by the former was not in its substance altered by the latter. But the equity of Sanderson's rule justifies the subscription of such of the Revisers as differed from the Framers, and acquits them from the charge of equivocation, &c.

There is another rule for determining the signification of an ambiguous law, which also bears upon the Article, and concurs in reserving to it this latitude. It is laid down in the "Codex de Legibus," (g) and is quoted in a "Treatise of the first Principles of Law," &c.—"If" it states, "the words of a law do plainly express the sense and design of it, we must hold to them; but if the true sense of a law cannot be sufficiently understood by the interpretations that be made of it, then we must have recourse to the Prince to learn of him his design, as to that part of the law which may be subject to interpretation, declaration, or mitigation, either to give us the right understanding of the law, or to temper its rigour with equity." (h) The supreme power has been twice expressly, and once tacitly interposed in the instance under consideration;—and with what effect? King James, at the Hampton Court Conference, decided that the additions expressly proposed to remove this ambiguity should not be admitted; for that, "when such questions arise amongst scholars, the quietest proceedings were to determine them in the University, and not to stuff the *Book of Articles* with all con-

(g) *Leges sacratissimæ quæ constringunt hominum vitas intelligi ab omnibus debeat—Si quid vero in iisdem legibus latum; fortassis obscurius fuerit, oportet, id ab imperatoriâ interpretatione patefieri, duritiamque legum nostræ humanitati incongruam, emendari.* 1. 9. Codex de Leg.

(h) *A Treatise of the First Principles of Laws, &c.* London, 1705.

clusions theological.”(i) King Charles I. by his Royal Declaration, noticed the different interpretations, authorised the ambiguity, and imposed silence on the parties. King Charles II. in his instructions for the Savoy Conference,(k) takes no notice whatever of the *Articles*, as if his predecessor’s Declaration had sufficiently decided upon the latitude permitted by the Seventeenth, while a virtual power over the *Articles* is conveyed in the commission; “to review the Book of Common Prayer, comparing it with the most ancient and purest Liturgies; and to take into their serious and grave consideration the several directions and rules, forms of prayer, and things in the said Book of Common Prayer contained; and to advise and consult upon the same, and the several objections and exceptions which shall be now raised against the same, and, if occasion be, to make such reasonable and necessary alterations, corrections and amendments, as shall be agreed upon to be needful and expedient for giving satisfaction to tender consciences, and the restoring and continuance of peace and unity in the Churches under his Majesty’s government and direction.” (l) Now this we say was a virtual power over the *Articles*; for the authority of the Liturgy is, at least, concurrent and co-ordinate with them.

Thus the judgment of the highest appeal confirmed the equitable construction which was given to the indefinite language of the Article, and this determination should dispel every doubt of the lawful exercise of the indulgence which it abets.

(i) Fuller’s Church History, Book x. Hampton Court Conference.

(k) Declaration dated Oct. 25, 1660, opened April 15th, 1661.—Rees’s Cyclopaedia.

(l) Rees’s Cyclopaedia, *Ibid.*

As the equity of enjoying a latitude of interpretation, left by the imposer, relies upon his power of employing more precise terms; so any circumstantial evidence, which tends to prove that this form of expression was intentionally lax from the beginning, will greatly confirm the conscientious use of the privilege. This evidence we shall now endeavour to adduce. The resorting to a latitude of expression for the ease of scrupulous consciences, is doubtless, in most cases, a bad expedient: but circumstances are sometimes so coercive, that they do not permit men to choose that which is best, but that which is least pernicious. Happy the Church of Christ, if the sincere activity of christian love were the only test of the truth of a christian's doctrine. Happy if Epiphanius's pregnant descriptions of the Apostolic age *πίσις μὲν ἐπέχουσα τῷ Χριστιανισμῷ εἰκόνα· ἀπίστια δὲ ἐπέχουσα ἀσεβείας τὸν χαρακτῆρα καὶ παρανομίας.* (m) had continued to be applicable to successive ages. Blessed are they whose knowledge of the heavenly origin of doctrine is derived from "doing the will of God," whose charity illumines their understandings. This was a happiness which the restless spirit of 'curious men' would not permit their less aspiring brethren either to enjoy, or to bequeath. Our Church, though favored in her founders, with the inestimable privilege of men of quiet unassuming tempers, did not derive from the advan-

(m) Quoted by Taylor—we extract the whole passage.—
 "There was at first no distinction of sects and opinions in the Church; she knew no difference of men, but good and bad; there was no separation made, but what was made by piety or impiety; or, says he, (Epiphanius) which is all one, by fidelity and infidelity; *πίσις* &c. For faith hath in it the image of godliness engraven, and infidelity hath the character of wickedness and prevarication."—*Fides Formata*; or Faith working by Love, Vol. iii. p. 74, London, 1807.

tage all the benefit which their characters might have conferred. The private wishes of these good men were controlled by the imperious necessity of surrounding events. Had they been permitted to pursue the suggestions of their own discretion, they would have placed the doctrine of Predestination under the seal of profound silence; but, forced by the pestiferous activity of the Gospelers to abandon this design, they noticed the doctrine only to guard against its evils. In performing this duty, they did not lose sight of the wisdom and moderation for which they have been characterized: they affixed to the Article no note of the *irrespective* decree on the one hand, nor of the *prescience* of the Deity on the other. Contenting themselves with the description of the principal features of the doctrine, they left the speculative part of it at large; and confirmed, in the concluding member, the temperate intention of these omissions, by referring, with the Saxon Confession, to the general promises of the Gospel.—These indications, which the Article carries on its face, are considerably strengthened by collateral incidents. So far were Cranmer and his associates from plunging the Clergy into disputations concerning the divine decrees, or even voluntarily soliciting their attention to the subtle controversy, that they expressly repressed all curious inquiry into these subjects. Would the discussion of them, then, be enforced as a common topic upon the acting Ministers of the Establishment; or would an unripe age, on its admission to holy orders, be compelled to come to a decision upon a question, the very debating on which, among Professors themselves, was too dangerous, and too perplexed with difficulties, not to be deprecated? Ridley could not have thought the subject very profitable to his Diocese, or the

matter of it inseparable from the doctrines of the Reformation, when, in his injunctions given at his Visitation, "for a uniformity in his Diocese of London, 1550," he instructs his Clergy, "that none maintain justification of man by his own works," but is wholly silent on Predestination,⁽ⁿ⁾

The state of the Lutheran Churches, too, held out a lesson of moderation to our Reformers. At that time "Osiander, Illiricus, and Amstorfius, were exercising the patience of the great and learned Melancthon,"^(o) and can we suppose that the knowledge of these divisions (the weakness of the Reformed Party, and the triumph of the Church of Rome) would be lost upon our Reformers, even though they had not been predisposed to sentiments of forbearance? Every circumstance concurred in inviting them to moderation, and the high authority of Bucer and Melancthon had pointed out the manner of its exercise. They recommended ambiguous terms and mutual concessions as advisable modes of healing differences.^(p) This method was adopted in other Articles; and were the Reformers guilty of absurdity in admitting the application of the same principle to an Article concerning Predestination; a subject confessedly most deserving of forbearance, whether its abstruseness or its dangers be regarded; and a controversy which had already produced considerable agitation? But if none of these incidental circumstances had existed; if we had had no other guarantee than the character of Cranmer, that great and happy instrument of our Reformation, stubborn facts alone could prevail upon us to believe, that he would aggrieve

(n) Burnet's Hist. Ref. Part 2. B. i.—Records, No. 52.

(o) Burnet's Hist. Ref. Part 2. B. i. p. 169.

(p) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Part ii. C. 2. §. v, and §. x.—Ibid. C. 1. §. xxvii.

his brethren by a peremptory decision upon a question, which no Council had determined, no Professor had so stated and proved as to command universal assent. Cranmer was not the man who would bind such burdens. In him were united those rare qualities, both of head and heart, which seemed to designate him specially promoted by Providence to his high station, for the great purpose of the Reformation. Had it in England been necessary to encounter opposition supported by power, a man violent in temper, inflexible in resolution, bold in decision, intrepid in conduct, and tenacious of his own opinion, would have been a character of prime importance; indeed the only one suited to the unhappy conjuncture. Such was the state of Germany, and such was Luther. This is a character, however, rather gifted to overthrow ancient Institutions, than to correct their errors, and remove their superfluities. Our Reformation, conducted under the auspices of our Princes, protected the operation of qualities in Cranmer, more usually to be desired than found in persons to whose charge the dangerous and delicate task of correcting errors is committed. To a solid judgment, acting on extensive erudition, the produce of indefatigable application; he united uncommon candor, sincerity, gentleness, moderation, sweetness towards those who differed from him, and truly christian placability to his bitterest enemies. Hence he did not refuse to truth the patience of inquiry, by which it is elicited. He did not bring to its investigation a mind distorted with passions, which rather seeks in authorities the support of a previous bias, than the discovery of truth; nor, after investigation, did he adhere with pertinacity to an opinion once formed. Conscious that he was surrounded with a night of error, he felt his way; cautiously retaining some of his old opinions, until,

upon minute examination, he had discovered his mistake; but then he frankly renounced them, and gladly acknowledged his obligations to those to whom he was indebted for the discovery. Again, when, like other great men of that day, dazzled with the sudden influx of light,^(q) he adopted some incorrect opinions, the indistinct conceptions were yielded to more steady consideration. Thus exercised under the discipline of resigning some long cherished opinions, and of correcting the imperfection of some newly-adopted notions by more mature reflection, he was prepared to grant to others that freedom of judgment, which he would have thought, under similar circumstances, due to himself, and towards which generous consideration, his candour, sincerity, and gentleness disposed him. It was his happiness, too, and the happiness of our national Church, that he acted with men of similar tempers, who understood the rights, and respected the exercise of private conscience. Hence, we trace in the Articles the guarded cautious declarations of twenty years' experience in the school of controversy. That code, equally remote from that laxity which would admit injurious deprivations, and the rigour which would shackle the progress of liberal inquiry, while it has secured the *fundamental* doctrines of Christianity, by enjoining *their* unfeigned belief, and excluded the corruptions of the Roman Church by negative propositions, has left a just latitude to opinion on speculative points; and the discoveries of two centuries of progressive illumination have had no reason to repine at her illiberality. But the overhearing pretensions of the admirers of the Genevan doctrine, strove in

(q) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Cent, xvi, Sect, iii. Part ii. C. i, § 45.

the reigns of Elizabeth, and James, and the first Charles, to wrest from our Church this title to her characteristic glory. Not satisfied with participation, they claimed a monopoly, and interpreted the charter, under which they derived a bare admissibility, into the exclusion of the rights of those who adhered to the principles on which it was originally framed; and the numbers, the clamours, the vehement zeal, and the bold assertion of these monopolists, almost overwhelmed their milder opponents.

While the Church of England was thus harassed by contests, in which the interpretations of the Seventeenth Article bore a principal feature, and which, be it remembered, the Absolute-Predestinarians both originated and fomented, the Church of Ireland was committed to the acknowledgment of all the scholastic niceties of that doctrine.

To the state of that Church it is time that we now turn.—“A Convocation of the Clergy was directed to be held in Dublin, A. D. 1615, for the purpose, principally, of framing a public Confession of Faith for the Established Church of Ireland. Doctor James Usher had, by this time, been eminently distinguished for learning and abilities; and to him this important work was entrusted. His attention had been considerably arrested by the writings of the then modern foreign Divines, from whence he had deeply imbibed the Calvinistical doctrines. The Confession which he drew up consisted of no fewer than one hundred and four Articles, in which were included, almost literally, the *nine Articles* agreed on at Lambeth, in the year 1595, and which were *disapproved* both by Elizabeth and James. So large a formulary could not but contain several minute decisions, and even dangerous expositions of what is *generally* revealed in the Scriptures. The Convocation

adopted his profession, and it was ratified by the Lord Deputy.”^(r)

This, to use Taylor’s expression, was a *Shibboleth*, which the King and the Lord Deputy determined to remove. Dr. Bramhall, afterwards Lord Primate, was employed for this important purpose. “This rare person (Sir Thomas Wentworth, better known as Earl of Strafford,) espied,” says Taylor, “the great abilities of Dr. Bramhall, and made him his chaplain, and brought him into Ireland, as one whom he believed would prove the most fit instrument to serve in that design, which, for two years before his arrival here, he had greatly meditated and resolved, the reformation of religion, and the reparation of the broken fortunes of the Church. The complaints were many, the abuses great, the causes of the Church vastly numerous; but as fast as they were brought in, so fast they were, by the Lord Deputy, referred back to Dr. Bramhall, who, by his indefatigable pains, great sagacity, perpetual watchfulness, daily and hourly consultations, reduced things to a more tolerable condition than they had been left in by the schismatical principles of some, and the unjust prepossessions of others, for many years before.”^(s)—
“He was careful, and he was prosperous in it, to reduce that divine and excellent service of our Church to public and constant exercise, to unity and devotion; and to cause the Articles of the Church of England to be accepted as the rule of public confessions and persuasions here, that they and we might be *populus unius labii*, of one heart and one lip, building up our hopes of heaven on a most holy faith; and, taking away that *Shibboleth* which made this Church lisp too indecently, or rather, in some little degree, to speak the speech

^(r) Coxe.—Leland’s History of Ireland, Book iv. c. 7.

^(s) Taylor’s Life of Bramhall, Funeral Sermon, V. iii. p. 220.

of Ashdod, and not the language of Canaan; and the excellent and wise pains he took in this particular, no man can dehonestate or reproach, but he that is not willing to confess that the Church of England is the best reformed Church in the World.”(t)

“It was mortifying,” says Leland, “to the Compiler of the Irish Articles of Religion, in the late reign, to find them now threatened with a solemn abolition; and, had the temper of this learned Prelate disposed him to turbulence and opposition, he might have proved highly vexatious and embarrassing to the Deputy, supported, as he was, by the judgments and affections of almost all the Irish Clergy. To reconcile him to the projected Reformation, it was agreed that no censure should be passed on any of the former Irish Articles; but that they should be *virtually*, not formally, abrogated by the establishment of those of the Church of England; and also, that the English Canons should not be received in a body, but a collection made of such as might be most acceptable, to form a rule of discipline for the Irish Church. The Articles were received, and the Canons established agreeably to the Lord Deputy’s mind.”(u)

Here is a disclosure of a material distinction, which exists to this hour, between the subscriptions of the English, and those of the Irish Clergy. It is an important fact, which would have deserved the serious attention of the Author of the Inquiry, when he raised so menacing a superstructure on the subscription to the Articles. But it is singular enough, that, though the *Irish* Bishops, and the

(t) Taylor’s Life of Bramhall, Funeral Sermon, V. iii. p. 224.

(u) Strafford’s Letters, Vol. i. p. 381.—Leland’s Ireland, B. v. C. i.

Irish Clergy, avowedly constitute that portion of the Established Church, whose delinquencies and whose differences are arraigned before the tribunal of the Inquiry, yet the *Irish Canons*, to which alone they owe obedience, and the peculiar form of the subscription of the *Irish Clergy*, seem totally to have escaped the notice of the Author. *English Canons* and *English* subscriptions alone are quoted. Now, though we have no wish to separate our cause from that of our brethren of the Sister Establishment, and though, with the views which we entertain of the true signification of the Seventeenth Article, we could place our "christian and surname at the foot of the Thirty-nine Articles, willingly and *ex animo*;" yet surely an alteration which, in changing the form, so modified the character of the subscription, as to leave no doubt of the liberty of conscience which it recognized, should not, in fairness, have been lost sight of by an Author, who was registering the Canon that required subscription, amongst the most penal of statutes.

The *Irish Canon*, to which, and not to the Articles, the *Irish Clergy* subscribe, simply expresses an approbation of the Thirty-nine Articles; but, what is still stronger, the 5th Canon English is incorporated with this first Canon Irish, so that that part of the *Irish Canon* which contains this expression of approbation to the Thirty-nine Articles, is made the preamble to a Canon which punishes only the *overt* act by which the Church's peace is broken; and to shew the intimate connexion between the character of the approbation and the character of the act, that punishment is rendered consequent upon the reception and approbation of the "Book of Articles of Religion:"— "And therefore," says the Canon, "if any hereafter shall affirm that any of those Articles are in any

part superstitious or erroneous, &c." This is a very considerable distinction, and it is plainly designed so to be understood. It was not Archbishop Usher's indignant feelings alone that were intended to be soothed by these general phrases; "We do receive and approve."—King Charles's Declaration, which had been issued some years before, and Bramhall's well known sentiments, afford the strongest grounds for presuming, that though the virtual, not the formal abandonment of the Irish Articles of 1615, might have been adopted to spare his mortification, yet that the *terms* of the subscription were contrived to shield the subscription of the Clergy of the Church of Ireland from the reproaches of the Puritans, who upbraided the English Clergy with subscribing to the Article on Predestination, and, as they affirmed, denying its sentiments. The hackneyed charges of Arminianism and Popery,—charges which were banded together at that period, and which "very naturally go together" anew in the Inquiry,—profusely lavished by the Puritans, in the venting of their spleen on Bramhall, for "his care of reducing religion to wise and justifiable principles,"(x) (as Taylor speaks,) serve, of themselves, to intimate the design and character of the subscription required to the Irish Canons.

These principles, commended by Taylor, are stated over and over again in "Schism guarded against," by Bramhall; and it is not a little remarkable, that this eminent Prelate and the Author of the Inquiry should have taken so contradictory views of the same subject, that "an unfeigned belief of doctrinal tenets," which is urged by the Prelate to be that enormous imposition of the Church of Rome, which justifies our separation

(x) Taylor's Life of Bramhall, in his Funeral Sermon.

from her communion, and repels from our Church "the charge of Schism," is affirmed, by the Author of the Inquiry, to be the grand security, in which our Church confides, for establishing the sincerity of the vital opposition of her doctrines to those of the Church of Rome, to be the bulwark which is raised against the re-admission of the corrupt doctrines which she has renounced, and the great argument by which her acquittal from the sin of schismatical separation may be assured. For the Church, we imagine, that the protection of her purity, and the justification of her separation from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, can be, at least, as safely trusted to the guardianship of Primate Bramhall, as to that of the Author of the Inquiry. And for the Clergy, how pitiful were their triumph, if they had been rescued from one form of tyranny only to be subjected to the rigours of another. With views so contradictory, it cannot astonish our Readers, that the wisdom of Bramhall, and the wisdom of the Author of the Inquiry, should be at variance, in attaching very different consequences to the subscription of the Clergy. The wisdom of Bramhall, however, will, it is presumed, be the surer guide in leading us to learn what obligations the *Irish* Clergy undertake, in receiving and approving the Book of the Articles of Religion.—"The Church of England," says Stillingfleet, quoting and approving Bramhall, "makes no Articles of Faith, but such as have the testimony and approbation of the whole christian world of all ages, and are acknowledged to be such by Rome itself; and in other things she requires subscription to them, not as Articles of Faith, but as inferior truths, which she expects a submission to, in order to her peace and tranquillity. So the late learned Lord Primate of Ireland often expresseth the sense of the Church of England, as to

her Thirty-nine Articles. Neither doth the Church of England, saith he, define any of those questions, as necessary to be believed, either necessitate medii, or necessitate præcepti, which is much less; but only bindeth her sons, for peace sake, not to oppose them. And in another place more fully; we do not suffer any man to reject the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England at his pleasure; yet neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving Faith, or legacies of Christ and his apostles; but in a mean, as pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity: neither do we oblige any man to believe them," (as necessary to salvation) "but only not to contradict them. By which we see, what a vast difference there is between those things which are imposed by the Church of Rome, as part of that Faith, *extra quam non est salus*, without belief of which there is no salvation. In which she hath as much violated the unity of the Catholick Church, as the Church of England by her prudence and moderation hath studied to preserve it." (y) And again, the Primate, in his replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon, writes:— "He (Smith, the Bishop of Chalcedon,) saith, that the new Creed is nothing but certain points of Catholick Faith, proposed to be sworn of some ecclesiastical Catholic persons, as the Thirty-nine Articles were, in the Protestants' new Creed, proposed by them to Ministers." To which Bramhall answers: "Pius IV. did not only enjoin all Ecclesiastics, Seculars and Regulars, to swear to his new Creed, but he imposed it upon all Christians, as "*veram fidem Catholicam extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*" (they are the very words of the Bull,) the true Catholick Faith, without believing of which no man can be saved. This

(y) A Rational Account of the Grounds, &c. Part i. c. 2. p. 51. London, 2d Ed. 1681.

is a greater obligation than an oath, and as much as the Apostles did impose for the reception of the Apostolical Creed. We do not hold our Thirty-nine Articles to be such necessary truths, "*extra quam non est salus*," without which there is no Salvation, nor enjoin *Ecclesiastick persons* to swear unto them, but only to subscribe them, as theological truths, for the preservation of unity among us, and the extirpation of some growing errors."^(z)—
 "The question is not what is necessary for a man to believe for himself; this is as different as the degrees of men's knowledge, but what may lawfully be imposed upon all men, or what may be exacted upon other men to whom it is not revealed, or to whom we do not know whether it be revealed or not. Then, if he would have objected any thing materiall to the purpose, he should have said; "That the belief of all fundamentals is not sufficient to Salvation, unless other points of Faith be imposed or obtruded upon all men, whether they be revealed or not revealed to them. And this had been directly contrary to the plain decree of the general Council of Ephesus, that no new Creeds, or new points of Faith, should be imposed upon Christians, more than the Creed then received."^(a)—
 "That which was once an essentiall part of the Christian Faith, is always an essentiall part of the Christian Faith; that which was once no essentiall, is never an essentiall."^(b)

These are the sentiments of the man, to whose care the Canon, that states the terms of the subscription of the Irish Clergy, was confided. These are his sentiments, which are not more adverse to the "unfeigned belief" of the Inquiry, than they

(z) Replication, &c. p. 263. London, 1656.

(a) Ibid. p. 374.

(b) Ibid. p. 377.

are consonant to the 'receiving and approving' of the Canon which was indited under his instruction. But hostile as the spirit of our Church is to the Papistical arrogance of dictating her doctrines as the only way of salvation, we again distinctly repeat, that she is equally a stranger to the lukewarmness that would construe this approbation into an official act, which was no more binding upon the conscience, in assenting to the *matter* of the Articles, than the signature of the Clerk of a Council to the contents of the acts of Council, which, in form of law, he authenticated by his subscription. (c) The intention of the superior, in requiring the approbation of Lecturers licensed to preach, is explained in the Act of Uniformity, xvii. and xviii. Car. 2. C. 6. to be "an unfeigned assent to the Thirty-nine Articles," and we cannot surely suppose a weaker obligation to be required from the beneficed Clergy and licensed Curates. The approbation of the Book of the Articles of Religion in the Canon, which was drawn up "to manifest our agreement with the Church of England, in the Confession of the same Christian Faith," we therefore take to be an 'unfeigned assent;' a phrase which is expressive of an approbation of her doctrines and discipline, without yielding to either the rank of *divine truths essential to salvation*; and which implies, "that he who subscribes his assent to them, does, at the time, believe them to be such as it is said they are; *true*, if they only say they are true; *usefull*, if they pretend to usefulness; *necessary*, if it be affirmed that they are necessary. For if the subscriber believes not this, he by hypocrisy saves the ends of public peace and his own preferment." (d)

(c) Taylor's Ductor Dubit. Book iii. c. 4. Rule xxiii. § 7.

(d) Ibid. § 2.

A deference to differing judgments, and a respect for conscientious scruples, though founded in equity, and exercised in a spirit of charity, and a desire of peace, to which we gratefully attribute the medium between papal tyranny and irreligious indifference, observed by our Church, could not, at former periods, escape reprobation from the disciples of Geneva; and we cannot, therefore, be surprised, that the revival of these doctrines of the Genevan School should be attended with a similar reprobation of the absurdity of imagining the exercise of such a forbearing temper in our Church. And as little can we be astonished at the self-gratulation with which the advocates of them assert to themselves the sole propriety of her doctrines, and then use the beloved scheme, like the bed of Procrustes, to be the measure to which every man's conformity to her doctrines must be forcibly adjusted. By what process of reasoning the abettors of that scheme of doctrines could, at any period, reconcile to its narrowing phraseology the all-embracing sentiments so perspicuously expressed in our Liturgy, it is beyond our comprehension to understand. We are, however, far from wishing to refuse to them the benefit of their ingenuity. But with such a document, not merely in existence, but employed in the daily service of the sanctuary, a document disclaimed, too, by the pure admirers of the Genevan doctrine, and honoured with the railing of Knox, Cartwright, Travers, &c. (e) as well as Calvin, this reprobation furnishes no mean testimony of the inthralling power of a devoted attachment to a favourite system over the reasoning faculties. They who find it necessary to cut down the obvious import of the phrases "the Re-

(e) "That the Book of Common-Prayer be not allowed—no, though a man be deprived of his ministry for it."—The Brethren's Decrees, penned (§ 2.) by Cartwright and Travers—Fuller's Church Hist. B. ix. Sect. 5. § i.

redemption of the World"—yea, and "of the Whole World,"—to the size of the Redemption of a few Predestinates, might, one would think, have had the modesty to be satisfied with a permission to adapt these expressions to their sentiments, for the satisfaction of their scruples. But we ask, could any thing short of experience evince, that they would have had the temerity to insist upon their mutilated interpretation being esteemed the doctrine of the Church; much less that it was to be reputed essential to salvation? For us, we desire to see our Church enfold her children, though of various, and some of them of wayward tempers, with motherly tenderness. We desire to see her family live in peace; for we are persuaded that Articles of Religion, especially, should vindicate their title to a heavenly character, by participating in those traits which mark the divine origin of law; of which, to use the superlatively beautiful language of Hooker, "there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the World; all things in heaven and earth do her homage; the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power: both angels, and men, and creatures, of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all, with uniform consent, admiring her, as the mother of their peace and joy."(f)—There was a period, and that not very remote, when our Church enjoyed the presence of that harmony, that peace and joy, the blessed offspring of her own moderate institutions, and of the charitable temper in which they were interpreted.—There was a period when that harmony could be quoted, with suitable exultation, to the Swiss Churches, and the example of her temperance

(f) Hooker's Eccl. Polity, B. i. ad finem.

proposed to their imitation. Archbishop Wake, in the reign of George I. could hold up to them the happy effects of the forbearance successfully practised in the Church of England, and recommend her "Evangelical simplicity," in the drawing up of the Seventeenth Article, to their adoption, as "commendable, not less for its wisdom, than for its piety; and the more to be admired, and to be esteemed almost divine, because that, by the experience of so many years, it had been found not only the best standard [*regulam*] of peace and concord, but also the *only remedy* against schisms and divisions." He could tell them, that "what she has determined in her Articles, concerning these subjects, may be equally admitted by all;" and he could advise them, as the true remedy for their distractions, in like manner, "not to impose, by more precise decisions in matters so litigated, a yoke on any man's private conscience." There is a satisfaction, which even the present melancholy crisis cannot subdue, in looking back upon this period of the history of our Church, and reflecting upon the singular circumstance of her auspicious condition, the consequence of the rejection of the Tigurine Confession, so earnestly pressed on her acceptance by the Elizabethan Divines, being held up to the Churches, regulated by that instrument, as a model, to which it would be their happiness to conform. We cannot be compelled, no, not by the arrogant imputations of those who would confine all liberty of conscience to their own way of thinking; charge their brethren, who differ from them, with equivocation, subterfuge, or falsehood; and issue anathemas against her Prelates, because their sentiments do not accord to that Confession:—No, not by such unwarrantable vehemence, shall we be compelled to wish that this her glorious moderation should be relinquished, and their ex-

cluding principles retaliated on their own heads. We trust that they may continue unquestioned, to entertain such opinions on these subjects as their consciences shall approve; but then, let them reflect, that it is only a *private* indulgence that is compatible with either the orders of the Church, or the peace of society. They transgress both, when they make the pulpit covertly, the social circle openly, and the press publicly, the organs of their sentiments. To the agitated Helvetic Churches the Archbishop suggests: "Let your Ministers, Professors, and Theologians, be prohibited, under any penalty you choose to annex, from maintaining publicly in their Sermons, their writings, theses, and lectures, an opinion in any respect contrary to that Confession; let this only be guarded against, that subscriptions of this sort be not multiplied without necessity, and that too strict an inquisition be not made into the private sentiments of learned men; only let them enjoy their own opinions peaceably; and neither by teaching, nor disputing, nor writing, depart from the public Confession, or publish their errors, (if indeed they be errors) to the offence (*scandalum*) of any one, much less of the Church, or of the Republic."

"Amongst us," says he, and let it be recollected, he had no interest to serve at home by the statement, "it has been determined and established, as well by *the royal commands*, (g) as by long observed (and I trust ever to be observed) custom, never to

(g) See Chap. iii. pp. 230, 231. of this Apology. The power of suppressing controversial debates, by silencing the contending parties, has been from the beginning of the Reformation supposed to be inherent in our princes.—Henry VIII. was appealed to by Cranmer, praying him "to put both parts to silence, commanding them neither to preach, dispute, nor openly to talk thereof under pain, &c."—Burnet's Hist. Ref. Part i. Addenda, No. iv.

demand from any person what his sentiments on these subjects are. He is only required to subscribe the Articles of Religion, set forth by public authority, and neither in Sermons, nor in any theological disputations, to determine any thing *more* about them, than what the Articles expressly state, and require to be professed by all who shall be admitted to the Ministerial Office.”(h)

Let us hope that, as good and dutiful Members of the Established Church, the Author of the Inquiry, and the ‘others’ of the Clergy associated with him in sentiment, will respect the authority of which this highest Prelate of our Church speaks, and, following the praise-worthy example of the Ministers of the Establishment in the reigns of Charles I. and his successors, will obediently suppress all debates upon these perplexing subjects. But if they deny the obligation of ‘the royal commands,’ and decline submission to their injunction, they should consider, that a discerning Public will look to facts, more than to words, and will not so readily exonerate them from the censure of observing a *conduct*, at least, “Sectarian, and opposed to the principles of the Established Church.”

(h) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist, Maclaine's Appendix, No. iii, Archbishop Wake's Latin Letters, No. 20, 22, 23, 24.

CONCLUSION.

THE Preface to the Inquiry opens with a summary view of the opinions ascribed by that Publication to the Clergy of the Established Church, which it undertakes to combat, and of those sentiments claimed for the party of the Author, which it engages to defend. They are thus presented to the Public.

“ There exists, at present, a considerable diversity of sentiment among the Clergy of the Established Church in Ireland, on the important subjects of the ruin and recovery of mankind.

“ Many of them regard man as but little injured by the fall of Adam, or, at least, not so much so, as to put it beyond his own exertions to raise himself above the difficulties into which it had thrown him. His salvation they consider as resulting from his merits and exertions, or so far suspended on them, as that they are necessary to recommend him to the grace of God, and the merits of Christ.

“ There are others who think and speak on these subjects in a very different manner. They believe that man is, by nature, dead in trespasses and sins, and unable of himself to think or to do

any thing truly good in the sight of God. Every thing excellent in the Christian they ascribe to the influences of the Holy Spirit, and consider his salvation, from the commencement to the completion of it, as the result of the unmerited grace of God. They allow him to trust in no merits but those of his Redeemer, in which they regard him as interested, not by any works or excellencies of his own, but solely by that faith which is the gift of God, and of the operation of his Spirit; and while they exclude all works of man from the office of justifying him in whole or in part, they uniformly maintain, and strenuously inculcate them, as the fruits of a genuine faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.”(a)

The preceding pages of this Apology have, it is presumed, made our Readers already too familiar with prejudiced representations in the Inquiry, to allow them to feel much surprise, either at finding that character associated with its prefatory statement of the existing differences which it announces, or at our entering a decided dissent from this unauthorised program.

It is hoped, too, that they are prepared for appreciating the justice of this dissent, without the necessity of troubling them with a refutation of the particulars in detail. But to what are we to attribute this statement? To an avarice of doctrinal orthodoxy, shall we say, which was not contented with grasping at the sole property of the doctrinal tenets of the Established Church, without seizing to its exclusive enjoyment the scriptural doctrine of the Redemption also?—or to the policy, which, having suggested the propriety of omitting Calvin’s works, because the sentiments ‘advocated’ by the Inquiry are stigmatized with

(a) Preface to the Inquiry.

the name of Calvinism, (b) intimated the utility of soothing the alarm, which is still justly felt by many at Calvin's doctrine, by suppressing in this schedule even an allusion to Absolute-Predestination?—or to that accompanying sign of the Calvinistic times, which has uniformly marked their prevailing influence in the world, by infixing on those who differ from the abettors of the doctrines of unconditional Election, irresistible Grace, &c. the unfounded and often-refuted charge of Pelagianism;—a charge which is sustained by refusing to the adversaries of the Absolute-Predestination scheme the knowledge of their own sentiments, and indulging to the supporters of that system such constructions of their opponents' opinions, as the perversions of party zeal devised? Is it, we ask, to one, or, as we rather think, to all of these actuating causes, that we are to attribute this preliminary summary, so partial in its statement, and so unjust in its assumption? Had not the subsequent pages of the Inquiry instructed us in the lore in which the tenets acknowledged to be Calvin's, and yet complainingly said to be stigmatized as Calvinism, are wrapped up, we should, for our own part, have supposed that the first member of this distributive arrangement, extracted from *the Preface to the Inquiry*, was intended to classify individuals of the Clergy, who may have enforced the Law of Sinai, without pointing to the atoning scene on Calvary; and who may have exhorted men to "work out their salvation with fear and trembling," without reminding them, as a motive to gratitude, humility, carefulness, comfort, and assurance of success, that "it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure." But we now find, that there is in

(b) Preface to the Inquiry.

the language addressed to the Congregation of Bethesda Chapel, (c) an exoteric and an esoteric doctrine; and that the most formidable tenets of the Absolute-Predestination School can be covered with the mantle of truth, and concealed from the incautious, under the inviting guise of the righteousness of the Redeemer. The advantages of placing them beneath so pleasing an exterior are not few.

The doctrines of Redemption and Grace, though expressed in no other terms than those which would be owned and adopted by the men who, it is affirmed, degrade the free gift, and despoil the Redeemer of his merits and glory, derive a semblance of peculiarity, not from the language in which they are clothed, but from the lips which give them utterance. Such is the fascination of high pretensions to an exclusive purity of doctrine, when sustained by integrity of life, recommended by an impressive eloquence, and attested by an unabated zeal; especially when the doctrines themselves are presented to the public eye disarmed of their scaring head-piece! The congregations of Preachers deriving under such pretensions so invested, are prepared for hearing doctrines, which they are given to understand are vituperated, as "novel, sectarian, and opposed to the principles of the Established Church;" but none of these characteristics are to be found in the language in which they have been addressed. And what is the effect? The circumstances under which these doctrines are delivered, surround the truth preached, with the air of truth persecuted; and is it surprising that numbers should retire,

(c) The Inquiry is inscribed to the Congregation of Bethesda Chapel, and the Dedication represents the doctrines which it 'advocates' to "have long been taught among them."

wondering at the injustice of the charges alleged, and prepared, if not to espouse the cause, at least not to yield credit to the imputations?

Still less surprising is it, that the observer of human nature should perceive verified in others, the usual process of plunging violently from one extreme into another, and should consequently discover, in some of the warmest partisans of these tenets, men and women, who were, at one time, strongly opposed to the sole justifying merits of the Redeemer. For the converts, once subdued into submission to the claims of the Preacher, and rendered plastic to his instruction, can, without difficulty, be persuaded into the inseparability of unconditional Election from the doctrines of Redemption and Grace, to which they assented before. At length these proselytes assume the airs of the initiated, and, contrasting their present information with their former ignorance, conceive it to be an illuminated condition vouchsafed to few, and plume themselves on the privilege of an exclusive admission to evangelical knowledge.

The benign form of exhibition, as given in the Preface to the Inquiry, to which the Calvinistic doctrines are mainly indebted for these effects, may be compatible with sincerity, because the advocates of them imagine they monopolize the scriptural doctrines of Redemption and Grace; but that they are equally compatible with candour, is extremely questionable. Can it gravely be denied, that the Extracts from Taylor and Beveridge, given in the first chapter of this Apology, contain as perspicuous a delineation, at least, of the freedom of Grace, and the sole Justification of the Saviour, as the summary in the Inquiry, which is the subject of these Remarks? And can it be denied, that Bishops Horne and Porteus, whose Works are in the hands of the Public, and whose names

are mentioned, because they have so lately been received to their reward—can it be denied, that after a lapse of nearly two centuries, they ‘speak the same thing?’ If it be not conceded, that Taylor and Beveridge, because they do not subscribe to the limitations appointed by the Predestinarians to the mercies of Redemption, preach the Gospel, ‘as it is in Jesus;’ if it be not conceded, that Horne and Porteus as unequivocally maintain the same, we have then to lament over the wretched perversions of good understandings, which the contracting tenets of Absolute Predestination produce. But if it be conceded that their sentiments are accordant to the standard of truth, then we demand on what authority is it affirmed, that “many of the Clergy of the Established Church,” the great body of that order, as distinguished from the ‘others’ associated with the Author of the Inquiry, “regard man as but little injured by the fall of Adam, or at least not so much so, as to put it beyond his own exertions to raise himself above the difficulties into which it has thrown him.” We are, on the contrary, free to affirm, and we challenge refutation, that there are Ministers of this Established Church, and they not few, who, like these their predecessors, do preach the absolute necessity of the vivifying beam of the Spirit of Grace to quicken into spiritual existence man dead in trespasses and sins; who teach, that we must renounce our own righteousness, to be made partakers of the righteousness of the Lord Jesus; who insist upon the transfer of our affections from this world to another, that we may walk by faith, not by sight, and exhibit in our deeds the operation of that faith which worketh by love; who dwell upon the promise of the abiding presence of God, and of his Christ, through their Spirit,

with the soul of the humble and the contrite Christian, shedding on it a peace which passeth understanding; who have preached, taught, and insisted upon all these topics, in the presence of their ecclesiastical superiors; not only without censure, but with approbation. And yet, the Preface to the Inquiry affirms, that the doctrines of Redemption and Free Grace are exposed to the censure of being "novel, sectarian, and opposed to the principles of the Established Church." Though, therefore, we admit the sincerity, we cannot also admit the candour, of the appropriation of a language, used with, at least, as fervent a conviction of its just representation of their sentiments by those who recoil from the Calvinistic tenets, as by those who, espousing these tenets, assume to themselves its entire possession. If to the apprehension of the Author of the Inquiry, and those who think with him, a "gratuitous, unconditional, personal election, and unconditional perseverance," can alone grant to these doctrines the tenure of evangelical property, would it not be fair, nay, would it be more than honest, not to omit to state the title under which they derive; to say at once, these doctrines of Redemption are indeed professed by others, but they do not comprehend them, for they cannot possibly subsist without these views of election: we maintain that they are absolutely indivisible? The hearers would then be able to appreciate the modesty and the soundness of these self-arrogating pretensions. The public taste, we suspect, is not yet ripe for this bold and plain procedure. There are, we trust, few amongst us, few comparatively, in whose minds this giant doctrine has crushed principles wrought into the very texture of their frame by that unchangeable Being, who is the Author of our nature, and of a revelation adapted to that nature. But if we

are to form an opinion from the Publication before us, the time is contemplated as not very remote, when Calvin's doctrine may be presented without disguise. Overton, while he asserts that "the fundamental principles on which the Calvinistic system rests are incontrovertible," yet "utterly disavows that frightful system of nothing but absolute decrees, absolute reprobation, and other extravagancies;" excepts against several doctrines contained in the Institutes; admits that the Redemption extends to all mankind; and, condemning the doctrine of absolute reprobation, as being unscriptural, or liable to abuse, states the cause of God's rejection of any man to be sin, and the rejection of the Gospel. (*d*) But in the pages of the Inquiry, none of these protests, none of these renunciations, have found a place. No; the Author has committed himself to the unconditional adoption of the sentiments of the Elizabethan Divines, the unexcepting disciples of the Calvinistic School. The sanction which he sought for his sentiments in their sentiments, would not indeed permit a separation of the tenets; and he fairly tells us, that "he is ready to avow his belief of the doctrines taught by these excellent men, on the subjects under consideration." (*e*)

Calvin had pronounced softenings, not so considerable as those of Overton, to be "childish puerilities;" and the Author of the Inquiry is never once guilty of the inconsistencies of 'moderate Calvinists,' in rejecting one particle of the system.

Omission is not rejection. We would warn the

(*d*) True Churchman, p. 355.—Ibid. pp. 89, 93, 96, &c. quoted by Mant, Bampton Lectures, pp. 155, 156, 157. Oxford, 1813.

(*e*) Preface to the Inquiry.

unwary not to mistake the one for the other. No sooner shall the public eye be familiarized to these doctrines, and the horrors of them be relieved by constant association with venerable names, than we shall have no longer any ground for calling on the advocates for these doctrines not to omit to state the title under which they derive. Should the progress of these doctrines be accelerated in any proportion to the efforts with which the publications that maintain them, of the age of Elizabeth, the age of the Lambeth Articles, (*f*) are re-issued from the press, we shall have at no distant period the 'nil we, or wil we, he will draw us unto his Son,' (*g*) once more plainly maintained as the true and only doctrine of the Church of England.

Let those who have hitherto contemplated this progress without alarm, and reconciled themselves to the preaching of the Calvinistic tenets, under the form drawn up in the Preface to the Inquiry, take the trouble of comparing that summary with the 247th page of the second part of that Work, or with the 19th and 20th pages of this Apology, into which the greater part of the passage is copied, and they will perhaps be convinced, that this prediction does not originate in a groundless fear, but in a just sense of danger. We refer from the Preface to the Author's own words, for the interpretation of the opinions exclusively appropriated to his party. We desire our Readers to see, in his own exposition, what is understood by 'salvation being suspended on man's merits and exertions;' to observe how the doctrines of Redemption and Grace, expressed in general terms in the Preface, are there represented as result-

(*f*) See pp. 52, 160, 161, 162, of this Apology.

(*g*) See pp. 198, 199, *supra*.

ing from unconditional Election; and if they shall find, that Calvin's writings, and those of his immediate disciples, to whom we are referred by the Inquiry, as the only organs of the doctrines of this Established Church, view the same doctrines as the result of the same principles, they will, perhaps, suffer themselves to be disabused of the innoxious construction which they have heretofore put on the free Grace, sole Justification, and gratuitous Redemption of the present Calvinistic School. When they will have perceived that these phrases involve absolute reprobation, with all its damnatory accompaniments, Calvin himself being judge, they will not, perhaps, indulge themselves in the charitable hope, that either these phrases are misunderstood, or their import exaggerated by the opponents of that scheme. A few passages from Calvin's Works will suffice to establish this position. Extracts from the writings of his disciples, drawn from the selections in the Inquiry, are already before our Readers, in this Apology.

"We were," says he, "elected from eternity, before the formation of the world, *from no merit of our own*, but according to the purpose of the divine pleasure." (h)

"None who would wish to be considered as pious, dares absolutely deny the Predestination, by which God adopts some men to the hope of life, adjudges others *to eternal death*; but they involve it in many cavils, particularly those who make *prescience the cause of it*." (i) "Two errors

(h) Nimirum quod in ipso electi sumus ab æternitate ante mundi constitutionem nullo nostro merito, sed secundum divini beneplaciti propositum.—Instit. Lib. iii. C. xv. § 5.

(i) Prædestinationem qua Deus alios in spem vitæ adoptat, alios adjudicat æternæ morti, nemo qui velit pius censi simpliciter negare audet, sed eam multis cavillis involvunt, præsertim vero qui præscientiam faciunt ejus causam.—Ibid. C. xxi. § 5.

are here to be avoided, because some people make *man co-operate with God*, that he may ratify his Election with his own suffrage; thus, according to them, the will of man is superior to the counsel of God.” (k) “Secondly, he confirms that the Election is gratuitous, when he adds, ‘in Christ,’ for if we were chosen in Christ, it was therefore external to ourselves; that is, not from the consideration of our worth, but because, by the benefit of Adoption, our Heavenly Father has grafted us into the body of Christ. Lastly, the name of Christ excludes all merit, and whatever men have of themselves; for from his saying that we are chosen in Christ, it follows that we are unworthy in ourselves. Hence we may collect, that holiness, innocence, and whatever virtue there is in men, is the fruit of Election. Therefore, by this short sentence, Paul still more expressly sets aside all consideration of merit. For if God *foresaw* in us any thing worthy of Election, the words would have been directly contrary to what we now read; for they signify that the whole of our holy and innocent life is derived from the Election of God.” (l) “Man left to his own proper

(k) Duo errores hic cavendi sunt, qui nonnulli co-operarium Deo faciunt hominem ut suffragio suo ratam electionem faciat; ita secundum eos voluntas hominis superior est Deo consilio.—Instit. Lib. iii. C. xxiv. § 3.

(l) Secundo, confirmat gratuitam esse electionem quum addit, in *Christo*. Nam si in *Christo* sumus electi, ergo extra nos, hoc est, non intuitu dignitatis nostræ, sed quoniam adoptionis beneficii cœlestis pater nos inseruit in *Christi* corpus. Denique *Christi* nomen omne meritum excludit, et quicquid ex se habent homines, nam ex quo dicit, nos in *Christi* electos, sequitur, indignos fuisse in nobis.

Cæterum hinc colligere licet, sanctitatem, innocentiam, et quicquid virtutis est in hominibus, fructum esse electionis.—Itaque expressius etiamnum hac particula evertit Paulus omnem meriti considerationem. Nam siquid prævideret in nobis Deus

nature, is a mass composed of sin. Whence it follows that we, so long as we are the sons of Adam, and nothing but men, are so enslaved to sin, that we can do nothing but sin; but that being engrafted in Christ, we are freed from this wretched necessity; not that we immediately cease altogether to sin, but that we may be at length superior in the contest." (m) "We are so addicted to sin, that we can do nothing of our own accord but sin." (n) "Although God begins our salvation, and at length completes it, by re-forming us into his own image, yet the sole cause is his good pleasure; by which he makes us partners with Christ. They (the Sophists) boast, that the heart may be bent either way, provided it be assisted by the instinct of the Spirit; that the free option of good and evil is in our power; that the Spirit only brings assistance; but that it is ours to choose or reject." (o)

Prescience and the Co-agency of man's Free-will are found, by Calvin and the Author of the

electione dignum, omnino contrarium quam hic legitur, dicendum fuit; etenim significat, totum id quod sante et innocenter vivimus, ex electione Dei manare.—In Ephes. i. 4.

(m) Homo enim naturæ propriæ relictus, massa est ex peccato conflata. Unde sequitur, nos quamdiu sumus Adæ filii, ac nihil quam homines, peccato sic esse mancipatos, ut nihil possimus aliud quam peccare: Christi vero insitos, a misera hac necessitate liberari: non quod statim desinamus in totum peccare, sed ut simus tandem in pugna superiores.—Rom. vi. 6.

(n) Sed addicti sumus ita peccato, ut nihil sponte possimus quam peccare.—Ibid. vii. 14.

(o) Quanquam enim Deus salutem nostram inchoat, et demum absolvit in imaginem suam nos refigendo, unica tamen causa est ejus beneplacitum quæ nos facit Christi consortes Jactant illi cor in utramque partem esse flexibile, modo adjuvetur spiritus instinctu, ac penes nos liberam esse boni vel mali optionem, at suppetias tantum afferat Spiritus: nostrum vero sit eligere vel respuere.—Ibid. viii. 6, 7.

Inquiry, to be equally incompatible with unconditional Election; and hence to maintain the repugnance of both to God's free grace, they who insist on them are said, by the one, to make "the will of man superior to the counsel of God," and by the other, to make "man, in fact, the turning point of his salvation."

Let us now observe, how glories of the eternal counsels of an all-merciful God, are unfolded by a system, which, affecting to be the sole guardian of the divine attributes, jealously repels prescience of the acceptance of grace and the co-agency of a moral agent's will, as rivals of the Creator's honour. "Although," says Calvin, "it is now sufficiently clear, that God, by a secret counsel, freely elects whom he wills, others being rejected, yet his gratuitous Election is only half explained, till we come to *individuals*, to whom God not only offers salvation, but so assigns it, that the certainty of the effect is not suspended or doubtful That, therefore, which the Scripture clearly shews, we affirm, that God, by an eternal immutable counsel, once appointed those whom he should hereafter will to take into salvation; those, moreover, whom he should will to devote to destruction. We assert, that this counsel, with respect to the Elect, was founded in his gratuitous mercy, without any regard to human worth; but that the approach to life is *precluded to those* whom he assigns to damnation, by his just, indeed, and irreprehensible, but incomprehensible judgment." (p) "Since the disposition of all

(p) Quanquam satis jam liquet Deum occulto consilio libere quos vult eligere aliis rejectis, nondum tamen nisi dimidia ex parte exposita est gratuita ejus electio donec ad singulas personas ventum fuerit, quibus Deus non modo salutem offert, sed ita assignat ut suspensa vel dubia non sit effectus certitudo

things is in the hand of God ; since the power of salvation and death resides in him ; he so ordains by his Counsel and his Will, that some among men should be *born devoted to certain death from the womb*, to glorify his name by their destruction." (q) " Impious persons object, that men are exempt from guilt, if the Will of God has the principal part in their salvation or destruction. Does Paul deny it? Nay, by his answer he confirms that God appointed what seemed good to him concerning men ; that, nevertheless, men in vain and furiously rise up to quarrel, because God of his own right assigns to his creatures what lot he wills." (r) " But you are greatly deceived, if you think that the eternal counsels of God can be so lacerated, that some he could have elected to salvation, destined no man to destruction. For since he hath elected some, it plainly follows that all have not been elected. What then shall be said of the latter, but that they have been left to

. Quod ergo Scriptura clare ostendit dicimus, æterno et immutabili consilio Deum semel constituisse quos olim semel assumere vellet in salutem, quos rursus exilio devovere. Hoc consilium quoad electos in gratuita ejus misericordia fundatum esse asserimus, nullo humanæ dignitatis respectu.—Quos vero damnationi addicit his justo quidem et irreprehensibili, sed incomprehensibili ipsius judicio, vitæ aditum præcludi.—Instit, Lib. iii. C. xxi, § 7.

(q) Ecce quum rerum omnium dispositio in manum Dei sit, quum penes ipsum resideat salutis et mortis arbitrium, consilii nutuque suo ita ordinat, ut inter homines nascantur, ab utero certæ morti devoti, qui suo exitio ipsius nomen glorificent.—Ibid. C. xxiii. § 6.

(r) Objiciunt impii, reatu eximi homines, si in eorum salute vel exitio primas partes tenet Dei voluntas. At negat Paulus? Imo sua responsione confirmat, Deum quod visum est de hominibus statuere, frustra tamen ac furiose insurgere homines ad litigandum, quia figmentis suis, Deus quamcumque voluerit sortem jure suo assignat.—In Rom. ix. 20.

themselves that they might perish? *It must needs be, therefore, that there exist a mutual relation between the Reprobate and the Elect.*" (s)

"As, by the efficacy of his calling towards the Elect, God perfects the salvation to which he had destined them by his eternal decree; so he has his judgments against the *Reprobate*, by which he may execute his counsel concerning them. Those, therefore, whom he created for the reproach of life and the destruction of death, that they might be organs of his anger, and examples of his severity, that they may come to their end, he sometimes deprives of the power of hearing his Word, sometimes makes them more blind and stupid by the preaching of it. Therefore that Supreme Disposer makes a way for his Predestination, when he leaves those in blindness without the communication of his light, whom he has once reprobated." (t) "Behold he directs his voice to them, but it is that they may become more deaf; he lights up a light, but it is that they may be made more blind; he proposes a doctrine, but it is that

(s) Tu vero mi Cristophore, longe falleris, si æternum Dei consilium ita posse discerpi putas, ut quosdam elegerit in salutem, neminem exitio destinarit. Nam si aliquos elegerit, certe sequitur non omnes esse electos. Porro quid de his dicendum erit, nisi eos relinqui ut pereant? Mutua igitur inter reprobos et electos relatio sit oportet.—*Calv. Crist. Liberteto, Col. 142.*

(t) Quemadmodum suæ erga electos vocationis efficacia, salutem, ad quam eos æterno consilio destinarat, perficit Deus; ita sua habet adversus reprobos judicia, quibus consilium de illis suum exequatur. Quos igitur in vitæ contumeliam, et mortis exitium creavit, ut iræ suæ organa forent, et severitatis exempla, eos, ut in finem suum perveniant, nunc ejus prædicatione magis excæcat, et obstupefacit. Prædicationi igitur suæ viam facit summus ille arbiter, ubi quos semel reprobavit, lucis suæ communicatione orbatos deserit in cæcitate.—*Instit. Lib. iii. C. xxiv. § 12.*

they may become more stupid by it; he applies a remedy, but it is that they may not be healed Nor can this also be controverted, that God delivers his doctrines involved in obscurities to those whom he wishes not to be illuminated, that they may gain nothing from it, except the being delivered up to greater stupidity." (u)

We are doomed then to behold the repose of the Church again disturbed by this terrific prodigy. We are compelled to witness a revival of the distressing perplexities, and unsoothed agonies, with which it has wrung the breasts of thousands; and we are taught; by the uniform experience of the past, to prepare, in the event of its success, for the disastrous blessings of its triumph, spiritual presumption, desperation, and profligacy. The appearance of these deplorable effects, it is true, is not at present bigger than the "little cloud which arose out of the sea like a man's hand;" but, like it, it ferments with the elements of the gathering storm which is preparing to burst upon our heads. But it may be said, "Calvin is never quoted by the Author of the Inquiry." Have we then rashly attributed his sentiments to a person who disowns them? Oh no; "it is, he says, his object to shew, that they are *not the opinions of Calvin only*, but of all the reformed Divines." (x) Let those, then, who now eye the swelling flood with indifference, be reminded, that should the

(u) Ecce vocem, ad eos dirigit, sed ut magis obsurdescant; lucem accendit, sed ut reddantur cæciores; doctrinam profert, sed quo magis obstupescant. Remedium adhibet, sed ne sanentur. Neque hoc quoque controverti potest quos Deus illuminatos non vult, illis doctrinam suam ænigmatibus involutam tradere, nequid inde proficiant nisi ut in majorem habetudinem tradantur.—Instit. Lib. iii. Cap. xxiv. § 13.

(x) Preface to the Inquiry.

mounds heretofore opposed by the Montagues, the Lauds, the Hammonds, the Sandersons, the Taylors, the Haleses, &c. of our Church be swept away, lamentations over their own inattention to the warnings of the more instructed, will neither restore the breaches it will have made, nor repair the mischiefs it will have spread. What sufficient securities now, more than heretofore, can the piety and the active services in the cause of religion, by which many of those are distinguished, whom this doctrine reckons in its train, provide against the recurrences of these foreboded evils? We cheerfully admit the claims of professors of this doctrine, but only in common with the adversaries of it, to these genuine proofs of influential Christian principle; but, we demand, should that zeal for proselytism, which is so remarkable a trait in the character of this party, give a wide extension to its tenets; is it not evident, that the more largely it is diffused, the more feebly can it be controlled by those who enforce its premisses, yet deprecate the inevitable conclusions? These are tenets which never have been offered with impunity, which never can be offered with impunity, to the bulk of mankind. They are not, they confessedly cannot, be submitted to the test of reason; and hence they, like the traditionary observances of superstition, act upon mens' hopes or fears, divested of the operations of the rational faculties, to direct the one, or to subdue the other. The delusive inflation of false hopes even in the dying hour; the melancholy of groundless fears, and the profligacy of desperation, have therefore ever been the usual attendants of these doctrines. (y) These are appalling consequences:

(y) "I have *seen* much of the mischief arising from it, (the doctrine of Absolute Predestination,) with regard to par-

if they were the creatures of the imagination, and not the realities of experience; if they were the apprehensions of speculation, and not the tried certainties of practical knowledge, we should find, perhaps, in the frequent contradiction which experience gives to theory, some justification of those who put to hazard the best interests of society, and the dearest hopes of the human mind. But supposing the experiment were to be made now for the first time, would a wise man encounter so terrible a risk for the sake of obtaining acceptance to a doctrine, whose terrors it is prudent to veil; whose fearful consequences its very abettors deplore, without being able to repel; whose tenets Calvin himself declares it would be madness to employ in appeals to the people, (z) and whose evangelical truth it is of so little benefit to establish, that the same proofs, which discover a lively faith, originated no matter how, are those only to which a pious and sincere Calvinist can presume to appeal for the witness of his Election? Could

ticular persons. I have *heard* some curse and blaspheme the God of Love, in a manner shocking to think of, on account of his supposed horrible *decree*. I have *known* other serious Christians, of a timorous disposition, walk for years together on the very brink of despair, always in fear lest they should not be in the number of the Elect, and so perish at last. I have *known* others that for many years were happy in God, and walked as became the Gospel, who have afterwards fallen; and then, rocking themselves in the Cradle of *Perseverance*, have vainly fancied they never could fall so as to perish, and therefore have given themselves up to take their full swing in Sin."—*Introduction to Argument against the Doctrine of General Redemption considered, by the Rev. Walter Sellon*. Written since the revival of these doctrines in England.

(z) Si quis ita plebem compellet, si non creditis, ideo fit, quia jam divinitus exitio prædestinati estis, is non modo ignaviam fovet, sed etiam indulget malitiæ.—*Instit. Lib. iii. Cap. xxiii. § 14.*

a wise man discover, in the acceptance of the doctrine, any benefit which could compensate for the fearful risk of the experiment? How much more certainly may we infer, that a retrospect of the periods in which the doctrine was universally received, and an acquaintance with our own times, since its revival in the sister-country, would not only deter such a man from exposing to danger the present peace and everlasting happiness of immortal beings, without an adequate motive, but would make him weep over the ungoverned rashness of men who could venture to commit their brethren to so very awful a conflict of the strongest principles of human conduct. Would not his grief, too, be considerably increased by the reflection, that this doctrine, whose banner is now waved for that awful conflict amongst us, has been surrendered, strange as the phenomenon is, by Geneva herself, 'its Mother, its Guardian and its Nurse?' (a) We had hoped that the Church which has had but a breathing time from the attacks of infidelity, and which is perpetually assailed by Sectarians, would, at least, be spared the misery of seeing the dragon's teeth sown in her furrows, and her children falling by the mutual wounds of one another. Is the practice of brotherly love so fervent, that there is no danger of its holy ardour being cooled by these disputations? Are its bands so strict, that they cannot be loosened by these controversies? Alas! alas! for Christian professors, who call themselves Christ's disciples, and have not this mark of Christ in their forehead; "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." (b) Wo

(a) Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvii. Sect. ii. Part ii. § 12.

(b) John xiii. 35.

be to those who shall be weighed in the scales, and found wanting in that "charity, the very bond of peace, and of all virtues, without which, whosoever liveth is counted dead before God." (c) But we bow to the will of him who has taught us through his Apostle, "that there must be heresies, that they which are approved may be made manifest;" (d) and we await that judgment of approbation in trembling hope, that while we have been earnestly contending for the Faith which was once delivered unto the saints," (e) our weapons have never once been wantonly steeped in the poison of uncharitable passions.

(c) Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday, Book of Common Prayer.

(d) 1 Cor. xi. 19.

(e) Jude, v. 3.

FINIS.

Rep'd H. 2012-4-47



